

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on May 19, 2021 at 1:00 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) LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha McKeel, and Ms. Donna Price.

ABSENT: Ms. Liz Palmer.

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 1:00 p.m. by the Chair, Mr. Ned Gallaway.

Mr. Gallaway said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." He 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. He stated that participation included the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public would be received.

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

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Mr. Gallaway said he did not recall any requests to add anything to the agenda. He asked if there were any items that needed to be pulled from consent.

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

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

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

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

Ms. Mallek said the Lewis & Clark Exploratory Center would be hosting an outdoor firepit party Thursday, May 27, from 5:00 to 7:30 p.m. She said in addition to visiting and hors d'oeuvres, there would be an art walk around the property and down to the river with some presentations from photographers and artists. She recommended the website for the center or the Facebook page for Lewis & Clark Exploratory Center to find out more.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley gave an update on the planting of the milkweed seeds for the Monarch butterflies. She said she planted her seeds, and within two weeks, they were already popping up. She said the seeds were not expensive, and it was easy to do; she suggested those not that good at gardening or something could buy the actual plants and then put them somewhere, but otherwise they are really easy and come up quickly. She said the scouts spread them out near the Lewis & Clark Exploratory Center, and they have volunteers in other places in Darden Towe, so all that went well, and hers are already coming up, so looking forward to some beautiful milkweeds this year or next year.

Agenda Item No. 6. Proclamations and Recognitions.

There were none.

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

Mr. Gary Grant (Rio District) said he had a proclamation: "Whereas, this all-Democrat Albemarle Board of Supervisors voted unanimously on May 5th to raise real estate taxes on County residents for calendar 2021; and whereas, according to the County's valid and reliable community survey, only one in five Albemarle residents say they are very satisfied with the value of services received for the tax dollars taken by this all-Democrat board; and whereas, this all-Democrat Board of Supervisors' leadership is rated as excellent by less than one in 10 County residents; and whereas, this all-Democrat Board of Supervisors is rated as excellent by only one in 10 County residents on how fairly supervisors treat Albemarle residents, and whereas, in spite of this all-Democrat Board's unanimous decision that the term

community members is to be used by County officials instead of the term citizens, the Board's executive continues to use the term citizens repeatedly in his annual community report video; and whereas, in spite of this all-Democrat Board of Supervisors' unanimous decision to abide by an inclusive strategic plan, this Board has appointed three white males to all three of its trust positions on Jefferson-Madison Regional Library Board; and whereas, in spite of this all-Democrat Board of Supervisors' unanimous adoption of a climate action plan promoting electric vehicles, the Board spent over \$90,000 taxpayer dollars on a gasoline-powered van for community engagement use; and whereas, this all-Democrat Board of Supervisors since September 6th of last year has refused to disavow Rivanna Supervisor LaPisto-Kirtley's statement, 'I think most of us by the time we get to meetings, if we've done our homework, we already know how we're going to vote'; and whereas, this all-Democrat Board according to the day's consent agenda item #8.2 intends to give itself another pay raise beginning July 1st, now therefore be it proclaimed that the current members of this badass all-Democrat Albemarle Board of Supervisors are duly recognized as being much, much more powerful than the dumbass voters who elected them; spoken this 19th day of May 2021, Gary Grant, Earlysville, Virginia."

Mr. Seth Chokel said he and his wife, Leah Willey, as of this past February were residents of the Rivanna magisterial district and owners of the property known as La Fourche on Keswick Road. He said in a moment, the Board would hear a homestay special exemption request for their property, and he appreciated the consideration of the matter. He said he and his wife wanted to offer some details on their request and first wanted to highlight the property's extensive history of hospitality. He said the primary structure dated back to 1790 when it was built as a tavern and inn, and guests included Lafayette on his way to Monticello and Stonewall Jackson and his army returning to defend Richmond.

Mr. Chokel said more recently, the property has hosted countless short-term renters and boarders since the late 1950s as evidenced by articles and previous Airbnb listings before they were the owners. He said the neighbors that they have spoken to have grown accustomed to this use and are supportive of the application. He said they do not believe that their request will change the character of the property or negatively impact neighbors, rather will just bring its previous use of short-term rentals in compliance with the County's regulations.

Mr. Chokel said secondly, they live on the property with their young children and will manage the homestay themselves. He said they will be the point of contact for any issues and will also be the closest neighbors that can make sure that guests comply with all County restrictions and norms. He said the property layout includes three one-bedroom apartments and a six-bedroom main house; allowing them to increase the number of guest rooms to five would still allow his family plenty of space to be a strong and watchful presence to make sure that homestay use is not detrimental to the community.

Mr. Chokel said finally, approving their homestay request would allow them to maintain and preserve the historic nature of the property in a way that is financially viable. He said they treasure its history and are currently pursuing getting it listed on the National Register of Historic Places and are actively renovating areas which have shown deterioration. He said they feel well equipped to maintain the property as Leah's family has extensive history maintaining historic structures; in fact, her parents were the owners of the Clifton Inn from 1985 to 2017, so they are familiar to the County. He said the County's comprehensive plan encourages finding ways for the preservation of historic structures to be financially viable for property owners, and they feel that approving their homestay exception will allow them to be better stewards of the property going forward. He thanked the Board for their consideration that day and said to please feel free to reach out if anyone had any questions.

Mr. Gallaway closed Matters From the Public.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

Ms. Price **moved** to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Ms. Palmer.

Item No. 8.1. Authorize a Public Hearing to Consider a Virginia Byway Designation for Routes 240 and 810.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the Virginia Byway designation recognizes a road having relatively high aesthetic or cultural value, and leading to or within areas of historical, natural, or recreational significance. This designation may promote local tourism by providing an awareness of local significance and aesthetic opportunities regionally. Following a January 2019 discussion, the Board directed staff to request a Virginia Byway Designation eligibility study for Route 240 in Albemarle County from Route 250 through downtown Crozet, including the Historic District, to its intersection with Route 810 within Crozet; and of Route 810 within Crozet to the Greene County line (Attachment A). These two routes include approximately 21 miles in western Albemarle County (Attachment B). In January 2019, staff submitted a formal request to the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) to study and evaluate the routes for Virginia Byway designation.

In March 2021, VDOT and DCR collectively evaluated Routes 240 and 810 for possible designation, and recommended that the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) designate these routes as Virginia Byways (Attachment C).

A county with a proposed byway may choose to hold a public hearing on the proposed byway designation.

If a public hearing is held, a resolution of support from the Board will be needed for the CTB to proceed.

There are no budget impacts to the County from the proposed Virginia Byway designations.

Staff recommends that the Board schedule a public hearing for July 7, 2021, to receive comments on the proposed Virginia Byway designations of Routes 240 and 810.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board voted to schedule a public hearing for July 7, 2021, to receive comments on the proposed Virginia Byway designations of Routes 240 and 810.

Item No. 8.2. Request to Set Public Hearing for June 16, 2021, on an Ordinance to Amend Chapter 2, Administration, of the Albemarle County Code, to Amend Section 2-202, Compensation of Board of Supervisors, to Increase the Compensation of the Members of the Board of Supervisors by 2% Effective July 1, 2021.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board voted to set a public hearing for June 16, 2021, on an Ordinance to Amend Chapter 2, Administration, of the Albemarle County Code, to Amend Section 2-202, Compensation of Board of Supervisors, to Increase the Compensation of the Members of the Board of Supervisors by 2% Effective July 1, 2021.

Item No. 8.3. FY 21 Third Quarter Financial Report **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.4. VDOT Monthly Report (May) 2021, **was received for information.**

Agenda Item No. 9. **Action Item:** SE202100010 Homestay Special Exceptions, La Fourche.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that The applicants have requested two special exceptions in association with the proposed homestay at 3555 Keswick Road, 3507 Keswick Road, and 1061 East Keswick Drive:

Increase the Number of guest rooms -Pursuant to County Code §18-5.1.48(i)(1)(i), the applicants are requesting a special exception to increase the number of permitted guest rooms from two to five.

Reduce Required Minimum Yards -Pursuant to County Code § 18-5.1.48(i)(1)(ii), the applicants are also requesting a special exception to reduce the 125' setbacks required by County Code 18-5.1.48(j)(1)(v).

Please see Attachment A for full details of staff's analysis and recommendations.

Ms. Ragsdale, Principal Planner, noted that the Board had just heard from the owners in public comments. She said she would primarily focus on the zoning and land use side of things in her presentation since they had just been given an introduction to the property.

Ms. Ragsdale said there were currently no complaints or issues with the property; the new owners were pursuing the proper permits before establishing the use, which may have happened intermittently in the past. Ms. Ragsdale said when they start these presentations with the Board, they like to remind the Board which regulations are applicable and which ones need the waiver or modification because there are several sets of regulations depending on the acreage or the zoning of the properties.

Ms. Ragsdale said the zoning of the property is rural area and is a parcel of less than five acres, so by right, rental of up to two guest rooms is allowed provided that all of the homestay structures and parking meet that required 125-foot setback, which the Board is very familiar with. She said no whole house rental would be permitted, and whole house rental is when the owners and managers are not present. She said all homestays must be owner-occupied and obtain a zoning clearance, and in terms of the process, the special exception is the very first step; then, prior to issuing a clearance, all of the safety inspections and neighbor notifications and final parking layout and such are verified before the use would be established.

Ms. Ragsdale said in this case, they are requesting two special exceptions, the one to reduce 125-foot setback, and then to increase the number of guest rooms that would be permitted for rental at one time from two to five. She provided a refresher for the Board in terms of the ordinance criteria used to evaluate special exceptions. She said the general special exceptions criteria apply, and the Board is

not required to make specific findings, but staff does analyze these requests in terms of the factors to consider in the homestay section of the ordinance and also provide additional information that they think may be relevant to that analysis of the comprehensive plan recommendations for the request.

Ms. Ragsdale said the primary analysis includes whether or not there would be detriment to any abutting lots or if there would be harm to public health, safety, or welfare in granting the waivers or modifications. She said the Board may approve, defer, approve with conditions, or deny special exception requests.

Ms. Ragsdale said this particular location is at the corner of Keswick Road and East Keswick Road. She said the property contains three residences, two at 3555 and 3557 Keswick Road, and then the other dwelling is on the East Keswick Drive side of the property. She demonstrated the surrounding properties that were notified as part of the process, and they have not received any objections or concerns from any of the neighbors in terms of the County notice that was sent.

Ms. Ragsdale presented a photo of the site from a different angle which showed the established trees and landscaping on the property and the structures: the main house at 3555; 3557 to the rear and left of that; and then along East Keswick is 1061, the other cottage on the property. She presented the standard exhibit staff had provided to the Board with the layout showing where the guestrooms would be located, parking areas and their orientation to the roadways, and where required screening would be provided. She said in this case, the structure that is 3557 itself and its parking does not require a special exception to modify the setbacks because the owners also own that adjacent property to the north.

Ms. Ragsdale said 3555 and 1061 were the structures that needed the setback reduction, as the main house is about 80 to 90 feet from the roadways and then the other cottage on East Keswick about 45 feet, so they do meet the primary structure setbacks for the rural areas. She demonstrated a slide labeling where the parking areas are. She said there is one parking area in particular that staff had a few concerns about and noted in the staff report. She said the recommendation the Board received was for removal; however, the owners would like the option of keeping it there. She said after the staff report and recommendations were provided to the applicant, they asked if they could reconfigure it to address the safety concerns, so staff has recommended a change to the condition of approval and the exhibit that is referenced in the conditions to note that the recommendation is that that parking either be removed or reconfigured as a condition prior to issuing that final zoning clearance before they could establish the use if the Board were to approve the special exceptions that day.

Ms. Ragsdale presented attachment F with the recommended conditions of approval. She said staff's recommendation is that the Board move to adopt the resolution attachment F subject to its conditions, and she had underlined in condition 4 the additional language that would allow the applicants the option of reconfiguring the parking.

Ms. McKeel asked to see a previous slide and noted that Ms. Ragsdale had said that there was not a concern about the buffer for 3557 because they owned the property across what she was assuming was a road. Ms. McKeel asked if that was a road that she was seeing.

Ms. Ragsdale said there was a private road that goes back to some lots that were platted known as Royal Acres; it goes back and serves as the access to a property off the screen. She said what is seen on the adjacent property, which the neighbors own, is a barn that they are renovating. She said the question about the yard is the 125 is from any abutting lot not under the same ownership as the homestay is the way the regulation is written.

Ms. McKeel said she would like to know at some point, not necessarily that day, what would happen if, in fact, that back property was sold because there is a road there.

Ms. Ragsdale said it would not change anything in terms of the requirements for the homestay parcel, and since there is that road, there is that corner lot situation, so they have not applied buffers and screening in that case. She said it is a lot of record, and another home can be built there, but they are intending to use the barn for their personal use.

Ms. McKeel asked to get back to this at a future time; maybe when they talk about how this is working and everything, she would like to come back to this question since approvals do go with the land of what happens if the property is sold.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she had visited this property, having done her homework as they all do, and it truly was a gem in this area, having been there since 1790 and used for an inn and tavern. She said everything is being renovated; it is a lovely, lovely piece of property. She said she did like the idea that that parking area is going to be reconfigured.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said to address Ms. McKeel's question, she knows there are some neighbors to the north planning on building another driveway exit from their property onto Keswick Road, so at that point, that road that is now in between may be able to be closed if VDOT approves, but that is sometime in the future.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she is so happy that it is going to be continued as a homestay, and she is hoping in the future that it could actually be turned into some kind of a small inn. She said the two buildings are very historic; one of them (3557) actually used to be a smokehouse, and 1061 was the doctor's office, and then he lived in the big house. She said she did not have any questions because, in

her opinion, they have addressed the issues, and she is glad to be seeing it become a homestay legally.

Ms. Price thanked Ms. Ragsdale for the presentation. She said she wanted to go back to Ms. McKeel's question because she was not quite sure what the answer was. She asked if the adjacent property, the one with the barn that is being reconfigured, was sold and then became a different owner's whether there was 125 feet between building 3557 and the property line.

Ms. Ragsdale said she believed that they did have that distance.

Ms. Price confirmed that it does not affect this particular setting. She asked, though, following up on Ms. McKeel's question, perhaps for Mr. Kamptner and again for a later time, if the Board were to approve a special exception for a homestay where the distance was less than 125 feet from an adjacent property, but then later the adjacent property is sold, since now it would be less than 125 feet from a different owner's property, whether the special exception would go away and whether the property owner would then have to essentially reapply. She said she thought that was kind of following up with Ms. McKeel's question, and again not for that day but for the future, she would like that also to be a topic of discussion.

Ms. Price said turning specifically to this matter, in preparing for the day's Board meeting at the invitation of Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, she had accompanied her on a visual tour of the property. She said she really concurs with the removal or reconfiguring of the small parking lot by #1061 but wanted to make a general comment. She said when there is a property that has a historical use such as this property has had for many, many decades, it is part of the tradition, the culture, the history of Albemarle County, which makes it attractive for both the residents as well as visitors; she is much more likely to see the favorable outcome for this than perhaps building an entirely new structure or new establishment that does not have the historical connection. She said she had no objection and is very supportive of this and appreciated both the applicant and County staff working towards what appeared to be a favorable resolution with regard to the concerns over the parking.

Ms. Mallek asked for clarification from Ms. Ragsdale if she were correct that one would not be able to build a brand-new building and then do a homestead; this is for existing buildings before the date of the adoption of the ordinance.

Ms. Ragsdale said the County allows homestays in primary dwellings; one could have a homestay in association with any single family detached dwelling regardless of the date it was constructed. She said for accessory structures, the County added the provision that new accessory structures after August 2019 would need a special exception, in some cases, for lots greater than five acres. She said for lots that are less than five acres and residential lots, one would need a special exception regardless of when the structure was built to use an accessory structure, so new construction (single family home) does have the ability to do homestays.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she thought that structure, 3557, was 125 feet from the road, or the other lot; she was not sure. She asked if it were not, and the other property were to be sold with the barn on it whether that one structure at 3557 simply could not be used as a part of the homestay or they would have to apply for a special exception.

Mr. Kamptner replied what would happen would be that that particular structure would become a nonconforming structure; it would not affect the validity of the special exception, but if that structure were to be modified in a way that triggered the nonconforming regulations, then they would have to get a special exception to reestablish the setback.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she thought that answered Ms. McKeel's question too.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment F) to approve the special exceptions with the conditions contained therein.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **moved** to adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment F) to approve the special exceptions with the conditions 1-4 contained therein as amended (#4 revised).

Ms. Price **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. Price.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Ms. Palmer.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS FOR
SE2021-00010 LA FOURCHE HOMESTAY**

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the Memorandum prepared in conjunction with the SE2021-00010 La Fourche Homestay application and the attachments thereto, including staff's supporting analysis, any comments received, and all of the factors relevant to the special exceptions in Albemarle County Code §§ 18-5.1.48 and 18-33.49, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the requested special exceptions would cause (i) no detriment to any abutting lot and (ii) no harm to the public health, safety, or welfare.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that in association with the homestay at 3555 Keswick Road, 3507 Keswick Road, and 1061 East Keswick Drive, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves the special exceptions both (i) to permit the use of up to five guest rooms and (ii) to modify the minimum 125 foot northeast and southeast yards otherwise required for a homestay in the Rural Areas zoning district, both subject to the conditions attached hereto.

* * * *

SE2021-00010 LA FOURCHE HOMESTAY CONDITIONS

1. Parking for homestay guests is limited to the Parking areas designated on the Parking and House Location Exhibit dated April 27, 2021.
2. Homestay use is limited to a total of five guest rooms, all of which must be within the existing dwellings depicted on the Parking and House Location Exhibit dated April 27, 2021.
3. The existing buffer and screening located along the southeastern property line, as depicted on the Parking and House Location Exhibit dated April 27, 2021, must be maintained, or equivalent screening that meets the minimum **requirements** of County Code § 18-32.7.9.7(b)-(e) must be established and maintained.
4. The existing parking adjacent to 1061 East Keswick Drive, labeled as "Parking to be removed" on the Parking and House Location Exhibit dated April 27, 2021, must be removed prior to zoning clearance approval for a homestay.

Agenda Item No. 10. **Action Item:** SE202100002 Ivy Proper – Special Exception for Disturbance of Critical Slope.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the applicant is requesting a special exception to allow the disturbance of 4,375 square feet of critical slopes (slopes greater than 25%) in association with a final site plan - SDP202100001 Ivy Proper - that is currently under review. Though this request for critical slopes disturbance was originally scheduled for Board consideration on April 7, 2021, the applicant requested deferral in light of concerns that were raised by Board members. The applicant has since revised its request by reducing the amount of critical slope disturbance by 1,140 square feet, showing the drainage feature (rip rap) from the adjacent railroad parcel, and incorporating alternative design comparisons via an appendix section. The applicant's revised request is provided in Attachment A, which includes a map on Page 3 that shows the location of the proposed critical slope disturbance.

County Code § 18-4.2.3(b) and § 18-4.2.5(a) allow for disturbance of critical slopes, provided the findings in § 18-4.2.5(a)(3) are made.

Please see Attachment B for staff's full analysis. Based on the findings therein, staff recommends approval of the applicant's request to disturb critical slopes with the following conditions:

1. The area of land disturbance on critical slopes must not exceed the "Disturbed Critical Slopes" shown on Image 1 of the request entitled "Ivy Proper: Critical Slopes Waiver - Special Exception Request," prepared by Timmons Group, dated January 5, 2021 and last revised April 26, 2021.
2. Final design of the retaining walls must be submitted and is subject to the approval of the County Engineer and the Building Division prior to approval of the VSMP application.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment C) to approve the special exception request.

Ms. Gleason, Senior Planner in the Planning Division of the Community Development Department of Albemarle County, said she was joined by Mr. Frank Pohl, County Engineer, who would also be available to answer questions. She said the property under discussion was located on Ivy Road across from the Ivy Post Office just west of Scott's Ivy Exxon. She said the application was a special exception request to disturb critical slope areas; the request was made in connection with the final site plan STP202100001, Ivy Proper, currently under review by staff.

Ms. Gleason said the applicant was requesting permission to disturb 4,375 square feet of critical slopes on site. She indicated the areas in the graphic she presented. She said the impacted slopes were thought to be man-made in nature created with the construction of the railroad. She said stepping back to review the history of this particular request, the item was originally scheduled for Board consideration on April 7, 2021, but the applicant requested deferral in light of concerns that were raised by members of the Board. She said since then, staff has worked with the applicant; the concerns were requested alternative designs, drainage and erosion from the abutting railroad parcel, and then designing construction of the retaining walls. She said discussion on these concerns is included in the staff report.

Ms. Gleason asked the Board to note that the request had been revised and refined to reduce the amount of critical slope disturbance requested; the original request in April was for the disturbance of 5,515 square feet, and the request had been reduced to 4,375 square feet, which is a reduction of 1,140 square feet.

Ms. Gleason said based on staff's evaluation of the applicant's revised request, staff recommended approval of the waiver with the following conditions: that the area of land disturbance on critical slopes must not exceed the area shown on image 1 of the applicant's request, and the final design of the retaining walls must be submitted and is subject to the approval of the County Engineer and Building Division prior to approval of the VSMP application.

Ms. Mallek said there was a mention in the staff report that there was some riprapping to be added to supposedly stop some of the erosion happening from the culvert of the property uphill. She asked if there was actually a drainage requirement to improve that runoff similar to what the shopping centers have to do; they have to take into consideration what is coming onto their property and then control that as well as what is native to their property.

Mr. Pohl, County Engineer, replied yes; they are routing that stormwater through their underground detention facility and through their site.

Ms. Mallek said it was mentioned in the report that this is located in a drinking water watershed. She asked what the extra requirements for this site are because of that designation that, if it were a half-mile further up the road, it would not have.

Mr. Pohl said with this request, there are not any additional requirements that have been offered. He said in looking at the criteria that staff is supposed to look at, they have analyzed it based on the criteria and did not think it was justified to require any additional measures to impact critical slopes.

Ms. Mallek asked if she was correct that the authority is there if the County chose to, but they think that this is sufficient.

Mr. Pohl said he did not know if the authority is there; he would have to ask Legal. He said he analyzed it based on the criteria in the ordinance, which is how he came up with his recommendation.

Ms. Mallek said she is not an engineer, so she is much more alarmist about things than those who have the academic background to be able to understand all this better, but she will say that dirt was put there for a reason, and it is to hold up the railroad track, and coal trains going by, empty coal trains even, create a lot of vibration. She said from an uneducated point of view, she is still very concerned about digging into the hill that is holding up that transcontinental rail line, and a really important one. She said she remembered when improvements were being made to the square in Crozet, there were all sorts of rules laid on about not being able to even enter closer to 50 feet from the main line in order to even have a fence or park a car, and so it seemed like the railroad took these safety issues pretty seriously.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if this had been discussed with the railroad, if they knew about this, and whether there was any concern.

Mr. Pohl said he had not discussed it with the railroad and had relied on the structural engineer of the applicant. He said he had spoken with them, and they have revised the design of the wall. He said they did not specify really the design of the wall in the previous application, but they have narrowed that down to be a wall that they say will not impact the property adjacent to their property, which is the railroad property. He said in speaking with them, they have provided a statement to that effect; they said that they can build this with a cast in place or a soldier pile wall, so he is relying on their expertise to make that determination.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if it would be a good idea to get the input from the railroad.

Mr. Pohl said it might be a good idea; that is up to the applicant. He said he did not reach out to the railroad; they are not easy to reach out to and contact. He said since they are not on their property, he did not see it as being a requirement. He said there are risks with every project wherever walls are built; there is going to be risk with these walls, and this is why they are in front of the Board to decide if the risk is adequate or proper for this site. He said he cannot accept all the risk as the County engineer; the applicant has to accept some of the risk. He said he did not have any objections to what they proposed based on their professional engineer's statements.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said if this were an ordinary situation, she probably would not even bring this up because she would trust the County engineers and the applicant's engineers; they are responsible, but the vibration factor that Ms. Mallek brought up is really sticking with her. She asked if there would be an increase in lines coming through there and whether that made a difference for the engineer that is coming up with the walls and everything. She said they do know that there is going to be an increase in train lines from Southern Virginia all the way up to Northern Virginia, so she questioned whether that increase would make a difference or whether it is just the current increase and the current tonnage.

Mr. Pohl said with regard to vibration, the structural engineer specifically addressed that and said that if the wall is designed correctly and built correctly, that is not an issue. He said he did have some photos at the end of the slide deck that he could show; there are two photos of railroad walls that are 20 feet tall, so it shows that one can design walls adjacent to railroads and then withstand vibrations and the loading of the actual cars. He said he knew these were extreme, but it shows even in extreme cases, society can build walls to hold up railroad lines.

Mr. Pohl pointed out on a slide that the critical slopes moving closer toward Ivy Road are all entirely on the railroad property, so it is thought they use this area as a laydown area, and they extended

and pushed those critical slopes onto this property. He said they could have theoretically kept all of those critical slopes on the railroad property, so there is a bit of a buffer between this property and the railroad, so if there were a slope failure that it would not reach the railroad line itself. He said because of that and because these are man-made, that is how he came up with his recommendation.

Ms. Price expressed appreciation toward Ms. Gleason and Mr. Pohl for the presentation briefing as well as the follow-up commentary in response to the questions. She also expressed appreciation to the applicant because the report that they provided, particularly where it showed consideration of various alternatives, really helped her to feel that she had a better sense of what possible options and considerations could be there. She commented that she did find in the applicant's report the last sentence of the third paragraph on section four to be subjective editorial commentary that was unnecessary and detracted from the objective consideration of the proposal and would simply ask that when the Board receives these sorts of reports and applications that they stick to the property in question and not necessarily address things outside of the application.

Ms. Mallek said that Mr. Pohl mentioned that the applicant takes the risk for making sure that his designs are correct, and the implementation of the designs is carried out correctly, and asked about the legal obligation that that person would have considering everybody downhill. She said she knew this was a worst-case scenario, but this was a very troublesome and challenging site, and that is probably why it has been undeveloped for many, many decades. She asked if the applicant keeps a bond to cover the losses of others if those slope failures, and things that are mentioned in passing almost in the staff report, happen because she does not see that the County will jump in and pay for everybody's damages.

Mr. Kamptner said the railroad as the adjoining property owner has a remedy in court if this property causes damage to the railroad property.

Ms. Mallek asked about properties downhill, where the damage would go if there were a mudslide downhill with a whole lot of rain; it is going to be the rest of Ivy that is going to be getting the damage. She said she did not know what legal remedies there were, rather than just saying go fight it out in civil court because she does not think that is fair; she asked whether for a decision that the Board was making, they were putting people at risk financially or otherwise.

Mr. Pohl said he thought Ms. Mallek was speaking of two different issues: One might be what Mr. Kamptner referred to or addressed, which was the adjacent railroad property, but then with regard to erosion/sediment control, yes, they will have a bond; for erosion and sediment control measures, the applicant will have a permit in place. He said if sediment does leave the site, they do have measures and means to address that not only with the County but with DEQ, and they may get involved because there will be a DEQ permit also.

Ms. Mallek asked how long that oversight happens because it may be 15 years until something happens.

Mr. Pohl said the oversight stops once the bond is released at the end of the project. He said if there is a future failure in 15 years, there is no bond in place, so it may at that point be a civil matter, but if the wall fails and sediment enters the stream because of the wall, the owner would still be liable to potentially DEQ including for state waters, so there is still a mechanism there through the state.

Ms. Mallek said it feels like a long distance when driving on the road, but it is a very short distance to the reservoir as the crow flies, so seeing how dirt can travel, it is very close.

Ms. Price **moved** to adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment C) to approve the special exception request with the conditions contained therein.

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

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

NAYS: Ms. Mallek

ABSENT: Ms. Palmer.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR SE 2021-00002 IVY PROPER

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the Memorandum prepared in conjunction with the SE 2021-00002 Ivy Proper application and the attachments thereto, including staff's supporting analysis, any comments received, and all of the factors relevant to the special exception in Albemarle County Code §§ 18-4.2.3(b), 18-4.2.5(a), and 18-33.49, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the special exception request would not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, to the orderly development of the area, or to adjacent properties; would not be contrary to sound engineering practices; and

- i. alternatives proposed by the developer or subdivider would satisfy the intent and purposes of Albemarle County Code § 18-4.2 to at least an equivalent degree; and
- ii. due to the property's unusual size, topography, shape, location or other unusual conditions, excluding the proprietary interest of the developer or subdivider, prohibiting the disturbance of

critical slopes would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use of the property or would result in significant degradation of the property or adjacent properties.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves the special exception to allow the disturbance of critical slopes associated with SDP202100001 Ivy Proper, subject to the conditions attached hereto.

* * * *

SE 202100002 Ivy Proper Conditions

1. The area of land disturbance on critical slopes must not exceed the “Disturbed Critical Slopes” shown on Image 1 of the request entitled “Ivy Proper Critical Slopes Waiver – Special Exception Request,” prepared by Timmons Group, dated January 5, 2021 and last revised April 26, 2021.
2. Final design of the retaining walls must be submitted and is subject to the approval of the County Engineer and the Building Division prior to approval of the VSMP application.

Mr. Gallaway left the meeting at 1:59 p.m. and returned at 2:08 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 11. **Presentation:** Transportation Project Update and Grant Recommendations.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that The Albemarle County Transportation Priorities Project Updates & Future Grant Options report found in Attachment A provides a complete update of all priority projects found in the 2019 Albemarle County Transportation Priorities list, which is included in Attachment B. The Board approved the 2019 report on July 3, 2019, which lists all capital transportation projects recommended through the various County planning processes. These projects have been ranked through a methodology intended to identify the most important projects. County staff previously proposed updating the Albemarle County Transportation Priorities once every two years. This would have been set to occur in 2021. However, because of limits in the CDD work plan and the proposal to develop an Albemarle County Multi-modal Transportation Plan, this update was postponed to roll into that planning process.

This report provides an update on the work to advance each of the projects that fall within the First Tier (projects 1-20) of the 2019 Priorities List, as well as the Second and Third Tier projects that have been advanced in some manner. The purpose of providing this report is to identify and get Board feedback on the highest priority projects that could become the subject of the next two grant cycles which includes the

Revenue Sharing and Transportation Alternatives Grants, due in Fall of 2021 and the Smart Scale Grants, due in Summer 2022.

Over the past two years, twelve of the projects from the 2019 Albemarle County Transportation Priorities List have received funding and are moving towards construction. As discussed in the report in Attachment A, for the upcoming round of Revenue Sharing applications, staff is proposing to submit the Eastern Avenue South project as the top priority project for 2021. There is a \$10 million limit for State funding per locality each application period. If the final cost of the Eastern Ave project leaves sufficient funds, then staff is recommends also submitting an application for the Avon Street Shared-use Path.

To appropriately plan for the potential applications for the 2022 Smart Scale Grant Round and allow the Board and community stakeholders an opportunity to provide feedback on those projects, staff would like the Board to begin considering potential projects. At this time, staff have considered seven preliminary projects for a 2022 application cycle. The County can submit up to four applications and the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission have agreed to assist by submitting additional applications on behalf of the County. The following projects are recommended as potential Smart Scale 2022 Grants:

1. District Avenue Roundabout
4. Hillsdale Drive Extension and Realignment Phase 1: Mall Drive to Rio Road
16. US 250 West/US 29 Bypass Interchange Belvedere Boulevard/Rio Road Intersection Improvement
19. 5th Street Extended Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
21. US 250 West Intersection Improvements in Crozet
- N/A. Rivanna River Bike and Pedestrian Bridge: South Pantops to Woolen Mills

Staff is careful not to obligate any funds for projects that are not known to be available. Because project planning is often required to occur many years in advance of the need for funding, however, staff attempts to make reasonable estimates on potential funding that could be available at points out in the future. The recommendations for projects that will require funding over the next five years described in this report under the Funded Projects Updates and the Recommended Projects for Upcoming Grants; Revenue Sharing 2021 are consistent with reasonable estimates.

Coordination with the Finance and Budget Department has occurred and the necessary local funding to implement the projects that are currently moving forward and those recommended for funding

in the 2021 Revenue Sharing cycle are consistent with the proposed Transportation Leveraging Funds expected in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Fall of 2021. Projects recommended for future grants will likely require County CIP funds to initiate design or provide required or optional local matches to receive State funding. However, staff is not requesting a decision from the Board on that funding today. When the specific need for funding is determined, staff will return to the Board to affirm support.

This report and presentation is being provided for the Board as an update on the Transportation Priorities and to give the Board a chance to weigh-in on the potential projects for upcoming Revenue Sharing and Smart Scale Grant Cycles. Staff recommendations regarding those grant cycles are included in the Discussion above and the attached report.

Mr. Kevin McDermott, Planning Manager for Albemarle County, said he was there to talk about the transportation priorities and project update and the future grant options. He said he had provided the Board with a report covering all the transportation priorities from the 2019 Albemarle County priority list that was approved in July of 2019. He said that list provided all capital transportation projects that were recommended through the various County planning processes. He said it was ranked with a methodology intended to identify the highest priority projects, and typically they would look at updating that list every 2 years, so that was going to occur in 2021. He said because of limits in the CDD work plan and the proposal before the Board to develop a multimodal transportation plan, the process of updating that list was postponed. He said he would let the Board know where they were with the existing list and hear the upcoming projects so that they could start to make decisions about the next projects they would apply for in grant cycles for revenue sharing in 2021 and in Smart Scale for 2022. He said final decisions did not have to be made at this time; he would come back to the Board for those, but he wanted to get direction from the Board to make sure that they were looking in the right way for these different projects.

Mr. McDermott said they have gotten 12 projects from that 2019 project list funded; that included eight first-tier projects, three of the second-tier projects, and one of the third-tier projects. He noted those were listed in the staff document, but he would focus mostly on these upcoming grant cycles in the next few years.

Mr. McDermott said revenue sharing was coming up in 2021; they would be making applications in the spring and summer. He said the first priority that had been discussed in the past for revenue sharing was the Eastern Avenue South connection from Westhall Drive across the Lickinghole Creek to Cory Farms Drive and Route 250. He said that project was currently being evaluated through an alignment study and conceptual design which the County has funded through the transportation leveraging project. He said the updated cost estimates were just recently received from the consultant that had been hired, and the preliminary cost estimates were now at \$19,983,000. He said these are still being worked on; there will possibly be some fluctuation in the final cost estimates, but this is where they were right now. Mr. McDermott pointed out that they have some people from the FES Department available to answer specific questions about that. He said this project was being managed by Mr. Jack Kelsey in Facilities & Environmental Services.

Mr. McDermott said the next project on the list that had been discussed for revenue sharing was the Avon Street bicycle and pedestrian improvements from Mill Creek Drive to Peregrory Lane. He said this was recommended in the Southern Areas Master Plan; it was a top priority in the Avon Street Corridor Study, and it was proposed as one of the Quality of Life projects a few years back, and so there was some funding attached to that. He said the proposal was for a shared-use path on the west side of Avon Street and a pedestrian crossing of Avon Street between Mill Creek and Peregrory Lane; just on the south side of I-64. He said the draft cost estimate for that from the Avon Corridor Study was approximately 2 million, and the consultant who did that study would take a second look at that to make sure that estimate was still accurate.

Mr. McDermott said those were the only two projects that they have discussed for revenue sharing, and he wanted to put out some considerations for the Board that could be discussed. He said there is a \$10 million limit for a revenue-sharing application period. He noted Eastern Avenue at a \$19 million cost estimate would eat up essentially all of that \$10 million because the County would be providing \$10 million and then would be requesting \$10 million from the state, so that is where that \$10 million limit would be reached. Mr. McDermott said that funding is programmed in the outyears of the six-year plan now. He said this was a change in VDOT's process for revenue sharing; in the past, when they got revenue-sharing applications, that money would be programmed starting in the next year; they have now moved to a process similar to Smart Scale where the money would not be available for about five years after that approval was made, so any funding from revenue sharing would not be available until 2027 or 2028. He said they could evaluate the possibility of the County continuing forward with any design to advance the project, but that \$10 million would not be reimbursable if they spent additional money before it was approved that would also not be reimbursable, so that was something to keep in mind.

Mr. McDermott said the preapplication for revenue sharing was open, it just started May 17, and would be open until July 1, so they would have to know what projects they were going to make applications for by July 1, and then the final application period was August through October when it finally closes, and they needed all of their information in at that time.

Mr. McDermott said those were the two revenue-sharing projects. He said he would talk quickly about the Smart Scale 2022 projects and then move to discussion and questions from the Board.

Mr. McDermott said for Smart Scale 2022, they have preliminarily identified a number of projects that they can make applications for. He presented a map noting it showed the Eastern Avenue and Avon Street projects in it as well, but the projects that had been discussed preliminarily for Smart Scale included the District Avenue Roundabout, which was a component of the Hydraulic project that was funded partially after this component was removed. He reminded the Board about three years prior, an application was made for the Hydraulic project that included a lot of different pieces of it; that project was not funded, and they scaled it back and resubmitted it in a previous application round with only some of those pieces. He said District Avenue was one that had been removed that is now being discussed with the Charlottesville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization MPO with the possibility of adding that back into the project as an application.

Mr. McDermott said a second project is the Hillsdale Drive Extension and Realignment Phase 1 from Mall Drive to Rio Road, and that included the roundabout at Rio Road. He said this was the recommendation from the Rio29 Small Area Plan and one of the high priorities from that. He said it is also currently part of the Rio Corridor study; they are reevaluating that recommendation. Mr. McDermott pointed out that the numbers shown on the screen were the rankings from that 2019 priority list, so they were going back and looking at the highest ranked projects from 2019 and trying to move the ones that had not been funded yet forward.

Mr. McDermott said the next project was US-250 West/US-29 Bypass Interchange. He said there were recommendations made for improvements at that interchange through the VDOT STARS study that was done a number of years ago. He said there have continued to be issues out there, and VDOT is evaluating potential improvements that include all the way from the Old Ivy Road intersection in the County, not the one at the City side, but the western end of that intersection with Ivy Road and those intersections with the ramps on Ivy and looking to see if some improvements could be made to operations and safety through there.

Mr. McDermott said #17 was the Belvedere Boulevard/Rio Road Intersection Improvement. He said this was one that they had considered making an application for in the previous Smart Scale round; instead, they decided to focus on the John Warner Parkway/Rio Rd intersection and make an application for that, which was funded, and now they are starting to consider how they might be able to tie in improvements with Belvedere Boulevard, and that is also currently being evaluated through the Rio Road Corridor Study so they would have some additional details about that as they moved through that process.

Mr. McDermott said the 5th Street Extended Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements was also a recommendation that was made in a recent VDOT STARS corridor study process for 5th Street. He said it looks at a lot of bicycle and pedestrian improvements. He said they could also tie in some roadway operation improvements, especially in the areas just south of the interstate there where there are some current problems; it would tie in well with the previously funded project for the roundabout at Old Lynchburg and 5th Street and the County 5th Street office building entrance, so that project is moving forward. He said ABC is coming in, which has Crawford, a shared-use path on the west side of 5th Street. He said they would like to try to extend that and make that a little bit more useful and tie it in with some other improvements.

Mr. McDermott said the next project on the list was Crozet Avenue and US-250 West Intersection Improvements. He said this was something that was previously ranked really high. He pointed out to the Board they are undergoing a Crozet master plan update right now, and as part of that, there was a transportation study that was done. He said through that transportation study, it was identified that of those intersections along US-250 on the south side of Crozet between Old Trail and Crozet Avenue, that actually Crozet Avenue is performing a little bit better than the ones at Old Trail and at the school's campus out there, Brownsville Elementary School entrance. He said the consideration could be made that instead of focusing on Crozet Avenue, perhaps they should be looking for a Smart Scale project there at Old Trail and the Brownsville Elementary School entrance. He said that is a consideration the Board should probably keep in mind.

Mr. McDermott said the next project on this preliminary list was the Rivanna River Bike and Pedestrian Bridge that is in South Pantops to Woolen Mills. He said as the Board of Supervisors recalled, VDOT did an evaluation of some potential alignments. He said they had identified some; it has not been finalized yet, but the ones that were identified essentially are from where the Woolen Mills facility is over to South Pantops near the State Farm property and then a second one up by the Riverside Park in the City also connecting over to Pantops/State Farm area. He said that project is still being evaluated for consideration for Smart Scale next year.

Mr. McDermott said they are already having these discussions with the Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) and VDOT because they are trying to get ahead of this. He said each can submit four applications for Smart Scale; four for TJPDC, four for CAMPO, and four for the County. He said they have developed a process at the TJPDC to select projects, and that would include a commitment to appropriate planning and public involvement prior to any submittal. He said they are doing this to make sure that there is not another situation where a project comes up that has not been entirely vetted, so they have made a commitment to working with the County to do that public involvement and planning process over the next year prior to making any submittals.

Mr. McDermott also pointed out that within the past week, VDOT has reached out to staff about two additional potential projects they would like to evaluate for consideration for the Smart Scale in 2022.

He said he is pointing these out separately because he actually got this information after he had submitted his report to the Board, so these were not ones he had considered at the time, but he thinks they could look at it and possibly have some additional room in the application limits to get these in if the Board is interested.

Mr. McDermott said the first one that VDOT would like to study is intersection improvements at US-250 and Route 22/Milton Road. He reminded the Board there has been a lot of discussion about US-250 east of Charlottesville and the problems out there. He said VDOT has identified this as well through the state VTrans process as a high priority, and that is why VDOT came to them asking about it. This was ranked at #39 in the previous priority list.

Mr. McDermott said the other one is not ranked in the previous priority list; however, components of it are ranked at #9 and #2, so there are pieces of it. He said those are both projects on 250 in Pantops that were identified in the priorities. He said VDOT would like to look at multimodal corridor improvements focused from Hanson Road to Peter Jefferson Parkway, which is essentially between the end of the Diverging Diamond project that was funded a few years ago and going to the corridor improvements that were funded in this most recent round. He said this study would cover that one segment that was not covered of US-250 in Pantops. Mr. McDermott pointed out that was a multimodal corridor evaluation they are looking at, and components of it would be bicycle and pedestrian, transit, and potentially looking at locations for a park-and-ride that could be connected to the transit and bike/ped improvements as well as other corridor improvements, crossings of US-250, all things that were recommended in the Pantops master plan.

Mr. McDermott said VDOT has reached out to them because they propose to provide the planning services that would be required for these projects that would include public involvement and conceptual design if the County wanted to move forward with that. He said the County could also ask them to move forward, and once again, no final decision was being made that day; they could always decide later that the County was not supportive of these projects and remove them from consideration for Smart Scale, but they offered to do that planning process.

Mr. McDermott said for Smart Scale 2022, the preapplications will be due the following year in April, and the final application is due in August. He said that seems like a long time away, but if they really want to get a robust planning process involved in any of these projects, they really want to get started now.

Mr. McDermott said he was available for questions as well as Mr. Blake Abplanalp and Mr. Dan Butch.

Ms. McKeel said her understanding was that this was for information only today as a kind of a general update for the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. McDermott agreed and said also in making sure that he was going in the right direction with these applications. He said if the Board had issues with them to please let him know now. He said they can always make final decisions later.

Ms. McKeel said they had a lot of discussion about all of these projects, and she felt comfortable with them. She said she had a couple of comments she would like to make at some point as looking at the future, she had some questions about not 2022, but the next round. She said she was not sure exactly and perhaps could talk with Mr. McDermott about this and could come back before Mr. McDermott left and just make a couple of comments about the future.

Mr. Gallaway said they had plenty of time scheduled and were running ahead of schedule.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated all these projects and does not have a lot of concerns about them right now.

Ms. Mallek asked about the three or four categories of funding. She asked Mr. McDermott to look at the list he had provided of the high-priority projects and separate them out among MPO, Albemarle County, and PDC because some might go in each of those places and have a home logically.

Mr. McDermott said he thought what Ms. Mallek was referring to was for Smart Scale 2022, where each can make those four applications, and they had started to discuss who would be most appropriate for those. He said he would go down that list of 22 projects: He said for the District Avenue roundabout, because the MPO was the lead on the Hydraulic plan, it would be most appropriate that the MPO would probably submit that application.

Mr. McDermott said because the County is working currently on the Rio corridor plan and also were the ones that did the Rio29 small area plan, he thought the Hillsdale Drive extension and realignment would probably be more appropriate coming from the County.

Mr. McDermott said that US-250 West could probably go any of the three ways, if considering the TJPDC as a third option, but he thought that would fit within the County's four if they wanted to make that application.

Mr. McDermott said once again because of the Rio corridor study, Belvedere Boulevard would be most appropriate for the County to do.

Mr. McDermott said MPO was offering to do 5th Street Extended because of its connection with the City. He said the STARS study actually went from Harris Street in the City down to Sunset in the County (or actually a little beyond Sunset), and so he thought that MPO was the one that is probably looking to make that application.

Mr. McDermott said Crozet Avenue/250 or if any project in that 250 corridor were to move forward, that would be most appropriate with the County.

Mr. McDermott said the Rivanna bike/ped bridge was an MPO project because a lot of the improvements would probably be in the City; even if it lands in the Woolen Mills area, they would want to make sure it connects to the City bike/ped facilities, so that would probably be best with the MPO.

Mr. McDermott said the next two projects, the Pantops corridor and the 22/250 intersection, would probably be the TJPDC or the MPO. He said that leaves the County with the Crozet Avenue, the Belvedere Boulevard, US-250 West, and Hillsdale as the four potential projects for the County and then the others from TJPDC and MPO.

Ms. Mallek thanked Mr. McDermott and said that made it more digestible for her brain and was helpful that they have some they have studied for a long time that are within the bracket.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked Mr. McDermott for the presentation and thanked Ms. Mallek for her questions because that was a good explanation for her also.

Ms. Price told Mr. McDermott that was a great report and presentation. She thanked him and everyone who worked with him to prepare and present that to the Board. She said it really is tying so many things together that they have talked about over the last year and a half, and she could visualize each of these as he talked about them.

Ms. Price said she especially wanted to appreciate #39, the US-250/Milton Road consideration. She said between that and the work that is being done at I-64 and 250 right now, the transportation situation in the eastern part of the County could really be improved. She said they have had, currently have, and have to expect that they will continue to have proposals for developments out on that part of the County, and 250 has simply got to be improved. She said she would really like to encourage attention being brought to bear on that one.

Ms. Price said with regard to the revenue sharing, it almost boggles her mind how they are supposed to be able to come up with ideas for some of these projects, and it is going to be another five or six years out before funding even comes up; with the way materials and other building project expenses are going up right now, it is basically anyone's guess what they may actually be looking at down the road, but she recognized part of the bureaucracy as well as the time that is required to actually go from proposal to project initiation is complex, and she was appreciative for the expertise that Mr. McDermott and everyone else he works with bring to this. She said this was a helpful report, and she hoped that their constituents see that the County is working very hard to address a number of traffic/transportation/infrastructure areas in the County.

Mr. Gallaway recalled they had voted to change some of the public input process on applications that the MPO could be taking forward and asked Mr. McDermott if there were any concerns about the number of projects that they are thinking of taking forward.

Mr. McDermott said he did not have any concerns with that. He said this does match up with their process that they have developed for that and is part of the reason why he is coming to the Board this early in the application period, still almost a year and a half out from the actual application deadline; their request was that they want to know what projects the County might ask them to apply for this early so that they have the time to achieve the appropriate planning and public involvement. He said staff has been working with them; he has had multiple meetings with them; and there was actually a public meeting that was through them a week ago that went over that process once again, and they did cover these exact same projects, so he is comfortable with it and thinks they are as well.

Mr. Gallaway said he did not have any adverse reaction to anything presented and answered Mr. McDermott's question and said that he was on the right track. He said they will certainly have to go back and study and make sure that a project here or there is getting the right due from a prioritization standpoint.

Ms. McKeel said they had been talking a lot about looking at a lot of developments and projects through the lens of equity, and she knew that Ms. Russell has been working on an equity impact assessment that is going to be in rollout to the Board in August; they are going to be looking at a lot of the proposals, projects, developments through an equity lens. She said she was looking at the factors/scoring (land use, safety, congestion, economic development, accessibility), and she wondered if they were going to be applying that equity impact assessment on projects such as this (transportation, multimodal transit) through that lens. She asked whether they would see a column there that staff had actually used that equity impact assessment when prioritizing in the future new projects coming forward, although not these specifically. She said they all feel comfortable with these.

Mr. McDermott said absolutely. He said that he has worked with Ms. Russell on that impact analysis; they have discussed it and walked through it and have tried to look at how they can look at

these transportation projects with that impact analysis. He said part of the reason why they are looking to do this multimodal transportation update is because they want to incorporate that into it, and that will inform future decisions, so yes, he thinks that is the case that they are doing that.

Mr. McDermott also pointed out that the accessibility factors that they looked at in the previous round did look at addressing areas with high proportions of low income and limited English-speaking populations, so they did map all that out, and that was a factor that was considered when they were trying to figure out what that accessibility score would be, so there was a rudimentary analysis of equity that was done at that time. He said if Ms. McKeel looks back at the initial 2019 report, it explains it in a little more detail, and they mapped out those areas where there were high proportions of at-risk populations and how they tried to address that.

Mr. Richardson said he thought Ms. McKeel asked a great question, and he was very interested in Mr. McDermott's answer. He said he was not sure how far along Mr. McDermott was with the Office of Equity and Inclusion and thanked him for what he thought was an extremely good and in-depth answer.

Ms. McKeel said she really appreciated the work. She told Mr. McDermott that was sort of her impression because she noticed the pedestrian project in one of the older neighborhoods went from somewhere in the 90's to all of a sudden somewhere in the 60's on the ratings; it obviously had been reviewed.

Ms. McKeel said in her citizen's advisory committee meeting on Monday, they were very focused on the Hydraulic/Lambs Road/Rio Road transportation issues. She said Mr. Bill Mawyer had come to them from Rivanna and talked about the pipeline route that would go down essentially Rio to Lambs Road and then of course behind Albemarle High School, the Lambs Lane campus. She said the question came up around whether or not they would be able to ask VDOT to allow that pipeline route to be used as a multimodal pedestrian/bicycle route along that area. She noted that supposedly that waterline was going to use VDOT right-of-way down Rio, which was the area she was talking about essentially because Lambs Road is so narrow.

Ms. McKeel said they discussed with Mr. Mawyer that it would be very helpful, five years out, to know what connections for bike and pedestrian in that area they were missing, what gaps, or what some of the areas were that they would like to be able to connect in the future where that area would be helpful to make those connections, and that would require maybe Mr. McDermott or someone to take a look at that area. She said if they were going to go and try and make a case to VDOT to use that right-of-way, they really need some facts, and it may be that it really would help connect it all; she said she did not know other than certainly it would be great for people along Rio. She said that was in the future but would be an opportunity if they could grab it.

Mr. McDermott said he agreed. He said he actually saw that presentation and noticed the alignment adjacent to Rio between Lambs up to Berkmar and noted that they needed to talk to them about that because that is a priority. He said they were moving forward with a shared-use path going down Berkmar all the way to Rio; there was a shared-use path along Hydraulic right next to the school, but there was a gap right there, and he thought he should talk to them about that but is glad that Ms. McKeel reminded him because he will make sure they reach out.

Ms. McKeel said she thought so too, but it is never too soon, and certainly Mr. Mawyer made the point that there was no guarantee that VDOT would let them use their right-of-way. She noted that is what the route plan was right now, but nothing was written in stone, so to avoid lots of private property purchases, they really need to be working with VDOT to see if they can encourage them, and then look at those gaps for multimodal would be wonderful.

Ms. Mallek thanked Ms. McKeel for that idea because all across the districts, there are trails sitting on top of ACSA right-of-way that are the basis of the greenways in so many places; she hoped that they will be able to do the same in this circumstance. She said right-of-way seems to be the biggest bugaboo everywhere they turn.

Ms. Mallek said she had several questions she thought maybe for the future as opposed to immediate. She said she was interested in the discussion earlier about the equity ranking, and she asked if that was folded in to what she wrote down first as the Smart Scale criteria (land use, safety, congestion, economic development, and environment was the one that the local area added five years ago), and since there was now a new environmental justice person in the Governor's cabinet, whether Mr. McDermott had heard any rumblings about also expanding that Smart Scale criteria which took so long to develop to also include an equity column.

Mr. McDermott said he had not heard anything about any changes to Smart Scale, but as he pointed out to Ms. McKeel, the criteria that they use to rank was mimicking the criteria that VDOT uses in Smart Scale and similar to their ranking in that accessibility factor part of the scoring is allotted to low-income populations and racial minorities and getting them access to jobs, so there is a scoring factor in that related to it. He said they could always probably do a better job of that, but there is something in there, but he would continue to follow to see if anything new comes out of that.

Ms. Mallek said that was something for them to keep an eye on as they were meeting and talking to VDOT as they go along. She said they had heard a lot in emails recently from the White Mountain Road people, and this is the 20-year discussion, and so they have not talked about in the last five years about putting that road on a do-not-pave list. She said Dick Woods Road has sections of it which are a

continual annual argument with citizens coming to the Board every year because one person would request to put it on the pave list, and 35 other people did not want to have it done, and so the Board a number of years ago just said that section of Dick Woods Road was now on the do-not-pave list to get it over with. She said in Ms. Palmer's absence, she will ask Mr. McDermott to add that to his thinking process because she would certainly support it; she thinks it would give a lot of comfort going forward to people to know that every April and September, they did not have to come to the Board and jump up and down. She said that particular road has a lot of cut-through potential, and the better the road surface, the higher the speed limit with everybody zooming through who does not live there.

Mr. McDermott told Ms. Mallek that on the agenda for that evening was the public hearing for the secondary six-year plan, and Mr. Butch would be going over that information including the do-not-pave list, called roads removed from paving consideration. He said he would take a look at his materials for that evening and said it was a great point to make in that evening's public hearing.

Ms. Mallek said the consent agenda had the scenic highway and a map in there which was lovely, but it did not list the Journey Through Hallowed Ground on Route 20, which is a national scenic highway congressionally approved. She asked Mr. McDermott to consider adding that to the map to make it more complete.

Ms. Mallek said she was still getting a lot of questions, and thought others were as well, from people throughout the area about the Three Notch'd Trail, and she understood fully where they were, but she asked if there was scoping information that could be provided for just a small section that they could share with people to explain even if they do from Crozet to the tunnel what would be involved. She said she knew Mr. McDermott did not have that today but asked if that was something that was possible to create. She said there was a lot of interest and possibly even funding from many sources on this project, and instead of looking the gift horse in the mouth and saying no thank you when VDOT said they would be glad to do something, she was trying to think of all the good reasons why they have chosen to do what they are doing, which is not to do it, but she does not know if there is any section of it that they can manage.

Mr. Abplanalp, Chief with Facilities and Environmental Services, Facilities Planning and Construction, said to Ms. Mallek she had asked about VDOT and the equity that they might be emphasizing, and just recently they were seeing this from Mr. Trevory, there was a special session, and they were looking into the public body procurement work group that will monitor and emphasize Commonwealth discretionary spend goals for certified Small Women- and Minority-owned Businesses (SWAM), and included in the email that they just sent out, the different people that are considered to be stakeholders, he would be one of them, have requested a survey be filled out to try to gather additional information because their goal is to expand that program and incentivize contractors to do so.

Ms. Mallek said that was good news.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley told Mr. McDermott she had a question but did not know if it would come under the Smart Scale project or the secondary six-year plan, but she thinks she had talked to him before about a possible roundabout on Route 22/231. She said Route 22 is also the same thing as Ms. Mallek had mentioned about 20 being Journey Through Hallowed Ground; that Route 22 has a scenic byway designation and is also part of the Journey Through Hallowed Ground.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if getting a roundabout at that intersection was a possibility; it is a rural road, and they are getting cars, trucks, especially large trucks that should not be there, and the reason why they are going through there is because the younger truckdrivers are using their Apple GPS, and that is the road they take instead of going down 15 to the I-64 freeway. She said she did not know under which project it would go in or if that was a possibility. She said people cannot even get to their mailboxes because of the speeding cars. She said she has heard from other people where they actually have to go by their driveway, go into another area, turn around and come back because they cannot turn into their driveway because of the speeding cars. She said it is a beautiful, beautiful stretch of Virginia road, and it is a freeway where it should not be a freeway as it is a rural road. She said it is very dangerous because on either end are deep ditches. She said if one goes off the road, they are going into a ditch and into a tree, and there have even been semis that have overturned. She said having a roundabout there at 22 and 231 would definitely dissuade the truck drivers, the large ones, if they are not going into the farms there but would definitely dissuade everybody else from coming through there along with some other traffic-calming measures such as having the same speed limit from Shadwell to Gordonsville, which currently is not the situation, but they are working on that one.

Mr. McDermott said a segment of road out there on 22 was identified in the priorities; it was ranked #85, a little bit on the higher side, but it was ranked. He said a project like that would likely have to be either a Smart Scale or a revenue-sharing project because it was going to be a high-cost project. He said it had not reached the priority where they could get someone to really evaluate it unless the County wanted to identify funds to evaluate the potential for a roundabout there, and the Board of Supervisors could work with the Finance and Budget office through the capital program and identify funding that could be put towards the study to see if a roundabout would be appropriate and give some idea as to the cost of it, and once they get information, then they can look at how a future funding application might be done. He explained that would either be through Smart Scale or through revenue sharing, but the first step would be to try to identify some funding through the County budget to put toward hiring a consultant to look at that.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley confirmed the first step would be doing a study, which made sense, to see

whether or not it was feasible and the cost and everything like that.

Ms. Price said following up with what some of the other Supervisors had mentioned, big concerns that she hears about road improvements are increased speed and frequency of traffic as well as the potential risk of increased pressure for development in the rural areas. She told Mr. McDermott she knew he appreciated and understood that.

Ms. Price said another concern she had was with regard to improving roads only utilizing impermeable surfaces, which then changes the waterflow and ends up causing some damage to adjacent properties resulting in the situation where VDOT is not taking any responsibility for the changes to the adjacent properties when they go outside of the right-of-way for the road. She said it was really more a question perhaps for VDOT but asked what the alternatives were that could be used for surfaces that are not impermeable and which would allow the roadway to be improved but would not result in a significant change to waterflows and those sorts of things. She said again that was not necessarily a question to be answered that day, but it was a concern and an area that she would very much appreciate getting some more information on as they move forward and look at what they are going to do with the roadways in the rural areas.

Mr. McDermott said he understood, and he has followed those conversations that the Board has had with VDOT and with residents in the rural areas. He pointed out that an unpaved road does not necessarily mean that water can permeate that surface; typically, water runs off an unpaved road in the same amount as it does a paved road. He said the difference is that when VDOT does go in and pave a road, they tend to identify how they want that water to flow off of it and direct it into certain areas, typically ditches and then towards a creek, and that is really where the problem is coming about. He said when there is property in between the road and the creek that they are trying to get the water to, VDOT will end up directing it there if that is where they are intending it to go, but previously it may have just come off in sheets and gone all over the place. He said that was really where that question comes in, and aside from having more significant projects that would really pool that water and either put it into a storm sewer system that goes underground or more effort into redirecting it, he was not sure where they could go with that, but he understood the concern. He said they could always add additional money to projects to try and make them address those water concerns a little bit better, but VDOT does what they can.

Ms. Price said she knew, for example, when one of her sons was living in Williamsburg attending college there, when they paved the parking area in his apartment complex, it was with a surface which allowed the water to absorb through the parking and into the ground rather than simply being diverted, and so if there are options like that to consider as well, but again, not to be discussed in great length that day, those are among the concerns that she hears with some frequency from the residents. She said she appreciated Mr. McDermott's reference back to his involvement and participation in trying to resolve some of those from previous situations.

Mr. Gallaway remembered the previous MPO discussion of the I-64 climbing lanes and asked if there was a way to get a graphic or something that showed projects over the last two cycles of Smart Scale revenue sharing and six-year projects that had been put forward but that did not get funded that now were kind of dropping off of their radar. He said the I-64 climbing lanes project was a very important project, and it seemed like everybody agreed 2 years ago, and even VDOT was pushing that as an important project. He said had the Pen Park Rio Road roundabout been funded, who knew what that would do to the corridor study, to the John Warner, who knew what the possibilities were if that particular thing had gone through. He said his concern is over a project that falls through the cracks that should be on their radar, and when they get a great presentation as they did that day and which they do not disagree with, it is hard to find in the notes an update section about a project that had gotten heavy consideration for good reason a few years back and is currently not being discussed.

Mr. Gallaway said there could be other examples, but he did not know how to get at those or find those. He said he was asking for another graphic or something that showed what those were so they would not lose sight of them. He said they know sometimes these projects take two or three times to get traction and get them through, and it is easy for a Warner Rio Road project to come in that was not even on the priority list and get a high priority, be accepted, and move through the process quickly, and something like those I-64 climbing lanes, which really are an ultimate solution they likely need and do not want to lose sight of, gets lost because of another important project.

Mr. McDermott responded that Mr. Gallaway could go to the Virginia Smart Scale website which had maps for every round of the projects that were submitted for those applications; they have a little map for each application period, and one can look at them all and select them as it is interactive. He said all these projects like the I-64 climbing lanes and the Rio Pen Park Lane projects are still in the priorities, and they are on the priorities map. He said it is currently a static map available on the website under the CDD transportation page, so one can pull up a map in the report that shows all of those projects that have been ranked, all 80-some-odd projects previously ranked, and be able to see those. He stressed that they do not drop off any list; they are kept on there unless the conscious decision was made that it was no longer something they wanted to consider, so even those projects that drop down in priority are still there.

Mr. McDermott said he forgot to point out earlier that he listed 12 projects that were funded; he said they have dozens more projects that are currently funded that are being worked on that were not in the 2019 priorities list but have been moved forward, so that is perhaps separate from the question, but he did want to make sure he pointed that out. He said sidewalk projects all over the County, previously funded major road projects, the Berkmar Rio Mills connection, the 250/151 roundabout are all still moving

forward but not shown.

Mr. McDermott said the climbing lanes are currently being evaluated by VDOT, and he was informed that they are looking for funding to potentially do that. He said this came up in the most recent secondary six-year public hearing that he attended just a few weeks ago, and they presented a map that showed high-priority highway projects for the state where those climbing lanes on I-64 up to Afton Mountain were included on there, and of course, in the public comment, he had expressed his support for getting those done, so there was still an opportunity to move those forward.

Mr. McDermott said this was really what they were getting at when they were talking about that multimodal transportation plan and the need for that in the County. He said they want to be able to correlate all of these projects into one working document, and it would be nice to be able to put those on an interactive map as part of that process so that they can continue to see all of the projects that have been discussed, where they are, and how they move forward. He said that is something that should be discussed as they are looking at that multimodal corridor transportation plan to ensure that nothing falls off the list.

Ms. Mallek said in regard to Ms. Price's question about the damages that are coming off the road, there are many, many places throughout the White Hall District where changes in the road, even graded gravel roads, are now causing horrendous erosion of people's properties with creation of 10-foot-deep gullies and inability to mow or pasture in acres of land because of these drainage issues. She said she has dragged the VDOT people out there multiple times, and they do a little surface grading and then go on.

Ms. Mallek said the reason she was saying this story was because, she thought it was the last legislative session, there was a proposal from mostly Eastern Virginia areas, but the County has the same problems; they are called orphan outfalls, and VDOT all across the state has places where the water from the roadway is just dumped somewhere, and it becomes somebody else's problem. She said she thought there was some legislation with details she cannot remember right now that was passed this past year to get more leverage behind that. She said maybe they can find out the rest of the details to go along because that may help. She said she was getting nowhere trying to get these repairs done, and people are getting very frustrated because they are losing parts of their property that they cannot take care of because it is now all boggy or it has already washed away.

Ms. McKeel said an interesting book that she read a couple of years ago and actually gave her copy to Joel DeNunzio was *Drowning a County: When Urban Myths Destroy Rural Drainage* about Mathews County. She recommended Mr. McDermott read it.

Ms. Mallek said Mathews County is the place where the Chesapeake Bay is coming up around their ankles underground.

Ms. McKeel said it was not the Chesapeake Bay. She said it was about VDOT, and it was amazing and goes through the Board of Supervisors in the counties and was a very interesting book.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 2:54 p.m. and reconvened at 3:10 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 12. **Presentation:** Update on the Broadway Blueprint Economic Revitalization Study.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that part of Albemarle County's investment in 2018 for the redevelopment of the historic Woolen Mills site and the expansion of WillowTree included \$50,000 in funding for a future economic revitalization study along the Broadway Street corridor. The study aimed to provide strategies to leverage public and private investments associated with the redevelopment and reuse of the Woolen Mills site to further enhance business activity on the corridor.

On November 20, 2019, the Board accepted an interim study that included goals for three focus areas: economic vitality, connectivity, and placemaking (Attachment A). Staff intended to present strategies for each of these focus areas in April 2020, but instead pivoted resources to respond to the COVID19 pandemic.

The Broadway Street corridor has remained active throughout the pandemic despite the economic challenges it continues to create for our community. There are notable changes to observe both on the corridor as well as within the County since the interim study was accepted by the Board in late 2019. As a result, staff would like to provide an update on the progress of the Broadway Blueprint Study and affirm the Board's direction for completing it. Specifically, staff is seeking the Board's concurrence to apply an equity lens to the study by using tools like the equity impact assessment in order to better ensure that the study reflects the County's new core value, Community - we expect diversity, equity and inclusion to be integrated into how we live our mission. The stakeholder engagement conducted to-date is included as reference in Attachment B.

In accordance with the approved investment package for the redevelopment of the Woolen Mills site, the County budgeted \$50,000 for an economic revitalization plan. A total of \$12,800 has been expended thus far in support of this effort and no additional funding is needed to complete the final phase.

Staff is seeking feedback from the Board and concurrence to proceed with the final phase of the Broadway Blueprint Study.

Mr. Johnson, Director, Economic Development, said he was there along with Mr. Newberry. He said not present with them was Ms. Jennifer Schmack and Lee Catlin, both very much a part of this Broadway Blueprint Economic Revitalization Study. He said they had planned on that day's event being a final report, but things had changed with the pandemic and other items, and they would provide an update instead and talk about the next steps.

Mr. Newberry said it had been quite some time since their group was able to update the Board on what has been happening on the Broadway Street corridor, so he would spend 5 to 10 minutes covering some of the history and recent activity.

Mr. Newberry said it was actually late 2019 when they last presented to the Board, and at that time, the Board had accepted an interim study and approved three focus areas as well as an intention statement. He said the goal at that time was to leverage the public and private investment that had taken place and was projected to take place with the Woolen Mills redevelopment and WillowTree relocation to that site. He said the focus was to not undertake a large land use planning effort but to rather have a focused economic development study, and so a recap of that interim study was included as Attachment A in the executive summary. He said they wanted to show pictures of some recent activity on the corridor just to update the Board as well as the public with some of the things that had taken place even during the pandemic.

Mr. Newberry said the Board was well aware of all the improvements that had taken place as a part of the public-private partnership at the Woolen Mills site. He said they would also be looking at some other pictures moving west through the corridor at the old Isotemp building where Sun Tribe Solar was now located; there were a lot of different uses with 1740 Broadway as well as the site across the street from 1740 where active construction was taking place for a site called Woolen Mills Industrial Park. He said they would also be looking even further west into the City where there has been recent construction for some residential projects including infill. Mr. Newberry demonstrated some pictures of the area.

Mr. Newberry said as a reminder, the City-County boundary is Franklin Street; to the west is the City and to the east is the County. He said the original study area is a section he demonstrated on the map of about 45 acres of contiguous light industrial zoned property south of the railroad tracks. Mr. Newberry presented a series of other pictures demonstrating the Woolen Mills site; the recently now complete and open bridge, which included a lot of pedestrian enhancements for both hiking and biking; and a picture of some of the work that the parks and rec crew has recently completed to improve sections of the trail and continue to build out, and members of the public have been giving positive reports about that new amenity.

Mr. Newberry presented more pictures up the corridor on Broadway Street of the aforementioned old Isotemp building where Sun Tribe Solar was currently and adjacent a new access for their warehousing; on the side of 1740 where Decipher Brewery is, there was a Safe Spaces & Places grant that created this outdoor space for people to come and safely enjoy a beverage outdoors. He said on the front of that building was an art gallery space; this was an artist-run gallery that is not currently open to the public but hopefully will be soon as the pandemic continues to subside. He demonstrated pictures and described looking across the street from 1740 by the old Yves Delorme site was a new access road that would be a repaired easement back out to Broadway Street that would provide access to this Woolen Mills light industrial area. He said there were about 10 to 12 paths under construction that would provide over 100,000 square feet of space for future industrial users. Mr. Newberry presented a photograph looking from Broadway Street to the west. He said he had mentioned those apartment buildings located in the City; he showed the City-County boundary with Franklin Street, Broadway Street, and across Franklin where it becomes Carlson Avenue. He demonstrated the City projects for housing.

Mr. Newberry said the team was ready to bring their implementation strategies back to the Board in April of 2020, but the pandemic interrupted their momentum; nevertheless, they tried to stay engaged with stakeholders on the corridor. He said there have been a number of projects that have continued; on the private side, he had shown pictures of some of those, and on the public side, the Service Authority was beginning their study of replacing a watermain down Broadway Street, and the Rivanna River corridor phase 2 plan has continued, which is a joint planning effort with the City and the County. He said as a result of the pandemic, they have had that limited stakeholder engagement; their cross-departmental team of parks and recreation, community development, and economic development has had to look at those draft implementation strategies from before the pandemic and try to figure out as a result of the pandemic and the uncertainty around future budgets whether those implementation strategies were still appropriate or whether they needed to be pared down or delayed.

Mr. Newberry presented the next slide of the stakeholder engagement timeline to give the Board a complete picture of what had taken place so far. He said he had started the presentation by recapping the interim study with the Board of Supervisors, but before that, they had been doing some open house meetings with corridor stakeholders, and they had been meeting with their public sector partners. He said following the adoption of the interim study, they met with City staff at a few points in time; they had presented information to the Economic Development Authority and the Planning Commission; they met with the 5th and Avon community advisory committee; and engaged with the Rivanna River plan. He said during all of this time and currently, the Office of Equity and Inclusion as well as the County Executive's

office contemplated a new core value for the County, which was "Community," and the Office of Equity and Inclusion had also been working with the City and university on an equity memorandum of understanding. He said he would turn the presentation over to Mr. Johnson to discuss how that impacted their proposed next steps.

Mr. Johnson said the new core value called "community" reads: "We expect diversity, equity, and inclusion to be integrated into the way we live our mission." Mr. Johnson said secondarily, Mr. Newberry had mentioned the new MoU for equity and inclusion that is between the County, the City, and the university that happened in February of 2021. He said as a result of these two new projects and/or core values and memorandums of understanding, they are going to pause their project and go back and review the Broadway corridor through an equity lens. He said they do not know if that will change anything substantively or not but expect that it will. He said he would get into the expected next steps, and unless the Board directed otherwise, it was the path staff would take.

Mr. Johnson said they would give a flavor for the types of low-cost draft strategies that staff has been contemplating. He said these were draft and subject to change based off of the information they receive in their second go-round looking through this project with the lens of community. He said they had contemplated creating a corridor business association, one much like one that occurs in Crozet called the Downtown Crozet Initiative. He said if an organization like this were to exist, they could accept grants; they may even formalize into a 501(c)(3) and be eligible for other philanthropic activities. He said they would contemplate creating an arts and cultural district for a high concentration of facilities, amenities, and events; the overall goal of that would be to improve the business and create a sense of place. He said some other types of activities they are contemplating are complete with pedestrian and biking activity, multimodal streetscapes, enhanced public transportation, and then Ms. Schmack, who is not present, plans to visit all of these businesses that Mr. Newberry touched on which are located on Broadway to see what issues they may have individually and see if the County can provide customized solutions to their respective needs.

Mr. Johnson said what the Board does not see presented are a lot of the long-term strategies which they will circle back around and talk about at a later date. He said they sort of deferred all large potential capital projects, whether it be complete streets or new roads or other types of projects that would be at a significant cost, in light of the pandemic and tightened belts for the time being. He said they do expect to circle back around with some long-term strategies later.

Mr. Johnson discussed the proposed next steps. He said they would like to meet with the City's new leadership; Ms. Ashley Reynolds Marshall had become the City's Deputy City Manager for equity, diversity, and inclusion and had started on May 10th. He said they would like to look at their project through the framework that is being created by the Office of Equity & Inclusion that would include additional community engagement and data collection and then return to the Board after integrating their new core value of community.

Mr. Johnson said there were a number of questions that they will ask this go-round that they may not have asked before such as who the project was serving, whether there were any unintended consequences, and what mitigation tactics they may recommend to minimize any negative impacts to any disenfranchised, or any people for that matter. He paused to entertain questions.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated the update; it was great to see how this project has moved along, and they certainly understand the pauses based on the pandemic. She said considering what they have been through over the last year, this site has done amazingly well. She said she had really enjoyed one of the restaurants down there recently.

Ms. McKeel said taking a pause to look at this project through an equity lens was really great, and the draft strategies she thought were outstanding, and she would not disagree with those at all. She said she did have a question. She remembered at one point when they had talked about this project and were in the County office building, she remembered they were in the auditorium, so that tells the time period, there were numerous young entrepreneurs that had come to them very concerned about being priced out. She said they were using one of the buildings for their space, and it seemed like there was an artist and maybe someone who was doing some welding. Ms. McKeel told Mr. Johnson that she knew she had mentioned to him a couple of times when they have talked about this project at the EDA that they do not want to lose track of those people, and he indicated that they had not been forgotten. She asked if he could give the Board at this time an update on what they might be thinking about in the way of help for those individuals. She said it was about gentrification and them being priced out and needing a space to do their work.

Mr. Johnson asked Ms. McKeel to harken back to the first two draft strategies that he had mentioned creating a core business association like Development Counsellors International (DCI); that organization could receive grants and philanthropic activities to help pay for or promote arts in that particular district and hopefully minimize the impact that was happening. He said an arts and cultural district sets up the framework for which incentives can be offered and other types of assessments to offset some other costs of having the artists there. He said what is not seen listed in the strategies and did not make the cut for reasons he earlier stated are things like subsidies, the County owning buildings in that particular area and perhaps offering lower rates for artists and things of that nature. He said those are longer term strategies with a higher price tag; they have delayed or deferred any recommendations of that nature until there is a clearer understanding of what the financial future may look like and now secondarily with the new community plans. He said for now, they have offered two strategies to help offset some of the ongoing costs but no long-term strategies that may require additional funding by the

County.

Ms. McKeel said she would hope that some of those entrepreneurs were still there. She said she was sure that some were stressed during the pandemic and does not know if they have moved elsewhere or if they are still there. She said she did not want to lose track of the ones that were still working and would still like some help.

Ms. Mallek added to Ms. McKeel's question about the young artists and entrepreneurs that Morgan Ashcom had a tour of his building, 1740, where the lovely lady who was a welder has set up her studio finally and was going gangbusters. She said it was the front of the building where the Decipher Brewing has their garden in the back. She said during the visit, the main question that she took away was whether there was a way for the County to give some forbearance on property tax increases as they improve their facilities, because the more work they do to improve their facilities for their tenants and try to also keep the rents low for their tenants to be able to stay there, the property taxes just wipe them out. She said she knew they had done this for other construction projects where they were trying to fill that gap between HUD or something else to get projects off the ground. She said the initial answer she thought she received from Mr. Kamptner at the time was they did not have authority to do that, but she may be wrong.

Ms. Mallek said she looked forward to learning more about all of these possibilities because the variety and riches of a community are that all these different players have a place. She provided an example of Jamaica Plain in Boston, now a very posh area, but in 1971, she would not even get out of the car there to look at an apartment because it was so scary, and yet, the artists all moved in because it was affordable and began to make it into a wildly diverse and safe and fun place to be. She said there are people who have been working in the Broadway area for decades and long-time owners who have really not taken the quick dollar and sold their properties to someone who has come and tried to wipe it out, and those offers have been there, and they are hanging on trying to do what they think is the right thing for their community, and so she hopes they will really work hard on trying to find a way to keep them all going.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she liked the presentation and thanked staff for the update.

Ms. Price thanked Mr. Johnson and Mr. Newberry and said she always appreciated their input. She said she so much wanted to echo what Ms. McKeel and Ms. Mallek said and give a real shout-out to Morgan Ashcom, who has really worked diligently to try and provide this resource, this avenue, this home for some struggling artists. She said "the arts" is an expansive term; it is not just musical entertainment or paintings; it is so many different things and affects lives so much. She echoed Ms. Mallek's words and said the variety of the richness of the community is one of the things that makes Albemarle County what it is today. She said she remembered the first time she went to Sedona, Arizona, and it was a wonderful artsy area, and there are other places around the country that have been able to copy it.

Ms. Price told Mr. Johnson and Mr. Newberry she appreciates the first two things that they listed which she thinks would allow them to provide this sort of an opportunity. She suggested Scottsville could do the same thing there in that tire factory, as these are the sort of facilities that are so opportunistic for this sort of enrichment of a community. She said she recognized there are a lot of complexities to try to achieve these goals, but she does appreciate hearing what they are doing to try to make sure they can get there.

Mr. Gallaway agreed with the approach and proposal to move forward. He said he had a curiosity question; in the report, there was a comment about site visits with Henrico (Westwood) and Scotts Addition and a bullet point of an Albemarle staff observation that "Their 'pyramid zoning' approach allowing commercial uses in their industrial zones already creates more flexible opportunities than in Albemarle." He said he wanted to know more about that.

Mr. Kamptner said he had not heard that particular term used before, but he thought what it was probably referring to was that, for example, in an industrially zoned area, any less intensive use in the hierarchy of usage was allowed, and that hierarchy would go from industrial, commercial (retail and office), and then to residential. He said in an industrially zoned property, everything in that pyramid is allowed; a commercial office, for example, would include just commercial office and residential to be allowed in that smaller pyramid.

Mr. Johnson said Mr. Kamptner was correct based off of the feedback. He said they had met with staff there, and that is how pyramid zoning was explained; less intensive uses were automatically allowed up and to the point of the most intensive use that is by right.

Mr. Gallaway said it was more flexible, the point being made in the report that each use has to be approved or a process has to go through to allow that other use.

Mr. Newberry said the current existing ordinances have certain percentage limitations, 25% requiring that it be some ordinance for a primary use, and so instead of it automatically being permitted, there was an additional level of review and consideration in addition to the scope and scale.

Ms. Mallek cautioned that many of them would remember that they used to have hundreds of acres of light industrially (LI) zoned land in the County, and through actions of prior Boards all throughout the 2000s, those were all rezoned to mixed use and/or commercial and/or residential. She said that led to a shortage of light industrial and thus places for economic development to happen. She said this may

be a vicious circle, and they need to have their eyes wide open about the kinds of things they allow, which is why she has raised it every time they have had this matrix before them about putting residential into LI, for example; unless it is a live/work situation or a supervisor of a building who has to be there 24/7, turning 1740 Broadway into an apartment building would be a disaster from her perspective. She said they have to be careful about unintended consequences or they will be back where they were in 2008.

Mr. Johnson said they would proceed with their action plan and circle back around with the Board after getting a schedule with the City to let them know when the next update would be.

Agenda Item No. 13. **Presentation:** Charlottesville Area Alliance (CAA) 2021 Action Plan.

Ms. Keane, Chair, CAA, said she appreciated the opportunity to update the Board on what has been going on with the Charlottesville Area Alliance. She said many of the Supervisors who are newer may not realize they are a member of the AARP network for an age-friendly community, and after quite a year, it was a great opportunity to fill the Board in on what they have been doing. Ms. Keane said she was happy to have Mr. Peter Thompson with her that day; he is one of the work group chairs and would be adding a little bit. Ms. Keane said May is Older Americans Month, so it was very fitting to be presenting to the Board that day.

Ms. Keane provided background that AARP had chosen the alliance with Charlottesville and Albemarle to be the key community for the Commonwealth of Virginia; they choose one from every state, so that meant there would be additional resources.

Ms. Keane said she wanted to direct the Board's attention to page 7 with an outline of some of the eight elements that are recognized to help to make a community more age friendly. She said there are a large number of seniors in the area, as a region with about 20%, and that is because it is a wonderful place for people to retire and also because people who live in the area want to grow old there. She said there is a real push for people to age in the community, and that means it is a demographic group that is going to continue to grow. She said she was curious to get the latest census numbers because she is sure that seniors will be a piece; nationally, they are a group that is growing, and there are now more people over 60 than under 2. She said it is something they need to be aware of because there will not be as many young people to help take care of the seniors when they are going to be at the point where they could use a little care, so they want to make sure they get this community in a good place.

Ms. Keane said several years ago, there was a group of eight of them who worked with seniors who recognized that there was a need to really put their voices together and to begin to work on what it would take to collectively create a community. She said they were very lucky that Albemarle County agreed; the elected officials signed a proclamation and signed up with AARP and then appointed a staff member, Ms. Emily Kilroy, to be the representative. She said the Board had been a very active part of the alliance all along, and that was really important because CAA wanted to make sure they were reflecting the things that were important to the Board.

Ms. Keane referred back to page 7 with those eight "life elements"; she said it covers a lot of what intersects with the comprehensive plan: buildings and outdoor spaces, parks and rec certainly with trails for walking and for biking; transportation; housing and the support that one needs in housing (not just housing); social participation; respect and social inclusion; civic participation and employment (sometimes people forget that many people over the age of 60 are choosing to stay at work longer or when they retire sometimes realize they need to go back to work part time, and so that is an area that often is not thought about with seniors); communication and information; and then community support and health services.

Ms. Keane said she was sure there were many other areas, but AARP wanted to make it a manageable group, and a lot of things can fit under those categories. She said the first step they took as an AARP age-friendly group was to do an assessment, and so in 2018-2019, they were able to be a part of the health district's general survey, then the Board helped them get a survey out to seniors; it was on the Board of Supervisors website, and CAA handed out paper copies and then did focus groups in several places within Charlottesville, Albemarle, and some of the rural counties.

Ms. Keane said out of that survey, they found out that seniors often do not feel socially included in the community, that there is not enough affordable housing, and that transportation is a bigger issue especially for those who do not live near the services. She said she was sure that not a single thing there was a big surprise to the Board. She said probably they did not even need to do the survey to recognize that, but at least they confirmed what many of them anecdotally felt was happening; however, the majority of people said that the community they live in is a good place to age, so despite all the things they said that did not occur, they still would prefer to age in their community, and she thought that was a real plus because it demonstrates there are people committed to making this work.

Ms. Keane said then in 2020, the next step was to develop an action plan, but as they got started and were really moving strongly, COVID hit, and so almost the 30 agencies that belong, being volunteer, all were very focused on trying to make it through COVID.

Ms. Keane said on page 9 was the list of the agencies. She said it used to be that she and Mr. Thompson could list them off, but they are up to the point where she knows they will leave somebody out, so she would rather the Board of Supervisors look at them. Ms. Keane noted that it was important to see that the planning district is a member, the health district, both hospitals, legal aid justice, Region Ten, a varied and great group where they are trying to look at all the different things that are important to help

the community move forward.

Ms. Keane said the three areas they found that people really said there was not only a gap, but a high concern included housing, and so they have been very happy that they have been able to be a part of the Regional Housing Partnership, and a representative from the alliance, Ginger Dillard, is their chair for that committee. Ms. Keane said currently, they have been busy being a part of the panel on affordable housing as well as commenting and contributing to the housing plan and really appreciate the plan Albemarle put together, and they were given the opportunity to have comments specific to seniors and appreciated that awareness. She said looking at comprehensive plans, their desire is for senior issues to be a part of what is being developed and not a distinct goal by itself, and so that is why they are glad to be working in conjunction with the housing partnership.

Ms. Keane said another area of concern was transportation, which Mr. Thompson would address, and social participation was the third. She said George Worthington, who is a cofounder of Dementia Friendly, is that chair; he also happens to be in charge of the dementia programs at the Department of Aging and Rehab Services at the state level. Ms. Keane said the first goal in that area was to begin to do more dementia training to businesses as they open up again, so that as people are out and about, waiters or theater ushers or retail merchants, for instance, have an understanding of how they could help someone with dementia feel more comfortable when they come in a store with their loved one or even on their own if they are still at mild levels of dementia. She said obviously some of this carries over to just being good training for working with seniors as well.

Ms. Keane said they also will be looking at a survey to find out what people want for social engagement. She said they have OLLI and a lot of things going on in the community; Albemarle County offers a lot of different activities and programs, and so when people say they want more social participation, the question is what those things are. She said they have also been working for about a year and a half with the Albemarle Rescue Squad doing the HUMAINS (High Utilizer Management And Integrating Needed Systems) project, and so both Department of Social Services and JABA have information on the different rescue squad units so that when the high utilizers are being cared for by the rescue squad, they can offer them opportunities to address those social determinants, because often it is not about the medical care. She said they can help take some people out of that high utilizer group by being able to address those areas, so that will continue to move forward, and they are hoping to do more in that area again now that they can all focus again.

Ms. Keane said Mr. Thompson would share the goals for the transportation. She said they were very appreciative that the planning district and the regional transit partnership agreed to having the alliance have a nonvoting member, and that is Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Thompson said on behalf of the Center at Belvedere and CAA, he would add his thanks to Albemarle County for doing its part to acknowledge the need to be a part of the AARP age-friendly network, and to use this data-based approach to a holistic age-friendly community for all would be a vital thing that everyone will need to work for continuously. He said the Center and he are pleased to have been a leader in helping get CAA started and working closely with their friends at JABA, Ms. Keane, and so many other CAA partners.

Mr. Thompson said as seen in the action plan and as Ms. Keane had mentioned, they identified three main priority areas out of the eight dimensions of an age-friendly community, and the transportation as no surprise was one of those key ingredients. He said the first goal was creating a one-call/one-click information plan and trying to get involved more with the regional transit partnership, and they are well on their way.

Mr. Thompson said importantly, one thing that CAA has always from the earliest informal discussions they had, first five, and then as Ms. Keane said, eight before they even formed CAA, was very much about collaborating, coordinating, aligning, and not creating whole new mechanisms. He said there was a lot of good work that needed to be done in the community, and their CAA partners just wanted to work with private business, nonprofits, and municipal governments locally to do this, and when there was already the regional transit partnership, it was obvious to them to see how they may align and be a part of. He said with Ms. McKeel's support and guidance, Mr. Boyles, both in his former hat and his new hat, helped them approach the RTP about becoming a nonvoting member. He said they were welcomed back in March, and he had been attending as the CAA representative as the transportation work group chair at the RTP for the last few months.

Mr. Thompson said he has had a lot of conversations with the TJPDC staff and have had an email communication with Ms. McKeel that day about trying to catch up the following month to see how else they can be a resource for RTP and work in tandem with the RTP to move forward. He said they are well aware that COVID interrupted transportation quite a bit, and certainly transitions in City government have impacted things in some of the key organizations in the transit partnership, but CAA stands at the ready to be a resource and an active partner with RTP and the municipal governments to move forward in some of the areas that transportation needs to work for in the community.

Mr. Thompson said the second goal was not surprising to him; he was working on a different work group and moved over to transportation that year to chair it at Ms. Keane's request, and he had been on the CAT advisory committee for several years, again with Ms. McKeel and others, and they talked a lot about the need for bus stop amenities to be improved, which does not mean just the bus stops themselves but the ability to get to and from a bus stop, so that is a transportation focus for CAA. He said he has talked a lot again with the RTP and with CAT director, Mr. Williams, who did do a presentation at

length about a vision and a plan to make amenity improvements throughout the City and County for CAT. Mr. Thompson said they have voiced their support for that through the transportation work group and stand again at the ready for when advocacy for the funding for that vision comes to the MPO and beyond; he and CAA will be there to work in tandem and to get energy behind those bus stop improvements.

Mr. Thompson said the third goal was around rural transportation help; they have a great partnership also with their friends in Fluvanna County, and of course, Albemarle County has plenty of rural areas that need services of many kinds. He said that was an area they had backburned a little bit but were starting to pick up. He noted a few members of their transportation work group were now looking to do a census of particularly volunteer driver programs that are already existing in the planning district. He said they know faith groups have some, and there were a couple of others, so they wanted to get a better handle on what is out there, which ones might be able to be leveraged and which ones may not, and then see if there was a gap. He said they know that there are volunteer driver programs in the country particularly aimed for older adults who no longer drive (whether it be due to physical or intellectual reasons, financial reasons, or environmental choice reasons) but still need to be able to get around, and the public transportation may not meet their needs. He said they are at the early stages of evaluating that and look forward to seeing where they get with that.

Mr. Thompson said again on behalf of the Center of Belvedere and all the CAA partners, they were thankful for Albemarle County's deep commitment and dedication to being a more age-friendly community.

Ms. Keane said she wanted to return for a minute to the fact that as a key community, they really want to make sure that the goals that they are setting are in sync with the County's goals and determine how they can leverage the resources from AARP. She said they will be having a meeting in June with the Virginia AARP person to understand what those consultant opportunities are because a lot of them could be things that staff could take advantage of.

Ms. Keane said Ms. Kilroy, Ms. McKeel, Mr. Thompson, and she will be meeting with the state person to better understand what is out there and what they want to make sure they take advantage of through the rest of the year, and that is why they wanted to be sure to get a chance to share with the Board so that as the Board goes forward, they can continue to think about seniors across all the areas they had talked about but knowing that CAA is glad that they as a group can work on using some resources that will come at no cost to delve into maybe some new or different ways or best practices, particularly around transportation, that they can bring to Albemarle County.

Ms. Keane thanked the Board for their continued commitment to the alliance, and certainly as JABA, she also thanked the Board for their continued commitment to the seniors in this area. She said that she and Mr. Thompson were more than happy to answer any questions.

Ms. McKeel said she really appreciated the report; it was great to have an update on their work. She commented that it was great to have the data in the report, regional data as well as specific data for Albemarle. She said she has put a couple of those pieces aside to try to remember them.

Ms. McKeel said, not as criticism of the report as much as a comment on her eyes, that on page 11, she really had trouble figuring out locality, gender, and race; it was so small that she got lost in the colors and trying to figure out how those pie graphs were divided up. She said she would love to see those pie graphs a little bit bigger so that she could figure out which was which a little bit better.

Ms. McKeel referred to page 15 regarding "Domain 3: Housing," and said she was sure they were aware of Porch Light VA, but she was going to mention it because it was a good opportunity for the community to hear it. Ms. McKeel said Porch Light VA was a website that was created through the work of the regional affordable housing partnership, and one could go into Porch Light VA and put in their zip code and preference to rent or buy, and it was an affordable housing locator for Central Virginia. She said she had sent several people to that site that have found it very helpful. She said one puts in how much they can afford in rent or how much they can afford to pay in a house. She said the affordable housing partnership created it, but like everything else, getting the word out and making people aware of it was really important, and the CAA group could really help do that. She recommended taking a look at Porch Light VA.

Ms. Keane thanked Ms. McKeel and said she would share that with the whole alliance.

Ms. McKeel said it was great website, and as far as she could tell, it was being kept up to date.

Ms. McKeel thanked Mr. Thompson for the transportation/transit piece. She said they are thrilled with the RTP to have CAA at the table. She commented that it would be important as transit in the community evolves through the two important transit studies that currently have just begun; the one study that is Albemarle County centric and another one that is regional looking at what transit should look like in the community in the future, it is going to be important that the alliance has the ability to weigh in and to be at the table with these discussions. She said both studies have community outreach and are going to be talking to the community, so she will try to make sure they stay connected. She said it was important they be at the table to represent that community.

Ms. McKeel said they have all wondered in Albemarle County about bus stop amenities as Mr. Thompson alluded to and been frustrated that there are no shelters or concrete pads even for the transit stops that are not appropriate necessarily for a shelter. She said right now, VDOT and CAT are working

out a memorandum of understanding for bus shelters and amenities on Albemarle County roads that are controlled by VDOT. She said that has been the issue all along; there was never an MoU created between VDOT and CAT about Albemarle County roads. She said Albemarle County does not have as much to do with it as VDOT because they are the ones that control the roads, and those shelters are on VDOT right-of-way. She said that is in the works. She asked if Mr. Henry had an update on how that MoU was coming.

Mr. Henry, Assistant County Executive, said he did not. He said they have a regional transit partnership meeting the following week, and he would make sure they get an update.

Ms. McKeel said she knew there had been a lot of work going on behind the scenes because a bureaucracy like VDOT has been challenging, but they have worked hard to get this done. She explained that has been the hang-up for years, and they are trying to work that out.

Ms. McKeel mentioned that she was looking at the action step descriptions and thought the volunteer program was a great idea, but she would push back a little bit on using the words “encourage rural residents to become drivers for Uber or Lyft”; that is a business model that pushes all the cost onto the drivers, which concerns her. She said they have started in the County working on an on-demand model with JAUNT and are hopeful they can get back to that at some point. She said that on-demand model will be able to solve some of the connectivity problems for the community rather than Uber or Lyft.

Ms. Mallek said it was a great read, and she appreciated all the information. She noted they were working on so many parallel tracks and bringing so many different people together who all have to be part of the conversation; having just had her 71st birthday the past month, she was right there with them and thanked them for all the work they are doing.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said Ms. Keane and Mr. Thompson had mentioned bringing in resources, and she was not sure if that was through AARP in regard to transportation needs. She asked if they were saying they could bring in monies from AARP or another organization that would then dovetail with what the Board was doing, such as what Ms. McKeel mentioned regarding JAUNT.

Ms. Keane said AARP by making this a key community is allowing for consultant resources, so it will be sharing how to go about doing some things and approaching some of these goals. She said they also have some small grants for specific projects, so yes, as a part of the key community, anyone who is a charter member of AARP has the right to apply for the grant; as a key community, there is a little more priority in the list when they are looking at the grants. She said as they find some areas that have actions that they would like to do that are specific to what is in the Board plan, then that would be the sort of thing that together they could apply for, and that is why she wanted to make sure with Ms. McKeel being the chair of the RTP and an Albemarle Board Supervisor that she get to hear from their state person and be able to ask about some of those things so that they really make this meet the needs of Albemarle County and not be something that stays theoretical but rather is very practical.

Ms. Price thanked Ms. Keane and Mr. Thompson for their excellent report and presentation. She said she greatly appreciated the work that they are doing, as all the other Supervisors do as well. She told Ms. Keane that she did have another matter that she would like to discuss with her separate from this and that she would reach out to her so they could schedule a time to talk about that.

Mr. Gallaway said Ms. McKeel had mentioned the Regional Housing Partnership, and she was actually moderating Spring Speaker Series, he believed. He asked if that was still happening.

Ms. McKeel said it was the next day at noon.

Mr. Gallaway said that Spring Speaker Series was on transportation and housing. He said the June one is on housing and equity, so if the regional housing partnership was not on their radar, it definitely should be. He said the quarterly meeting of the entire body will happen in June as well; he would have to look up the date, but it was usually the last Wednesday of the month. He said they could find that out on their website. He noted they were the six localities or surrounding jurisdictions and private developers, public advocate groups, nonprofits, citizens, a lot of involvement in that organization, so that is certainly one that should definitely be on their radar.

Ms. Keane thanked Mr. Gallaway and said their chair of housing is a partner on the partnership, and they have been advertising the monthly webinars to the entire alliance.

Mr. Gallaway asked who the chair was.

Ms. Keane answered Ginger Dillard; she had joined the partnership and had been attending all those meetings.

Mr. Gallaway said he appreciated their being there to give the presentation and looked forward to continued involvement and advocacy. He said the two of them were powerful advocates and were appreciated.

Mr. Keane thanked the Board for the opportunity.

Mr. Thompson thanked the Board for their leadership.

Agenda Item No. 14. Closed Meeting.

There were no items for a closed meeting. Mr. Gallaway asked if there would be any objection from the Board or the County Executive to move numbers 21 and 22 to this section. There were no objections.

Agenda Item No. 15. Certify Closed Meeting.

There was none.

Agenda Item No. 21. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. McKeel said she saw just that day in the news that Roanoke City Council unanimously passed a new plastic bag tax that will charge residents 5 cents per bag to use at grocery stores, drugstores, and convenience stores. She said they were the first in the state, and they were going to be figuring that out. She said she was just putting it on their radar screen because she was very pleased to see a locality now doing that. Ms. McKeel said in the article there were some details that Roanoke was going to need to figure out for implementation, which was great because they would let them do that.

Mr. Kamptner said part of that board's decision was to hold off until getting out of the pandemic, and the feeling was that the grocery stores were already stressed.

Ms. McKeel said the details in the article were really interesting about how they were going to be providing certain things for low-income people like free bags, reusable bags. She said it was a great article, and she was excited to see it.

Ms. Mallek said she had some questions from the day's staff report to leave for future answers. She said in the transportation report, it talked about Rivanna River Corridor phase 2, which she thought was the \$300,000 some kind of community outreach thing, so her question was whether this was funded, and if not, she hoped it would be coming back to the Board with more detail if they are thinking of spending funds like that. She said that was just a wish that she would leave.

Ms. Mallek said she got a reminder again that day from an applicant in the White Hall district who would like to have a no-employee home occupation where she can groom someone's dog in her garage; this was a prohibited use from 25-30 years ago for unclear reasons. Ms. Mallek said she knew they were not supposed to be thinking up new things to do, but if it is taking an item off of a list, it seemed simple. She said Mr. Kamptner would have to advise on whether this was as simple as it seemed because most of the time, it was not.

Ms. Mallek said they were talking about entrepreneurs and described the letter as saying, "Life is really hard. I'm home here with kids; I'd like to be able to work at my house because my kids aren't in school, and I would like to do this." Ms. Mallek said there were a lot of other rural boarding kennels and things all around the area in the White Hall district which have been in business for 30 or 40 years that probably were there before zoning came along. She said that is something she would like people to think about, and Mr. Kamptner would have time eventually to give her the bad news on that. Ms. Mallek said staff met with her, and since she is trying hard to develop a business, she just cannot manage the \$2,500 for a special permit to be able to go through the process for something like this when it is all indoors. Ms. Mallek asked for a possible response to this and said she would provide more information when she got it.

Ms. Mallek said the last thing to think about was in the grant report, it talked about VDACS, the money for the local purchase of development rights, the RA's program, but she understood they do not have the money to get the state match. She said she would like to get an update on that later on and find out because that would be the first time since the year 2000 that they have not done that, and that would be something they would like to know about. She said she would leave those questions for people.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said assuming that no one wanted to hear any more about the Monarch butterfly, she was now transitioning to kudos for the Town of Scottsville to have a 40-cent cigarette tax; she thought that was good.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was wondering when they will be addressing their legislative agenda. She said she was hoping that would come up soon.

Mr. Kamptner said they had had one meeting with Mr. Blount to start compiling a list of what he had heard and what was on the horizon. He said with it being an election year, they were probably timing it so that they would come before the local delegation in either October or November, so they would probably be coming to the Board in July for the first time. He said the General Assembly was also going to be in a special session in the second half of summer. Mr. Blount thought it was going to be July/August, but he thought he had read somewhere that it sounded like it may be a little bit later in the year, so they are navigating through all that, but the first time with the Board should be in July.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was hoping they do it sooner than later so they can then start to work with the state legislators.

Mr. Gallaway said a few meetings ago, they had the issue with CenturyLink and service relative to some people in the rural area getting both phone service and internet service and outages and getting quick return of services. He said the past week, and he was not dog piling on CenturyLink, they had a resident in the Rio District who was dealing with an issue with their sewer, and the utility was found as they were digging up to figure out the sewer issue. He said there was a disagreement over who owned the utility that was clearly in place, whether it was CenturyLink or Ting, and Ting was not in the area. He said this resident reaching a certain point of frustration reached out and has been very complimentary of staff in helping to try to resolve this issue for him, but as he has continued to learn why this was happening, it sounded like this happens with some frequency, or at least this is not an isolated incident of happening around the County when a utility gets involved or a utility is found and the utility ownership can be in dispute with nobody taking responsibility for said utility infrastructure. Mr. Gallaway said it seemed somewhat absurd to him that a utility service provider cannot determine whether or not it is in fact theirs, and then if it theirs, taking responsibility for it.

Mr. Gallaway said he was very appreciative of staff getting involved to help this particular resident to get this resolved and all the time and effort that had gone in quickly to make it a priority because they cannot use their facilities in their own house until it is resolved, but he was using his platform to call attention to it, that utility providers if they have ownership for something need to take responsibility for it, and they need to own up to that in quick fashion so that residents are not basically stranded or having to resort to hotels until these matters get resolved so that they can get their issue fixed and fixed quickly.

Mr. Gallaway asked the other Supervisors who have dealt with this in the past if there were other things that he could do; whether it was writing a letter or calling somebody or doing something, he certainly welcomed the advice of how he could also continue to advocate that this type of issue does not continue to happen. He said it is one issue he was certainly going to call attention to and thinks that they should call attention to it every time they know about it so that, if nothing else, they know that the Board is at least going to be vocal about the fact that they are avoiding a responsibility to take ownership of their infrastructure and getting in the way of residents when they are trying to resolve their own issues.

Mr. Gallaway said he knew Mr. Henry had been involved with that but does not know the extent of this beyond County-wide or elsewhere, but it is an issue that in going through this one, he was learning could happen with more frequency around the County, and that was not acceptable in so many ways.

Ms. Mallek suggested putting something like this on their discussions with legislative priority, even if they do not get a bill that they get the delegation to understand what is going on, because they may not. She said when she was a kid, Centel was actually a utility; they were it, the Ma Bell in Virginia, and they were required to act like a utility, a monopoly, and provide services, and they were covered by the FCC. She said that is no longer the case; having done warfare with the so-called private investor communications businesses now, where they can look one in the eye and deny responsibility, has been the biggest infuriating situation for three years all around the White Hall District, and lots of other places, she is sure.

Ms. Mallek said CenturyLink also had no idea where its lines were, and it held up the streetscape back in 2008, 2009, and 2010 in Crozet because they waited for months and months. She said the diggers were digging across Crozet Avenue and moving the real utilities, the Dominion things, around, and then they would come across other wires, and about six weeks later, somebody would finally show up, having the street all torn up the whole time, to say it was theirs and supposed they would move it next year.

Ms. Mallek said they are so unresponsive because nobody in Richmond is bearing down on these folks, and she thinks this is an issue for their broadband local as well as Evan Feinman's organization in Richmond because these companies are untouchable, and they know it. Ms. Mallek said she feels terrible for Mr. Gallaway's person and thinks it is really sad, and she wished that the County had some kind of adjunctive authority or whatever. She said this is a health and safety issue for these people, as is not having one's telephone for six weeks at a time because the company cannot be bothered to get a technician out to fix something they should have replaced 30 years ago. She said this is a really important issue across all of these service industries, and unfortunately, Virginia does not do a good job of keeping these companies on a short leash as other states do far better. She noted she was getting an email at that moment from CenturyLink guy.

Ms. McKeel said she was not being critical of Dominion Energy and VDOT specifically, but she worked about a year ago to just try and get the bulbs replaced on Georgetown Road because the streetlights had been out for years. She said she found out that the light poles on one road, and Georgetown Road is the equivalent of three blocks maybe, were a mix of Virginia Energy and VDOT, and they did not know which poles were theirs. She said there did not seem to be even a marking on the poles to tell them whether it was Dominion Energy or VDOT, and so it took a long time for them to just sort out which one was which so that they could change a bulb out. Ms. McKeel said they did it, and they were gracious about it, but that road has a lot of pedestrians, and she has had numerous residents that work at Barrack's Road or wherever that have said to her how nice it was to have those lights back on.

Mr. Gallaway said it boggled his mind in some ways, but he would be continuing to follow up with this resident. He thanked the staff who have been helpful and continue to be helpful to try to get this resolved.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked how many electric companies it took to change a lightbulb.

Agenda Item No. 22. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Richardson presented the County Executive's report. He said there were really cool things going on in the community. He said the past week, they observed National Police Week and this week were recognizing national EMS week to celebrate the service of the officers as well as the career and volunteer EMS providers who give such great service to the community each and every day, and it has been noticed more than ever over the last 15 months because they have been there for the community and expressed heartfelt thanks.

Mr. Richardson said just a few days ago, Wawa officially entered the community and had their ribbon cutting in the Pantops area. He said they did donate \$1,000 to the charity of the police department's choosing in observance of Police Week and in celebration of the new stores that opened in the community. He said the police selected the Special Olympics to receive this donation.

Mr. Richardson said on a parallel track with some of these celebrations and noted service weeks, the community was aware of the cyber-attack on the Colonial Pipeline and the subsequent disruption of fuel distribution all through the Southeast. He said he wanted to talk just a little bit about the local response. He said the past Tuesday with the emergency declaration by the governor in a day of long lines at local gas stations, the police department and fire rescue department began with the school division and other regional partners to develop a shared understanding of the open scale of the issue: whether there was an understanding of essential fuel needs; what the daily usage rate was; what their supplier's capacity was; what officers were observing in the community as residents waited in long lines; what they could do to ensure that police cars, fire trucks, ambulances, and school buses had the fuel to keep moving.

Mr. Richardson said they had staff from Facilities & Environmental Services Department, CAPE, IT, Finance and Budget, alongside police and fire rescue working together to ensure that the community's continuing needs were met all during the fuel disruption situation. He said as a precautionary measure, staff who could telework were directed to do so. He told the Board it felt good because it truly was flipping a switch, and most of the time it is not and is much more difficult than that, but they flipped a switch and with some quick communications were able to very aptly coordinate most of their organization to relieve some of the pressure with the community on fuel demand. He said he appreciated the departments that he mentioned as well as all of the departments who continue to work through this as hopefully this issue comes to an end.

Mr. Richardson said Summer Swim would return that year with some changes. He said they were able to recruit lifeguards, which they believed would be the largest challenge; not all of the interested applicants had the required certifications, however, so at the beginning of the season, they will be operating all three swim lakes at Chris Greene, Mint Springs, and at Walnut Creek four days a week, Thursday through Sunday, beginning June 17th and wrapping up August 22nd. He said the hours of operation will be typically 11 a.m. to 7 p.m.; the fees will be one rate for anyone looking to cool off at the lakes; children under 3 and seniors will enjoy the lakes for free.

Mr. Richardson said the County office building will be reopening for members of the public in support of tax payments beginning on May 24th running through tax deadline on June 25th; while customers are strongly urged to make use of other convenient payment options online using the upgraded payment kiosk, customers wishing to receive on-site services this cycle will certainly be able to do so. He said community members will need to go through the screening questions, temperature checks, and must wear a mask to enter the building to receive these services. He said a wider return to more normal operations was still being considered and scoped. He said they expect to have more information shortly to the Board. He said guidance changes around face coverings announced by the CDC and Governor Northam the past week did not come with changes in guidance for employers from OSHA or VOSH, which the County has an obligation to meet as an employer.

Mr. Richardson said Ms. Melinda Crawford, who is the director of the Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport, gave a presentation a few weeks prior for members of the tourism industry. He said travel remains below 2019 levels, which was historic; outbound flights and passengers being served have increased significantly from the significant drop-off they experienced in the spring of 2020. He said COVID-19 protocols are in place at the airport, and thanks to the CARES funding, they have been able to weather the significant decrease in revenues that were experienced throughout 2020. He said he would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank the airport staff for tremendous effort and tremendous hard work to continue to serve the community members coming into the airport and leaving from the airport during this very complex time for travel.

Mr. Richardson said the first Community Read just wrapped up; the book *The Monacan Indians: Our Story* has been distributed at Little Free Libraries in seven of the parks as well as through the Jefferson-Madison Regional Library System, the short history of the Monacan Indians written by two members, the late Karenne Wood and Diane Shields. He said there was a panel discussion of this book the past Friday, and a recording of that was available at the County's YouTube and Facebook pages.

Mr. Richardson said later that evening, they would be speaking to the Board about the local emergency proclamation which will carry forward, the brief mention of the services for that building moving forward through tax season, and they would also have Dr. Bonds from Blue Ridge Health District, and that would be starting after 6:00 that evening. He said he would be happy to answer any questions

the Board may have about the information he had provided and/or if there were concerns or questions that they were not able to get to, they would certainly follow up.

Ms. McKeel asked when the tax bills would be mailed. She said she had a constituent that asked her the other day.

Ms. Emily Kilroy, Director of Communications and Public Engagement, answered the tax bills were due to be mailed on Friday, May 21, and should start hitting mailboxes as soon as Monday, May 24.

Ms. Mallek said that Mr. Richardson had mentioned for parks and rec the beginning of the season due to the lifeguards' still needing some more training there would be Thursday through Sunday hours. She asked if this meant that later as they got their training, there would be more hours later in the summer or if she misunderstood.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Assistant County Executive, said work with parks is part of the portfolio of work involved with the County. He said the answer is possibly; it is twofold. He said the hours and days are based on the total number of lifeguards they currently have employed, and that assumes that they will all be trained and ready to go. He said traditionally they would open up Memorial Day weekend; that had been delayed to allow time to ensure that those that are being hired were certified and ready to go. He said they will continue to recruit, and with that recruitment, if they can gain more staff, then they will look to expand the days, but they do not want to overpromise that; that really is going to be limited by those lifeguard resources.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 4:36 p.m. and reconvened at 6:00 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 16. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda or on Matters Previously Considered by the Board or Matters that are Pending Before the Board.

Mr. Gallaway confirmed there was no one signed up to speak and closed From the Public.

Agenda Item No. 17. **Action Item:** Albemarle County Debt Financing - 2021.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that beginning in Fiscal Year 2009 (FY 09), the County had a practice of issuing debt on an every-other-year basis, using its cash as an interim/temporary source of funding until such time as the next debt was issued. As authorized by the annually adopted reimbursement resolutions, the County reimburses itself from bond proceeds. Between 2010 and 2017, the County issued five Revenue Bonds through the EDA. The County also issued a \$30.5 million General Obligation Bond for school projects based on a referendum in FY 17.

In June 2020, the County modified its practice by securing a line of credit to be used, if needed, to temporarily provide funding to meet timing requirements that may occur between debt issuances. According to the County's Financial Advisors, this is a practice being used more and more by local governments because of the uncertainty regarding the timing of when capital projects, which have previously been authorized, are ready to proceed. Too often the funding takes place and the capital funds are left unused, sometimes for extended periods while the project ramp-up takes place, and under current market conditions, the unused funds are invested at rates much lower than the rate of borrowing. To date, the County has not utilized the line of credit to issue short-term debt in large part due to the pandemic and the slowdown of capital projects.

At this time, the County has the opportunity to lock in advantageous long-term interest rates to both refinance existing bonds at lower rates and to issue new debt for project costs already expended or are on track to be expended in Fiscal Year 2022, with anticipated interest rates lower than modeled for budgetary purposes. Going forward, the County anticipates resuming its practice of issuing debt on an every-other-year basis.

Staff recommends the Board approve the issuance of new revenue bonds for capital projects not to exceed \$67.5 million and the refinancing of existing bonds at lower interest rates not to exceed \$42.5 million. These amounts include costs of issuance for a total issuance that would not exceed \$110 million.

The \$67.5 million in new revenue bonds, inclusive of cost of issuance, would reimburse the County for approximately \$40.2 million in expenditures it has cash funded in anticipation of a future reimbursement and will fund approximately \$25.4 million in additional capital expenditures anticipated to occur through December 31, 2021.

If the County determines that some of the project expenditures have the potential to be funded by the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 ("ARPA") the amount of the actual issuance may be reduced. The ARPA guidance is anticipated to be released by the Federal Treasury on or about May 10, 2021.

The refinancing potential includes all or a portion of the outstanding Public Facility Revenue and Refunding Bonds (Albemarle County Project), Series 2011 (the "2011 Bonds"), Public Facility Revenue Bonds (Albemarle County Project), Series 2013 (the "2013 Bonds"), and Lease Revenue Bond (Albemarle County School Projects), Series 2015 (the "2015 Bond"). The total refinancing bonds is not to exceed \$42.5 million. Preliminary savings estimates from the refinancing are expected to exceed \$1.25

million spread over the remaining life of each issue, assuming all of the bonds are refinanced.

On May 18, 2021, the County's Financial Advisors, Davenport & Company, will present an overview of the proposed plan of revenue bond financing to the Economic Development Authority of Albemarle County, Virginia (EDA), which is authorized under State law to assist the County in financing local government facilities and equipment and will request an approval of an associated Resolution. If the EDA approves the Resolution presented to them on May 18, it will serve as the conduit issuer.

If the Board approves the Resolution (Attachment B), the EDA would issue debt through a Public Sale in a principal amount not to exceed \$110 million (total of the refinancing and new money) to refinance outstanding bonds, finance project costs and cost of issuance and would loan the proceeds to the County. The EDA Bonds will be secured under a master trust agreement and master financing agreement structure described in Attachment A, prepared by Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP, the County's Bond Counsel. The security for the EDA Bonds will be the County's promise, subject to appropriation, to make payments to the EDA to enable it to make debt service payments associated with this debt issuance.

A draft Preliminary Official Statement (POS), which is the Bond offering document to the capital market, is available for Board and public review in the Board Clerk's Office.

Based on the County's excellent triple-AAA credit ratings, and without the security of offering additional leased collateral (unless recommended by the financial advisor), it is expected that the debt would be issued with credit ratings in the high 'AA' category, given the appropriation structure of the financing.

The resolution necessary for the Board's approval to advance this borrowing plan is attached (Attachment B).

Interest rates at the time of preparing this Executive Summary are at favorably low levels. The County is expected to realize budgeted debt service savings due to the refinancing of existing debt and conservative interest rate assumptions on the new debt. The debt payments associated with this issuance are anticipated to be similar to or less than the amount budgeted for County debt service in FY 22. This financing adheres to the County's financial policies regarding debt limits, debt capacity, debt affordability, and debt repayment standards.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) authorizing the proposed plan of financing through the EDA.

Ms. Birch, Chief Financial Officer, said they were there that day to seek the Board's support and approval of a resolution that authorized the proposed plan of finance to be issued through the Economic Development Authority; their approval was sought the night before, and that would be discussed during this presentation, and they agreed to be the conduit issuer.

Ms. Birch said she was accompanied by a few new faces to the Board including Mr. Courtney Rogers, who has been with the County as financial adviser from Davenport & Company for 21 years, so Davenport is very much a trusted advisor for the County, there is a reason why the County has been with them for a long time, and a great continuity for the County, particularly in Ms. Birch's new role as CFO, to have longstanding support from a great and well-reputable financial advisor.

Ms. Birch said Mr. Chris Kulp, bond counsel, was there to answer any legal questions that the Board might have related to the financing structure, bond counsel through Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP.

Ms. Birch said Mr. Daniel Greene was there from her team; he had been with them for several years in the Finance and Budget Department and recently had become a division chief, and he leads the treasury function, which is debt management, investment management, and cash management, and that night would be leading the PowerPoint.

Ms. Birch said she wanted to provide an opportunity for the public and the Board to understand a little bit about the background, which was in the executive summary in the agenda. She said the County's practice had been to issue debt every other year. She said they have actually not gone to market since 2017, and so the County will be reimbursing itself for about four years' worth of expenses that have funded the capital program and then will seek some additional funding due to the current low interest rate environment to forward funds and capital projects that have been planned for and that were approved as part of the FY 22 budget.

Ms. Birch said between 2010 and 2017, the County had issued five revenue bonds, which is the structure that they have and that they are moving forward this evening with the Board's support, and one voter referendum approved general obligation bond in that time period, and that was actually the last bond issuance that had been done in the County in 2017. She said the prior year, right before she started, the Board was involved in securing a line of credit that could be accessed, if necessary, in order to help with the off years in which bonds were not being issued to help pay the coffers back. She said the County could issue this line of credit, which is a short-term financing tool, and then be able to take that out with longer-term debt. She said it did not need to be used over the last year mostly because the pandemic slowed down the capital finance and capital funding program, so not as much was needed in terms of cash equity late last year and in the beginning of the fall.

Ms. Birch said now they are at the point where they do need to seek long term, and they are going to take advantage of the interest rates, so actually going forward with this financing rather than accessing the line is really to take advantage of those interest rates. Ms. Birch said they would be asking for the Board's approval of this structure, and the EDA did approve their part of this is the conduit issuer only, so these bonds will be issued through the Economic Development Authority, and the County will then pay the Economic Development Authority a payment in order to make the debt service payment.

Ms. Birch said the following week, they would actually go to the rating agencies defending the triple-AAA, the county has a AAA by all three rating companies that are out there in the municipal market, and they will do their best to uphold that. She said they have a really great story to tell, and one of the things that they are going to be really interested about is how the County has been able to manage through this pandemic, what strategies have been used and whether they are consistent with other AAAs, and what they would expect of the County. She said based on conversations to date with their financial advisor, they do not expect a difference in the rating; they have a good story to tell, and she is very excited to do that the next week with the County Executive and others including the schools with the superintendent going to sit in on the meetings, which is a great place to be and show their coordination.

Ms. Birch demonstrated a slide with the big overview of what they are planning to do. She said they are planning to issue up to \$110MM, which includes refinancing of existing bonds up to \$42.5MM depending on how the market is at the time of going in and looking to access the market. She explained this is not new money; this is taking old money that has a higher interest rate and refinancing it, much like one would a home. She said the interest rates have to be advantageous, and it has to really be able to make sense with all of the cost of issuance, and so that is the work that Davenport does for the County in making sure they actually are getting savings from that refunding and refinancing that is planned. Ms. Birch noted they are expecting somewhere between \$1.25MM on up depending on where the interest rate lies, maybe even less than that if they are not able to take advantage like they hoped to. She said that is a portion of this, and the refinancing is what is making this bond issuance seem a little large.

Ms. Birch said the new money portion is both reimbursing themselves for capital projects that they have already spent, which is about \$40MM of it, the bulk of it, and then they are forward funding capital projects that have been approved for FY 22, and that is to the tune of \$25.4MM. She mentioned much of the reason for that number is largely because of the American Rescue Plan Act; they took that into consideration with respect to how those funds might be used to help support capital projects. She said they do have still a requirement to spend the bond proceeds within three years, so they really worked with Davenport to ensure that they did not issue more than they think they can reasonably execute in the time frame allowed to spend those funds.

Ms. Birch presented the next slide with an overview of the capital projects, which is the new money portion, not the refinancing. She noted it listed the projects that the County is reimbursing itself for, about \$40MM, and the projects for which debt financing is planned to be used in FY 22, which gives the total of \$65.6MM. She noted that number is different than the number from the previous slide, and much of that was because there is cost of issuance, so they had to go up to a level that would assume and support whatever cost of issuance there might be in order to be able to actually execute and receive the funding through the bond structure.

Ms. Birch said going up to \$110MM is not actually going to have an impact on the County's future capacity. She said that seem a little counterintuitive, and Mr. Rogers had some slides to help the Board and public see that is actually not adding to. She explained it was not like having a house, buying five more houses with then a mortgage for six; it was structured so, for example, there is a mortgage on one house, which actually gets retired, no more money is spent on that mortgage, and then buying a new, maybe, condo at the beach, and so that is how this works with respect to being able to wrap around the current debt service.

Ms. Birch said another thing she could share with the Board and the public is this does not in and of itself require any future tax rate increase. She explained debt service is principal and interest of the obligations the County has, and in the time period that they have to pay off these bonds, it actually does not go higher than what is in the County's model, so this in and of itself does not require future tax rate increases.

Ms. Birch said they will be seeing some advantages because of the interest rate environment, but one of the things the Budget Division does is use a model that helps with understanding how the County can afford to take on new projects. She said this is actually lower than what they had expected to issue; the original model was about \$88MM. She said the reasons are twofold; the first reason for that is because they have really done an incredible job over the last year or year and a half of scrubbing the capital model and making sure that new projects are only added as old projects are able to be finished. She said if they are not able to do that and the data is showing that they are not actually able to execute as quickly, it is not reasonable to continue to add more to areas of government that are not actually executing on some of the projects that they have. Ms. Birch said they have worked with their departments to come up with better timelines, and that is lowering that expected amount of money that would need to be financed.

Ms. Birch said they have really fast amortization schedules, and so the debt is being retired. She said one of the things that rating agencies will look at is how quickly debt is retired. She said the policy says that 60% will be retired in 10 years, but they are actually trending at 79%, and so they have really quick amortization schedules that are allowing for some future flexibility and why she can hold to that

statement ("Does not impact the County's ability to borrow funds in the future nor require future tax rate increases") based on this financing.

Ms. Birch referred back to her analogy about the house for which there is no longer a mortgage and explained that there will be some natural retirement of debt over the next few years that drops the debt service, and so they are able to wrap this around that and maintain level debt service over the next few years. She said with respect to what she just indicated, that meant they are going to see about a \$37MM savings, and what that really means is they are able to capture \$37MM of additional capacity in the future years. She described that over the life of the bonds from their original model, the savings that are seen in 2022 stay with them as long as those bonds are active; that is about \$37MM, which is amazing given the capital needs of the County and how to plan for those.

Ms. Birch said more specifically, looking at FY 22, they just prepared a budget that made some assumptions on where they were with the capital plan and what interest rates were going to look like, and so the expected debt service cost for 2022 was \$6.1MM, and that is estimated at this point, will not know for sure until the bonds close, but that is going to come down to \$4.2MM, and so that is an immediate savings in FY 22 that is going to go back into the capital plan's equity. She said that is an exciting thing that they are able to take advantage of and be able to put back in to support the needs on the capital side and help offset some future costs that were originally anticipated.

Ms. Birch said that Mr. Rogers would get into more specifics on debt service and show visually what she provided an overview on.

Ms. Birch presented the next slide of the process. She said again that the previous night they had sought approval and received it from the EDA, and they were requesting approval of the Board for this resolution to enable them to borrow what she had just spoken about and what Mr. Rogers would go into more detail about. She repeated that the following week they would be meeting with all three rating agencies virtually to sell the County and its story and work to uphold the triple-AAA that the County had worked so hard over so many years to have.

Mr. Rogers said it was almost a year ago when they had talked about the line of credit and had just come out of the very unusual market disruption due to the pandemic. Mr. Rogers said over the last 20+ years that he had been working with the County, they have had a very nice downward slope when it came to interest rates. He said they have worked with finance and budget over the years and are very conservative when it comes to interest rates. He said a lot of that \$37MM that Ms. Birch was speaking of was because they were using higher interest rates because of uncertainty of where rates were going to be. He said two years ago before anybody knew about a pandemic, everyone was expecting interest rates to go higher in the future because the world economy was starting to come out of a slowdown; the U.S. economy was already a little bit ahead of the world economy and so they really thought rates were going higher at that point.

Mr. Rogers said due to the pandemic, not only have rates held their ground, but they actually dropped further; ignoring the March/April timeframe in the chart where it jumped back up with the market disruption. He said when they talked a year ago, they talked about the possibility of coming back and maybe doing some new money and also a possible refinancing depending upon what interest rates looked like here; a year later, now here they are, and rates have continued to stay low. He said there was a little bit of a jump up earlier in the year, but it is basically just below 1.5%, so with the new money part of the transaction, they are looking at possibly somewhere between 1.5% and 1.75% as an all-in rate for 20-year money, which is unheard of. He said additional revenues are not needed to take on this new debt, as Ms. Birch had said, because of two things: 1) interest rates are not as high as expected, and 2) there is a drop-down of debt taken on years ago that is starting to be paid off and go down.

Mr. Rogers presented a chart going back to January of 2020, which showed the disruption there where rates jumped up as high as almost 3.5% for the 30-year bonds but then came right back down and have basically been under 2% since the past year basically at this time, so enjoying low rates. He said the expectation is that rates are going to go up higher again, so they wanted to go ahead and lock in the rates on the money the County is reimbursing itself but also to make sure that money was not being put back in the bank that is not going to earn a lot of money right now that was not going to get used, so that is why, as Ms. Birch said, between ARPA money and knowing what is certain to be needed over the next several months, they try to keep that down to a minimum.

Mr. Rogers demonstrated a slide of the projected and existing debt service. He described the graph of current debt obligation, just a shade under \$25MM, probably \$23.5MM roughly of debt service, and the way the new money is being structured. He said they had not taken into account any savings yet; they have not assumed they are going to get savings from the refunding, but they will be level anyway in terms of the way they are taken over the remaining years of those bonds. He said for the new debt service, there was built into the budget a certain amount of debt service when the budget was adopted for 2022, and they are going to be under that, and so that is the savings Ms. Birch was talking about when added up over the several years of the bond issue. He said that will be able to be added to basically the budget, but the County is not going to have to find additional dollars to be able to take on this additional debt.

Mr. Rogers said the other thing that they like to look at is whether they are staying within the debt policy guidelines. He said these are policies set up to make sure that the County keeps that AAA in good stead. He said there are two ratios looking at two different things, one being total amount of debt divided by the assessed value of the County, personal as well as real property, so the goal is for that percentage

to stay below 2%, and even with the additional new debt, it will be below 1%, so the County is in great shape there.

Mr. Rogers said the other ratio which takes a different slant is annual debt service payments as a percentage of the budget, and revenues are used as that measure, and so that is looking at the annual debt service payments that roughly are just under \$25MM divided by the budget, which is going to be a shade above 6% by their projections; they want to stay below 10%. He said these are ratios set up many years ago to make sure to stay in that AAA high-grade area, so the County is in great shape even adding this additional debt, so that is not a concern at all.

Mr. Rogers said the other thing that Ms. Birch mentioned was refunding; \$42.5MM was the not-to-exceed number. He said there are actually three issues, and he would show two because they do not think they are quite ready with the third issue. He said they do not think rates are going to drop low enough between now and the sell date but wanted to have the authorization that if rates take another drop between now and the end of the year, they have permission to go forward and try to get those savings as well. He said that is about another \$20MM; it is a larger issue, but it is an issue where it is a little bit further between now and the call date, so there are not the same kind of savings as the 2011 bonds and the 2015 bonds.

Mr. Rogers said the 2011 bonds and the 2015 bonds total about 20MM refunded. He said the number that Ms. Birch had used earlier was 1.25%, and that is because that is the minimum they would want to get, which is by industry standards a calculation called 3% of the net present value savings. He said they come up with a net present value number divided by the par, and the graph is showing that they are estimating right now (with a little bit of cushion in there of about 25 basis points) it is going to be around 1.75 with that cushion divided by the 20 gives 8%, so well above that 3% or that 1.25, so they think these are going to make sense. He said if it goes below that 3%, they just will not do it; they will just wait and hope that maybe the market will come back. He said they do not think the market is going to jump that quickly; as Ms. Birch said, they are going to talk to the rating agency the following week and will get the rating back roughly a week later, and they are looking to go to market about June 10th, so hopefully things will stay pretty stable between now and June 10th.

Mr. Rogers mentioned that the Board might notice that they ask for it not to exceed, on new money, about \$2MM more than the projects, but it would not be \$2MM of cost of issuance; there is a little bit more built in there, called "bond math". He said they do call it sales: the bonds are not sold on 100 cents on the dollar basis; sometimes they are sold at a dollar price of 98 or 99; sometimes they are sold at a dollar price of 110, and that has to do with coupons and yields, so they ask for a little bit of room in case the market adjusts, and so they do not think they are going to need that but always put enough there just in case. He said they are only going to issue as much as they actually need in order to produce that \$65+MM that is needed for those bonds.

Mr. Rogers explained the way this works with the EDA, as Ms. Birch said, is essentially they assign to the trustee the rights to receive the payments coming from the County, so the EDA actually does not even see the money; it goes straight from the County straight to the trustee and then on to the bond holders. He said if there are any legal questions, Mr. Kulp was there to answer them as far as any questions on the resolution.

Ms. Price noted these new bonds would be fixed rate whereas a line of credit is a variable rate, so this really locks the County into these savings, which is why it is so beneficial and, as Ms. Birch said, comparable to refinancing a house. She said it really does look like a great plan, and just as a comment, she would also add how pleased she is to see how far they are below the ceilings that have been set; that really demonstrates the incredible financial stewardship that they have done throughout the County, and the community members should be very, very appreciative of the stability brought to the County finances.

Mr. Gallaway echoed Ms. Price's comments. He said thinking about over the last 10-12 years how far behind the County had gotten in its capital improvement program and plan, in trying to figure out how to get to all the projects that they have, he sees this looking forward as building in extra capacity without having to go back and ask for the additional resources, and that is phenomenal.

Ms. Price commented as it was referenced in earlier conversations that they are seeing the increase in the price of materials and projects, and she anticipates that there very likely could be some significant inflation over the next few years, so the County being in the strong financial position it is today and now taking advantage of this to refinance and provide some additional funds will really help the County have a leg up when it comes time for some of those expenditures.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) authorizing the proposed plan of financing through the EDA.

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. Price.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Ms. Palmer.

**RESOLUTION APPROVING A PLAN TO FINANCE CERTAIN PUBLIC
FACILITIES PROJECTS AND REFUND CERTAIN PRIOR BONDS
THROUGH THE ISSUANCE OF ONE OR MORE SERIES OF REVENUE AND
REFUNDING BONDS BY THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF
ALBEMARLE COUNTY, VIRGINIA**

WHEREAS, the Economic Development Authority of Albemarle County, Virginia (formerly the Industrial Development Authority of Albemarle County, Virginia) (the "Authority"), pursuant to the Industrial Development and Revenue Bond Act (the "Act"), under which it was created, is authorized to exercise all the powers set forth in the Act, which include, among other things, the power to make loans to, among others, a county in furtherance of the purposes of the Act, to finance or refinance facilities for use by, among others, a county, to issue its revenue bonds, notes and other obligations from time to time for such purposes and to pledge all or any part of its revenues and receipts derived from payments received by the Authority in connection with its loans or from any source as security for the payment of principal of and premium, if any, and interest on any such obligations;

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors (the "County Board") of Albemarle County, Virginia (the "County"), desires to finance, in conjunction with the Authority, the costs of certain projects in the County's Capital Improvement Plan including (without limitation) capital expenditures related to the following governmental and public purpose categories: (a) County administration, (b) judicial, (c) parks, recreation and cultural, (d) public safety, (e) public works, (f) schools, (g) transportation, (h) water resources and (i) solid waste (collectively, the "Series 2021 Project");

WHEREAS, the County Board desires that the Authority undertake for debt service savings purposes refundings of all or a portion of the Authority's outstanding (a) Public Facility Revenue and Refunding Bonds, (Albemarle County Project), Series 2011 (the "2011 Bonds"), (b) Public Facility Revenue Bonds (Albemarle County Project), Series 2013 (the "2013 Bonds"), and (c) Lease Revenue Bond (Albemarle County School Projects), Series 2015 (the "2015 Bond"), the proceeds of which were loaned to the County to finance and refinance various public facility projects for the benefit of the County;

WHEREAS, the County Board desires that the Authority issue one or more series of Public Facility Revenue and Refunding Bonds (Albemarle County Projects) (collectively, the "Bonds"), and use the proceeds thereof to (a) finance or reimburse the costs of the Series 2021 Project, (b) refund all or a portion of the outstanding 2011 Bonds, the 2013 Bonds and the 2015 Bond (such refunded portions, the "Refunded Bonds"), (c) pay as desired interest on the Bonds up to one year following completion of the Series 2021 Project, (d) fund as desired a reserve fund for the Bonds and (e) pay the related costs of issuance and refunding;

WHEREAS, the Bonds will be secured by payments appropriated from time to time by the County Board and payable to the Authority in accordance with the terms of the Financing Agreement (as defined herein);

WHEREAS, there have been circulated prior to this meeting drafts of the following documents (collectively, the "Documents"), proposed in connection with the issuance and sale of the Bonds (in one or more series):

- (a) a form of Supplemental Agreement of Trust, supplementing the Agreement of Trust dated as of March 1, 2003, as previously supplemented (collectively, the "Trust Agreement"), all between the Authority and U.S. Bank National Association, as successor trustee (the "Trustee"), pursuant to which the Bonds are to be issued and which is to be acknowledged and consented to by the County;
- (b) a form of Supplemental Financing Agreement (the "Supplemental Financing Agreement"), supplementing a Financing Agreement dated as of March 1, 2003, as previously supplemented (collectively, the "Financing Agreement"), all between the Authority and the County, pursuant to which the Authority will loan the proceeds of the Bonds to the County and the County will undertake, subject to appropriation, to make payments to the Authority in amounts sufficient to pay the principal of and premium, if any, and interest on the Bonds and certain other related costs;
- (c) a form of Preliminary Official Statement of the Authority relating to the public offering of the Bonds (the "Preliminary Official Statement"); and
- (d) a form of Continuing Disclosure Agreement (attached as Appendix F to the Preliminary Official Statement), pursuant to which the County agrees to undertake certain continuing disclosure obligations with respect to the Bonds;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF
ALBEMARLE COUNTY, VIRGINIA:**

1. The County Board hereby finds that the undertaking of the Series 2021 Project and the refunding of the Refunded Bonds will be in the best interests of the County and its citizens. The County Board hereby requests that the Authority undertake the following plan to issue the Bonds for such purposes. The Authority will issue the Bonds (in one or more series) and use the proceeds thereof to (a) finance or reimburse the costs of the Series 2021 Project, (b) refund the Refunded Bonds, (c) pay as desired interest on the Bonds up to one year following completion of the Series 2021 Project, (d) fund as desired a reserve fund for the Bonds and (e) pay the related costs of issuance and refunding. Pursuant to the Financing Agreement, the County will undertake to make certain Basic Payments and Additional Payments (each as defined in the Financing Agreement) to the Authority in amounts sufficient to amortize

the Bonds, to pay the fees or expenses of the Authority and the Trustee and to pay certain other related costs. The obligation of the Authority to pay principal of and premium, if any, and interest on the Bonds will be limited to the Basic Payments and Additional Payments received from the County. The Bonds will be secured by an assignment of the Basic Payments and certain Additional Payments due under the Financing Agreement, all for the benefit of the holders of the Bonds. The undertaking by the County to make Basic Payments and Additional Payments will be subject to the appropriation by the County Board from time to time of sufficient amounts for such purposes. The plan to issue the Bonds, finance the Series 2021 Project and refund the Refunded Bonds shall contain such additional requirements and provisions as may be approved by the County Executive (the "County Executive," which term as used herein shall also include any Deputy County Executive) and the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Authority.

2. The County Board, while recognizing that it is not empowered to make any binding commitment to make appropriations beyond the current fiscal year, hereby states its intent to make appropriations in future fiscal years in amounts sufficient to make all payments due under the Financing Agreement and hereby recommends that future County Boards do likewise during the term of the Financing Agreement. The County Board hereby confirms that the facilities and purposes of the Series 2021 Project and the prior projects to be refinanced are either essential to the efficient operation of the County or important to the welfare or quality of life of the citizens of the County, and the County Board anticipates that such facilities and purposes will continue to be so during the term of the Financing Agreement.

3. The Chair of the County Board and the County Executive, either of whom may act, are hereby authorized and directed to execute the Documents to which the County is a signatory, which shall be in substantially the forms circulated prior to this meeting, which forms are hereby approved, with such completions, omissions, insertions and changes not inconsistent with this Resolution as may be approved by the officer signing such Documents. Such officer's execution and delivery thereof shall constitute conclusive evidence of such officer's approval of any such completions, omissions, insertions and changes.

4. In making completions to each Supplemental Financing Agreement (which may relate to one or more series of Bonds), the County Executive, in collaboration with the Financial Advisor and the Authority, shall provide for Basic Payments and Additional Payments in amounts equivalent to the payments on the Bonds, which shall be sold to the purchaser(s) thereof on terms as shall be satisfactory to the County Executive. The County Board consents to the issuance by the Authority of one or more series of Bonds pursuant to the provisions of the Trust Agreement; provided that (a) the aggregate principal amount of all series shall not exceed \$110,000,000, (b) the "true" or "Canadian" interest cost of the Bonds of any series issued on a federally tax-exempt basis shall not exceed 3.00% (taking into account any original issue discount or premium), (c) the "true" or "Canadian" interest cost of the Bonds of any series issued on a federally taxable basis shall not exceed 3.50% (taking into account any original issue discount or premium), (d) the Bonds of any series shall mature or be subject to mandatory sinking fund redemption in installments ending not later than December 31, 2041, (e) the Bonds of any series shall be sold to the purchaser(s) thereof at a price not less than 98% of the aggregate principal amount thereof (without taking into account any original issue discount or premium), (f) the Bonds of any series shall be subject to optional redemption, if at all, at a redemption price not to exceed 102% of their principal amount or at a "make whole" redemption price, and (g) no Bonds may be issued after December 31, 2021, without further approval by the County Board. The County Executive is also authorized to approve, in collaboration with the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Authority, the timing for the issuance of the Bonds of any series, the determination of whether the Bonds of any series are issued on a federally tax-exempt or taxable basis, the aggregate principal amount of each series (subject to the aggregate limit for all Bonds set forth in clause (a)), the maturity schedule (including serial maturities and term maturities for the Bonds) for each series and the redemption provisions for each series, all as the County Executive shall determine to be in the best interests of the County.

5. The County Board hereby approves the following terms of sale for the Bonds of any series:

(a) Each series of Bonds shall be sold through a competitive sale or a negotiated sale, as the County Executive, in collaboration with the Financial Advisor and the Authority, determines to be in the best interests of the County.

(b) If the County Executive determines that a series of Bonds shall be sold by competitive sale, the County Executive is hereby authorized to receive bids for such Bonds and award such Bonds to the bidder providing the lowest "true" or "Canadian" interest cost, subject to the limitations set forth in Section 4. Following a competitive sale, the County Executive shall, in collaboration with the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Authority, file a certificate with the Authority and the County Board setting forth the final terms of such Bonds. The actions of the County Executive, in collaboration with the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Authority, in selling such Bonds by competitive sale shall be conclusive, and no further action with respect to the sale and issuance of such Bonds shall be necessary on the part of the County Board.

(c) If a series of Bonds is sold by competitive sale, the County Executive, in collaboration with the Financial Advisor, is hereby authorized and directed to take all proper steps to advertise such Bonds for sale pursuant to the terms of a Notice of Sale, the form of which shall be prepared by the Financial Advisor and the County's bond counsel and approved by the County Executive.

(d) If the County Executive determines that a series of Bonds shall be sold by negotiated sale, the County Executive is hereby authorized, in collaboration with the Financial Advisor and the Authority, to choose one or more investment banks or firms to serve as underwriter(s) for such Bonds and to execute and deliver to the underwriter(s) a bond purchase agreement (the "Bond Purchase Agreement") in a form to be approved by the County Executive in consultation with the County Attorney and the County's bond counsel. The execution of the Bond Purchase Agreement by the County Executive shall constitute conclusive evidence of his approval thereof. Following a negotiated sale, the

County Executive shall file a copy of the Bond Purchase Agreement with the records of the County Board. The actions of the County Executive in selling such Bonds by negotiated sale to the underwriter(s) shall be conclusive, and no further action with respect to the sale and issuance of such Bonds shall be necessary on the part of the County Board.

6. The Preliminary Official Statement in the form circulated prior to this meeting is approved with respect to the information contained therein (excluding information pertaining to the Authority). The County hereby authorizes distribution of the Preliminary Official Statement to prospective purchasers of the Bonds of any series in a form deemed to be "final" (within the meaning of Rule 15c2-12 of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Rule")) as of its date, except for the omission of certain pricing and other information permitted to be omitted pursuant to the Rule and with such completions, omissions, insertions and changes not inconsistent with this Resolution as may be approved by the County Executive. Such distribution shall constitute conclusive evidence that the County has deemed the Preliminary Official Statement to be "final" (within the meaning of the Rule) as of its date.

7. The County Executive is hereby authorized and directed to approve such completions, omissions, insertions and other changes to the Preliminary Official Statement that are necessary to reflect the terms of sale of the particular series of Bonds, determined as set forth in Section 4, and the details thereof and that are appropriate to complete it as an official statement in final form (the "Official Statement"), and distribution thereof to the purchaser(s) of such Bonds shall constitute conclusive evidence that the County has deemed the Official Statement "final" (within the meaning of the Rule) as of its date.

8. The County covenants that it shall not take or omit to take any action the taking or omission of which shall cause any series of Bonds issued on a federally tax-exempt basis to be "arbitrage bonds" within the meaning of Section 148 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code"), and regulations thereunder, or otherwise cause interest on such Bonds to be includable in the gross income for federal income tax purposes of the holders thereof under existing law. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the County shall comply with any provision of law that may require the County at any time to rebate to the United States of America any part of the earnings derived from the investment of the gross proceeds of such Bonds. The County shall pay from its legally available general funds any amount required to be rebated to the United States of America pursuant to the Code.

9. The County covenants that during the term of the Financing Agreement it shall not permit the proceeds of any series of Bonds issued on a federally tax-exempt basis or the facilities financed or refinanced therewith to be used in any manner that would result in (a) 10% or more of such proceeds or facilities being used in a trade or business carried on by any person other than a governmental unit, as provided in Section 141(b) of the Code, provided that no more than 5% of such proceeds may be used in a trade or business unrelated to the County's use of such facilities, (b) 5% or more of such proceeds or facilities being used with respect to any "output facility" (other than a facility for the furnishing of water), within the meaning of Section 141(b)(4) of the Code, or (c) 5% or more of such proceeds being used directly or indirectly to make or finance loans to any persons other than a governmental unit, as provided in Section 141(c) of the Code; provided, however, that if the County receives an opinion of nationally recognized bond counsel that any such covenants need not be complied with to prevent the interest on such Bonds from being includable in the gross income for federal income tax purposes of the holders thereof under existing law, the County need not comply with such covenants.

10. Such officers of the County as may be requested by bond counsel for the County are authorized and directed to execute an appropriate certificate setting forth (a) the expected use and investment of the proceeds of the Financing Agreement (derived from any Bonds issued on a federally tax-exempt basis) in order to show that such expected use and investment will not violate the provisions of Section 148 of the Code and (b) any elections such officers deem desirable regarding rebate of earnings to the United States for purposes of complying with Section 148 of the Code. Such certificate shall be prepared in consultation with bond counsel for the County, and such elections shall be made after consultation with bond counsel.

11. All costs and expenses in connection with the issuance of each series of Bonds, the financing of the Series 2021 Project and the refunding of the Refunded Bonds, including the Authority's fees and expenses and the related fees and expenses of bond counsel, counsel for the Authority, and the Financial Advisor, shall be paid from the proceeds of the particular series of Bonds or other legally available funds of the County. If for any reason any series of Bonds is not issued, it is understood that all such fees and expenses incurred in connection with such series of Bonds shall be paid by the County from its legally available funds and that the Authority shall have no responsibility therefor.

12. The County Board hereby authorizes and directs the County Executive to (a) determine which portions, if any, of the 2011 Bonds, the 2013 Bonds and the 2015 Bond shall constitute the Refunded Bonds and when to refund such Refunded Bonds, (b) request that the Authority take all proper steps to call for redemption the Refunded Bonds and prepare and deliver any notices and correspondence necessary therefor and (c) take such action as may be considered necessary or desirable to assist the Authority in redeeming the Refunded Bonds.

13. Any authorization herein to execute a document shall include authorization to deliver it to the other parties thereto and, if applicable, to record such document where appropriate.

14. All other acts of the County Executive and other officers of the County that are in conformity with the purposes and intent of this Resolution and in furtherance of the issuance and sale of each series of Bonds, the financing of the Series 2021 Project and the refunding of the Refunded Bonds are hereby approved and ratified.

15. This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

Mr. Kamptner, County Attorney, said this ordinance has quite a history; it was first adopted back in July as students were getting ready to return to the community. He said it was adopted as an emergency ordinance, and over the past 10 months, it has been adopted as both emergency and nonemergency ordinances as its provisions were adjusted to keep up with the conditions at the time. He said it most recently was adopted April 7th as an emergency ordinance because the nonemergency version of the ordinance was due to expire, and the conditions were such that there was just some uncertainty then, so they came to the Board with an emergency version of the ordinance and then brought it forward again on May 5th for some further amendments. He said that emergency ordinance is due to expire on June 2nd because emergency ordinances can only last for up to 60 days.

Mr. Kamptner presented a slide of the data as of that day. He described that in parenthesis were the numbers that he had shared with the Board two weeks prior, and the numbers continue to improve. He said new information that he had included in this slide for the daily new cases and the positivity rates were the trends, and both of those have been decreasing for the past 30 and 31 days, respectively.

Mr. Kamptner said Albemarle County continues to lead Virginia by a few percentage points in the doses, and the City of Charlottesville is a few percentage points behind; Nelson County is also doing pretty well, so doing well in the immediate neighborhood. He said the first-dose numbers have increased by 5% from two weeks prior and a little over 8% fully vaccinated in the County since May 5th.

Mr. Kamptner said since the Board considered that emergency ordinance, a lot of things have been happening at the federal and state levels. He said the first major event was the FDA approving emergency use of the Pfizer vaccine for 12- to 15-year-olds, which increased the pool of the population eligible to receive the vaccine. He said then the CDC issued revised guidance focusing primarily on fully vaccinated people. He noted for those who have been following the media and the state and local governments, there has been some difficulty in fully understanding what is expected. He said the two key takeaways from their guidance online are that fully vaccinated people no longer need to wear masks or physically distance in any setting and can refrain from testing following a new exposure. He said there are some other relaxed standards for travel and quarantine and things like that for fully vaccinated people.

Mr. Kamptner said then at the state level, the governor amended Executive Order 72, and this executive order has been around since winter; this was the seventh time it has been amended. He said the key takeaway from that executive order is that it now for wearing masks defers to the CDC guidance, so incorporating the CDC guidance for fully vaccinated people, Executive Order 72 no longer requires wearing masks. He said that executive order took effect only on May 15th, which was also when the most recent round of amendments to the local ordinance took effect to coincide with that.

Mr. Kamptner said other requirements continue in place; the Board is aware that the numbers of size of gatherings and attendance at certain events and activities were increased in Executive Order 72. He said the big change on May 14th was the one related to face covering, and then Executive Order 79 was issued, and this one probably surprised a lot of people because there was at least word of mouth that the restrictions might be relaxed at some point in June, but Executive Order 72 has a delayed effective date of May 28th. He said it does direct that people should cover their mouth and nose with a mask in accordance with CDC guidance, but all the other restrictions and guidelines would be terminated effective May 28th.

Mr. Kamptner said there was also a statement from the governor on May 14th regarding the state of emergency; as of May 14th, the governor's intention was to have the state of emergency remain in place at least through June 30th, and the governor did express a desire to ensure that individuals will have the option to wear masks up to and after June 30th. Mr. Kamptner said the executive orders since Executive Order 53, which first imposed the mask requirement, included a waiver of a state law that prohibits wearing masks for the purpose of concealing one's identity. He said there are both health and disaster exceptions in that, and so he would imagine that the executive order would probably provide some clarification that even after the state of emergency is lifted, wearing face covering to protect oneself from COVID-19 would continue.

Mr. Kamptner said that was a summary of the changes since May 5th. He said the incident management team recommended to the County Executive that the ordinance be repealed, and the County Executive was now recommending to the Board that the ordinance be repealed. Mr. Kamptner provided some recommended motion language and said the essence of it, if it were the Board's desire, was a motion to adopt the ordinance identified as Attachment A which would repeal the ordinance.

Ms. Mallek said mention was made earlier that day in some presentation about the Virginia OSHA rules, which apply to local government employees, that have not been changed, and therefore the rules for the County employees would stay the same as far as masks. She said she was all in support of that and wished that the Board could also do that for the businesses because removing the requirement for masks in her mind creates haves and have-nots or two different groups of people, some who are free to go live about their lives and do whatever they want without any obligation to protect others, and there are lots of people for whom vaccines will not or cannot be taken due to health issues of their own or age or something. She said she personally feels an obligation to help take care of those people and little children who might be living in those households, so she is worried about that consequence.

Ms. Mallek said she has gotten calls from businesspeople to plead not to be put in the middle of a free-for-all on this; they have asked that businesses can rely on local government for rules so they can

just keep those stickers in the door that say the County rule says to wear a mask inside, and that has helped them to not have to be the policemen all the time. She said a lot has been learned about the ability of people to function, whether it is running a marathon or varsity children playing sports with full masks, sometimes two, all the time without any problem, so she is a fan of masks and does hope there would be others on the Board who would like to do more about that. She asked if things go differently than hoped for, and she certainly hoped they go well, if it would mean starting all over again from scratch as was done in March of 2020, or because things have gotten where they are now, whether they could have a public hearing and revert to some other rules more quickly.

Mr. Kamptner said if things reverse course, the Board could certainly consider an emergency ordinance which does not require a public hearing; it would have a duration of 60 days, and within that time if the ordinance were to extend beyond 60 days, the Board would have to have a public hearing on the ordinance.

Mr. Kamptner said to touch on the occupational safety and health regulations that the department of labor and industry adopted, which the final/final version became effective in January, the amendment to Executive Order 72 that was issued the past week by the governor actually provides that where there are any conflicts between those regulations and the executive order, the executive order will prevail. He said there has been some confusion the past week as to whether or not the governor had the authority to do that because there was an attorney general's opinion from several years ago in a nonemergency situation, where a state of emergency had not been declared, that concluded that the governor could not do that because there is an unwinding process for regulations that takes some time; there is a comment period to undo those kinds of regulations.

Mr. Kamptner said that the day prior, there was correspondence from the governor's office noting that the executive orders are issued under the governor's executive powers, and it is known that the governor has already superseded from state laws that were enacted by the General Assembly, so the governor's office's position is that the governor does have the authority to craft the executive order as it was done so that if there is a conflict, the executive order will prevail. Mr. Kamptner said they were going to have to go through and compare the executive order to those regulations and identify the conflicts, and every business sector is going to have to do that.

Ms. Mallek said it was interesting that in every place she has been all week, everybody inside and outside and in stores has been wearing a mask, and she was very heartened by that but does not know how long it will last.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said to Mr. Kamptner that she understood that they were going to be going with the governor's recommendation and in there was a proviso that one can also wear masks after June 30th, but otherwise she asked if the County's numbers as far as people assembling for a party, for example, were still in effect or whether everything was out the window except for being able to wear masks after June 30th if desired.

Mr. Kamptner said the County's numbers for gatherings and attendance at activities and events currently match the state limits, and that has been the case setting aside the lag time for a while. He said it is the governor's desire to have the mask wearing option available beyond the end of the state of emergency.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley encapsulated that the state of emergency ended June 30th; one could wear masks after June 30th if desired, but otherwise it would be open all over.

Mr. Kamptner said that was only what the governor had said he intended to do; if the numbers change statewide, the state of emergency may continue beyond that. He said that he knew VML had sent a letter to the governor's office requesting that localities be given sufficient lead time to adjust. He said the County's continuity of government ordinance and local emergency were still in effect, so as far as for meetings having to be in person, the County actually had as of that day six months to return everything to normal once the local emergency was eliminated; there is a new law which will take effect July 1st that extends that return to normal period to 12 months.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if at present, they were still and would remain in a state of emergency until June 30th or if they would have to decide the determining date of limiting that locally.

Mr. Kamptner said there would be a statewide state of emergency until the governor ends it, and he has stated that he intends to have it end around June 30th; the local emergency would end when the director of emergency management, the County Executive, ends it.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley clarified that if Mr. Richardson decided to end it sooner or go later, he had that ability.

Mr. Kamptner said yes; he had not looked that far ahead, but Mr. Richardson would have to evaluate all of the information, probably on a recommendation from the incident management team, as to whether the local disaster had come to an end at least to the point where operations could return to normal.

Ms. Price said Americans frequently talk about their rights, maybe not so frequently about their responsibilities, but the numbers that were shown earlier that day reflect that the community members in Albemarle County have acted responsibly with maturity and demonstrated respect for the rights of other

community members, and that leads her to be very supportive of repealing this ordinance.

Ms. Price said one thought she had was that just because it is legal does not necessarily make it right, and in that respect, it is still needed for community members to continue to do their part to help reduce the risk of infection, and one of the main things is to get the vaccination. She said she was pleased to see, though, that the point is being reached where they can look to repeal this. She noted that the community's businesses have struggled mightily, as they have across the country, and with Memorial Day coming up in just a very short time, July 4th, Labor Day, these are big holiday weekends, the local tourism industry could really use to have a little bit more openness, and she would be very reluctant to put Albemarle County at a disadvantage to other locations who may open up a little bit more. She emphasized that she says this with great respect for the maturity that the residents have shown.

Ms. Price said when she was younger, there were a number of slogans that came out, like for pollution, "Give a hoot; don't pollute!" so, with apologies, with regard to people who want to wear their masks, "Don't take someone to task just because they want to wear a mask," and, worst of all, "Don't be slouchy; get your Fauci-ouchie." She said there is still a ways to go, but she respects and appreciates the actions the community has taken.

Mr. Gallaway said when it was clear several months ago there was this urge, or this want, to try to loosen and ease things up, they held true at that point and recognized it was not the time to do that, and the County made the proper decision on that. He said it feels different this time; he did agree with the repeal of the ordinance. He said he certainly has a newfound respect, though, for the things that they have done over the last 15 months in regard to mask wearing, handwashing, hand sanitizing, paying attention to where one is at and being mindful of those sorts of things. He said he suspected a lot of people would continue to use those defense mechanisms not just because of COVID-19 but because of flu and colds and other regular ailments; he has not really had any of those issues in the past 15 months, and it is because of all the extra efforts to avoid COVID, so they seemed like smart actions to take whether the pandemic is happening or not, and he would certainly encourage people to feel free to be able to continue to do that. He noted, that being said, it did seem like things were at a state where support of the repeal of the ordinance is where his thinking was, knowing fully well that if something were to make any turn or surprise them, just as the initial pandemic did, they can certainly get back into action in quick order.

Ms. Price **moved** to adopt the Emergency Ordinance to Repeal Emergency Ordinance No. 21-E(1), as Amended by Emergency Ordinance No. 21-E(2), an Ordinance to Prevent the Spread of the Novel Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, and the Disease it Causes, Commonly Referred to as COVID-19.

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. Price.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Ms. Palmer.

EMERGENCY ORDINANCE NO. 21-E(3)

AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE TO REPEAL EMERGENCY ORDINANCE NO. 21-E(1), AS AMENDED BY EMERGENCY ORDINANCE NO. 21-E(2), AN ORDINANCE TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF THE NOVEL CORONAVIRUS, SARS-CoV-2, AND THE DISEASE IT CAUSES, COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS COVID-19

WHEREAS, on July 27, 2020, the Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 20-E(5), "An Emergency Ordinance to Prevent the Spread of the Novel Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, and the Disease it Causes, Commonly Referred to as COVID-19," which became effective August 1, 2020 (hereafter, "Ordinance No. 20-E(5) and its emergency and non-emergency successor ordinances are referred to as the "Ordinance"; and

WHEREAS, the Ordinance established regulations pertaining to: (1) the maximum indoor occupancy allowed at restaurants, farm wineries, limited breweries, and limited distilleries; (2) the maximum size of public and private gatherings; and (3) the requirement for persons to wear face coverings in public places; and those regulations were more restrictive than the Governor's Executive Orders in effect at the time;

WHEREAS, the Ordinance was initially part of a coordinated effort among the County, the City of Charlottesville, and the University of Virginia to prevent the spread of SARS-CoV-2, and the disease it causes, COVID-19, in the community as the number of COVID-19 cases was increasing and University of Virginia students were returning to the community for the Fall 2020 semester; and

WHEREAS, the Ordinance was most recently adopted as an emergency ordinance on April 7, 2021 (Ordinance No. 21-E(1)), which was amended by the Board on May 5, 2021 (Ordinance No. 21-E(2)); and

WHEREAS, as of May 10, 2021, the County's 1.5% seven-day average positivity rate (PCR test only) for COVID-19 is less than the statewide positivity rate of 4.3%; the County's seven-day average of six new daily COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population is the same as that statewide; the County's seven-day average of 0.3 new daily hospitalizations per 100,000 population is one-half that of the statewide average of 0.6 new daily hospitalizations; and the County has the highest vaccination rate for COVID-19 in the

State, with the City of Charlottesville also having one of the highest vaccination rates in the State; and

WHEREAS, the need for County restrictions to prevent the spread of SARS-CoV-2, and the disease it causes, COVID-19, are no longer necessary.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, that Ordinance No. 21-E(1), as amended by Ordinance No. 21-E(2), is repealed.

Agenda Item No. 19. **Presentation:** Blue Ridge Health District (BRHD) Update on Vaccination Program.

Dr. Bonds said she wanted to take a moment to thank all of the Supervisors and all of the executive staff of the County. She said everyone's support and assistance over the last year had really been instrumental, and she appreciated all of the help that everyone had given.

Dr. Bonds asked each Supervisor to work with their constituents to get those final people in to get their vaccine. She said Albemarle County, as was noted by many of the Board, had really done a fabulous job in getting vaccinated. She said it was now the final stretch where everybody's assistance was needed to get people in to get vaccinated.

Mr. Ryan McKay thanked the office staff from the County Executive's office and said it had been truly instrumental for them to be able to get to this point and critical to mention that. He said looking through how they were going to present some of the information that evening, they wanted to really look at where they are both in terms of cases and current case counts and trends and then where they are with the vaccination campaign, looking at certain data points; where access was being provided currently and then how they are transitioning from more fixed mass vaccination sites to a broader, more mobile vaccination campaign to conduct some outreach in that sense; and then what they are trying to do to accomplish information sharing and education to really get people over whatever hesitancy that might be there.

Mr. McKay said he would start with where things are currently in terms of cases with data collected that day; there was one reported case in Albemarle County that day and 10 for the entire district. He said there had been a really significant drop in cases since late February/early March where there was a little bit of an uptick. He said this was critical because it allows the continuation of the vaccination campaign, but it also allows potential spread to be controlled and contained as cases emerge, limiting and minimizing risk that could occur with outbreak or a larger influx of cases, so this is critical to the overall response and will help in terms of controlling spread in the community as certain restrictions become relaxed.

Mr. McKay recapped that in January they started with phase 1a and 1b focusing on individuals who were at highest risk based on medical conditions and based on their work and exposure risk. He said moving into April, they were really focusing on phase 2, opening up to everyone, and then recently opening up to 12- to 15-year-olds. He said as they have moved along that phase, they have had tremendous success in getting people vaccinated in Albemarle County, and now they really want to look at how to get over that last hurdle to reach 70%, which is the governor's goal for all adults across Virginia.

Mr. McKay said phase 3 goals that are intended to be reached by July 4th are providing access at all of the County public schools for both the first and the second dose of Pfizer, to begin to increase fully vaccinated to 70% of the total population, and then looking at the demographics, a 35% increase in percentage of African American residents who are fully vaccinated.

Mr. McKay presented a map of census tract data used internally for planning purposes. He said the census tracts with a darker shade of blue have a higher percentage of people vaccinated with the first dose and then on the left, the data here was slightly different than what Mr. Kamptner shared. He said the total number of people with at least one dose (73%) and the total fully vaccinated (61%) is from the VDH website, and then the population 12 and up is based on data pulled from 2019 census data and then information they had through map to health data that they had collected in 2019. He said it gives them a better sense of where things are for 12 and up, and really the vaccination campaign has been tremendously successful and fully anticipate meeting the 70% goal by July 4th based on current projections.

Mr. McKay said one thing seen really since April is a decline in demand for first doses. He said vaccination demand for JCPenney first dose peaked the week of April 12th, which is when they opened to everyone 16 and above, and then there was a little bit of an increase the past week as children 12 to 15 were now able to get vaccinated, and so on Thursday of last week, there were nearly 200 12- to 15-year-olds getting vaccinated, which indicates the demand. He said they anticipate that demand will increase a little bit over the next couple of weeks but getting into mid-June with greater access provided throughout the community to 12- to 15-year-olds, it is anticipated to see that sort of drop in demand for first doses. He said the demand shifting downward is the trend seen all across the district and across Virginia.

Mr. McKay recapped where things are with JCPenney and what they have done and accomplished so far. He said thus far, nearly 30,000 doses have been administered since March 23rd, which was the first day they opened. He said the data presented on the slide was current as of the day before, so he imagined the 30,000 doses administered threshold was crossed that day. He said it has been a tremendous boost for them; they have moved from the K-Mart location in the tent to a more stable

structure and infrastructure with support from Albemarle County and the Regional Emergency Operations Center. He said it has been critical to the success of what they have been able to accomplish. He said as Mr. Richardson had discussed in a previous meeting, they are transitioning out of this very large space and working with the County Executive's office to identify a smaller space that would still provide a central hub for access to the vaccine but would be more appropriate in terms of the resource need at that point for meeting demand.

Mr. McKay said where they are right now in terms of providing access, there is an abundance of access across Albemarle County and certainly the district, so obviously they will continue to operate out of JCPenney until mid-June and transition to that smaller location once it is identified in late-June into July. He said UVA Health is still operating at Seminole Square and providing access to the Pfizer vaccine; they have also seen an increase in the number of individuals coming in, particularly within the 12- to 15-year-old range over the last week or so. He said pharmacies have had ample access to the vaccine through the federal program so receiving doses directly from the federal government as opposed to getting an allocation from BRHD. He said that is a pretty big change over the course of the last few months; they were initially providing them a small amount of their allocation that they were receiving, but now that they are receiving their own doses from the federal government, and that provides tremendous access to the community in that sense. He said they are providing some doses to primary care providers in the district in Albemarle County and Charlottesville. He demonstrated a small list, CVHS Southern Albemarle, Piedmont Pediatrics, Pediatric Associates, and Albemarle Family Medicine, just to name a few, and said they will continue to do that especially with the Pfizer vaccine to get to that 12-18 range for parents who want to bring their children into the pediatrician's office as opposed to a larger site.

Mr. McKay said for a complete list, individuals can go to vaccines.gov to identify all the locations in the County, in the City, and then across the state in the health district for access to the vaccine.

Mr. McKay said in this space now, they really do need to transition to take advantage of some of the mobile efforts that have already been in place over the last couple of months. He said they have been working very closely with Charlottesville Fire and UVA Health to ensure they are providing access to the vaccine to those who are homebound. He said since April 1st, they have served 75 individuals in this capacity, and while those days may provide 5 to 10 doses being administered, it is a huge accomplishment and a tremendous success for the overall vaccination campaign to reach these individuals who otherwise may not be able to get it.

Mr. McKay demonstrated a picture of a mobile unit that they anticipate coming in the next couple of weeks. He said this has been a partnership through donor and certainly through the County Executive's office. He said this will increase their capacity to meet demand where people are and to go mobile in that sense. He said they will use the census tract data to inform decision-making about where this mobile unit will go. He said this will be tremendous for the COVID-19 vaccination campaign, and they look forward to using it as a way to conduct outreach in the community in ways they really have not been able to do before, so tremendously beneficial for the long term, not just for the short term for the COVID vaccine campaign.

Mr. McKay said they have been focused on place-based vaccinations, so they operate in different community settings and neighborhoods where they are providing access through known entities in neighborhoods that enable individuals to get access to the vaccine a little easier or more efficiently. He said in partnership with UVA Health, there is a new program called Dose On-the-Go where essentially they partner with a couple of their community health workers; those health workers go out to businesses and talk to individuals in public places asking them about the vaccine, trying to educate them and get them over the hesitancy hump, and then that is backed up by two vaccinators who have anywhere from 21 to 32 doses of Pfizer with them, and they can administer that vaccine right then and there and then return in three weeks to provide the second dose. He said this has been found to be hugely successful in the first couple of weeks since this has been happening, providing access in barbershops, outside Fashion Square Mall when they are not there, and giving anywhere from 30 to 60 people, depending on the day, access to the vaccine where they might not have been able to get vaccinated given work schedules, timing, and then the hesitancy concerns that they may have.

Mr. McKay said children 12 to 15 received approval the past Wednesday to get access to the vaccine; they did see a pretty instant increase in the number of first-dose appointments related to the 12- to 15-year-old range, and then in the coming weeks, part of their strategy is to go to all of the County middle and high schools to provide access to at least first dose before they leave school and then also going back to provide access to that second dose of Pfizer before summer camps open, and then that can increase protection for them and the community moving forward.

Mr. McKay said they have worked with some of the independent and private schools to provide at least access to the first dose. He said individuals will need to go to JCPenney for their second dose or another location, but again, providing more direct access to those students in those settings quickly to get them vaccinated pretty efficiently.

Mr. McKay said they are doing a lot of place-based vaccination where they are going to either a neighborhood or local community working with UVA Health and Piedmont Housing Alliance to try to provide more access to try to provide a lot of that education to get people over the hesitancy and get them access pretty quickly to the vaccines. He said this has been pretty successful and with the mobile unit and the Dose On-the-Go will certainly be able to expand access to neighborhoods over the coming months.

Mr. McKay said they continue to provide, as they have been with various partnerships access to support services, to individuals who are testing positive for COVID or are in quarantine to get access to some of these programs which can offer food for them and their families, money to support their ability to isolate and quarantine, which is a pretty important aspect of this so that individuals can truly isolate and quarantine at home without worrying about having to break that isolation or quarantine to go to work or send children to school. He said they continue to provide access even as cases are low. He said they have had a tremendous amount of success for distribution of food, PPE kits, and obviously funding for those that need it to support their isolation and quarantine period.

Mr. McKay said with community engagement, they have been working hard to not only identify new ways to communicate with their partners but also utilize those individual organizations as a mechanism for communicating with the community; that is another part of this transition of phase 3, which is relying on community partners to help deliver the message about vaccine safety and the importance of getting the vaccine, so it is not just the health district communicating that message but is a whole-community approach to getting individuals educated about the vaccine and getting them vaccinated.

Mr. McKay said they have received over 25,000 calls to their hotline since January 1st, and one of the things they have been trying to accomplish is actually making direct calls to individuals using the hotline staff, so while their calls may have decreased over the last couple of weeks, they are trying to conduct outreach in different ways using that team to make direct phone calls if people miss appointments to understand why, and if they did not come in for a second dose, they want to educate them about why it is important to get that second dose. Mr. McKay said they will continue to work with the partners noted on the slide specifically for a communication campaign to really increase information access but also go to where people are to get the information; while there is a ton of information available online, they think that person-to-person contact will be much more effective in providing individuals with the information they need to make the decision about getting vaccinated.

Mr. McKay said they do want to highlight introducing a community health worker for Albemarle County, Willie Mae Gray, who has been instrumental in a lot of the grassroots efforts to provide information to individuals in the community about getting vaccinated. He said they were excited about the work that she is doing and the work she will continue to do in the community during this effort.

Mr. McKay said as far as their communications plan, again they are adjusting that a little bit. He said they will utilize all of the methods they have been using from social media to radio and print ads but also want to rely on the community to help spread that message as trusted members of the community and family members providing information that gets individuals what they need to know about getting vaccinated and hopefully then to make that decision to come in and receive their vaccine.

Mr. McKay said in addition to thanking everyone with the County, they want to thank all the partners that they have had in Albemarle County and in the Charlottesville area as part of this effort; it is an ongoing effort, and they need that continued support to continue their efforts in the vaccination campaign. He said there are countless community members who have been really critical to this effort. He said things are at maybe the hardest part in that final stage of really doing that grassroots campaign to get people vaccinated, and so now more than ever, it is really critical that they rely on their partners to deliver that message and move a little bit closer to the goals for getting more in the community vaccinated.

Mr. McKay said for more information, their hotline is able to assist; there is a lot of information on their website and vaccines.gov to get some information about where a vaccine is accessible in the County.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated the presentation and all the hard work; Mr. McKay had recognized lots of people and put lots of work in that presentation, and they certainly appreciate every bit of it and appreciate the community for following his recommendations as best they could.

Ms. Mallek said sometimes people ask if they have information or programs for people whose doctors have told them that they are precluded from taking the vaccine. She asked whether there were supports through the health department for those people as a sort of parallel track to the other work they have been doing.

Dr. Bonds said they can certainly help answer any questions and can certainly research with the CDC if there are specific things. She said if someone for a particular health reason cannot receive any of the vaccines, then the focus would be on helping them maintain mitigation measures. She said Ms. Mallek pointed out a really good point; there is going to be a certain percentage of the population, and every time someone who can get vaccinated becomes vaccinated, that is helping to protect that small percentage of the population who otherwise could not. She said this a community, and a community does best when people all look out for each other; getting vaccinated is one of those ways, so certainly if there are individuals that cannot get it and they have questions, she is more than happy to help them research in trying to figure out alternatives for them.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked Mr. McKay and Dr. Bonds for their presentation.

Ms. Price thanked Dr. Bonds and Mr. McKay not just for that day but what they have done over the last 15 months or so; it has just been incredible. She said it has been an endless day and night parade for them for all these months, and she appreciated Dr. Bonds' comment how people help each other best when they all work together to protect the community.

Mr. Gallaway said it hardly seemed like enough to say thank you or express appreciation. He said as the Board has had to make decisions and policy decisions over the past 15 months, just having Dr. Bonds and Mr. McKay available to come and give updates is something that they sincerely need to thank them for because without those updates, they would not have been able to make the policy decisions that they have made. He said in addition to all of the other things that gratitude is owed to them for, that one in particular he wanted to definitely point out that evening.

Ms. Mallek commented that one of the reasons the nation was so behind the eight ball for this was because of allowing the public health infrastructure to fall apart, so hopefully one thing that will be done better going forward is to strengthen all of those support systems that have gone into hyperdrive for the last 12 months and keep them going; that will help everybody. She said all those other programs they have not been able to do because they have been so busy with COVID would be a tremendous help to those who do not have great access to physicians who pay attention to them, first of all, or even programs or availability of offices and that kind of thing, so she hopes at the national, state, and local level, a better infrastructure job will be done for public health.

Mr. Richardson said he appreciated the comments from the Board and loved what was said about how reassuring it has been over the last 15 months for Dr. Bonds and Mr. McKay to be before this Board with regularity. He said as he looked at both of them tonight, he looked at two people with color in their faces; Dr. Bonds and Mr. McKay look rested, and they look normal, and for a lot of the last 15 months, they have not because they have both worked nonstop. He said there have been a number of times that the Board has asked them to be with them, and they ask what time and say they will be there, whether it be 3:00 in the afternoon or as late as 7:00 or 8:00 at night, and either or both of them every time has said they would be there.

Mr. Richardson said he knows for a while that they were working seven days a week, he hopes they are not now, and Dr. Bonds was serving two districts; she served two health districts for over a year, and that had an effect on her and an effect on Mr. McKay. He said they really are an amazing regional health department, and for everyone in Albemarle County government that works with them every day, they really have enjoyed being with them because they have public service at the heart of everything that they do. He said there was still work to be done, and even that night they were discussing the tough work ahead, and they needed to roll up their sleeves and get this next 15% or 20%, always looking ahead for what is next. He said he would appreciate everybody taking a moment that night to thank them because they have served five counties tremendously well.

Agenda Item No. 20. **Public Hearing: VDOT/Albemarle County FY 22 – 27 Secondary Six-Year Plan. To receive public comment on the proposed Secondary Six-Year Plan for Fiscal Years 2022 through 2027 in Albemarle County, and on the Secondary System Construction Budget for Fiscal Year 2022.** (Advertised in the Daily Progress on May 3 and May 10, 2021)

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that this public hearing is to receive input on the County's proposed Secondary Six-Year Plan (SSYP), FY 22-27 (Attachment A).

The SSYP allocates funding for construction, maintenance, and improvement of roads in the state secondary system (roads with a route number of 600 or higher). The funds allocated to Albemarle County through the SSYP include state and federal funds for a variety of road improvements. The SSYP for Albemarle County is updated and approved annually and identifies the specific funding source, use, and levels allocated for the immediate fiscal year. The SSYP also identifies projected funding allocations for the next five fiscal years.

The Board supported the proposed SSYP, priorities, and recommendations on the March 17, 2021 consent agenda, with no changes requested. Attachment B is that Executive Summary and Attachment C is the Report on the Secondary Six-Year Plan Priorities and Recommendations from March 17, 2021. The FY 22 Albemarle County Priority List for Secondary Road Improvements, Unpaved Roads, is included as Attachment D.

No updates have been made to the proposed SSYP since it was presented to the Board on March 17, 2021. The line item "Future Unpaved Account" represents funds projected for FY 26 and FY 27 that are not currently assigned to any project identified in the Proposed SSYP (Attachment A). As these fiscal years approach, staff will identify paving projects for the Board to consider as options for this funding. All future Telefee funding through FY 23 is committed to the Berkmar Extension Revenue Sharing project.

Approximately 170 miles of unpaved roads within Albemarle County are maintained by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). The SSYP allocates funding to pave public unpaved roads from the County Priority List for Secondary Road Improvements, Unpaved Roads (Attachment D) that have been the subject of petitions by property owners and supported by the Board.

Staff has received public comment both in favor of and opposed to the proposed paving of certain roads, regarding general opposition to the paving of unpaved roads in the County's Rural Area, as they are seen and used as rural greenways, especially by cyclists; opposition by property owners on White Mountain Road (Route 736) for its inclusion in FY 26 of the proposed SSYP for paving; support by property owners on Hammocks Gap Road (Route 612) for its inclusion as a fully funded project in FY 22 of the proposed SSYP; and concern by property owners on Harris Creek Road regarding traffic dust.

The SSYP outlines the proposed expenditure of State/VDOT secondary road construction funds allocated to the County. The SSYP does not require the expenditure of County funds unless the Board directs the appropriation of additional funding from the County general fund to a project, such as through the use of the revenue sharing program.

After the public hearing, staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment F) approving the FY 22-27 Secondary Six-Year Plan and authorizing the County Executive to sign the Plan.

Mr. Butch, Senior Planner of Transportation, said the secondary six-year plan allocates funding for the construction, maintenance, paving, and improvement of roads in the secondary system within Albemarle County for route number of 600 or higher. He said this process is updated and approved by the Board of Supervisors annually, and there is approximately \$522,000 available in fiscal year 2022 funds that must be appropriated to paving unpaved roads and \$309,000 in fiscal year 2022 that is dedicated as TeleFee funds to the Berkmar Connection Revenue-Sharing Project, and the TeleFee funds are dedicated in the outyear to fiscal year 2024 to that project. He said project selection for paving is based on the Albemarle County priority list for secondary road improvements, unpaved roads, and the Board's preferred method for paving within the secondary six-year plan for unpaved roads is through the Rural Rustic Road Paving Program that is very basic and is able to least impact.

Mr. Butch said at the March 17th work session, there was a consent agenda item; a recap on that was to continue to dedicate future TeleFee funding until FY 24 on the Berkmar Drive extended revenue-sharing project as well as continue to advance as the top paving priorities within the secondary six-year plan for Reservoir Road, Burnt Mill Road, Hammocks Gap Road, Harris Creek Road, and there were no changes to the fiscal year 2022 Albemarle County priority list for secondary road improvements, unpaved roads. He said that is basically the roads that are gravel roads; residents request these roads to be paved, and if the Board endorses this, VDOT evaluates these roads to see if they qualify for rural rustic, and then they are prioritized on this paving priority list.

Mr. Butch said Attachment E showed the priority list but was mapped within the County. He emphasized that the blue is VDOT-maintained public unpaved roads with the Albemarle County priority list in red, which are paving priorities, and in green the roads that have been previously removed by the Board that were on the priority list or within the secondary six-year plan but have been removed by the Board as not to be paved. He said they would be asking for any more roads that are to be removed from the priority list or the secondary six-year plan for the Board to provide a justification for future reference as to why a road was removed so they are able to track this for record-keeping purposes, and this would be under roads removed by Board requested not to be paved category within the Albemarle County priority list for secondary road improvements.

Mr. Butch said to recap on the timeline of the secondary six-year plan, he would provide a summary. He said currently, the Rio Mills connector road project was still funded and had an expected completion within the following year. He said Coles Rolling Road was broken down into two phases; phase 1 was complete and phase 2 currently ongoing. He said Burnt Mill Road, Wesley Chapel, and Reservoir were going to be fully funded FY 22, and VDOT will be scoping on these rural rustics. He said they will be bringing on July 7th Burnt Mill Road, Hammocks Gap Road, Harris Creek Road as well as Red Hill School Road to the Board for rural rustic road resolution; these letters will be sent if nothing changes at the public hearing. He noted they would be sending letters to property owners on these roads informing about the paving, asking them for comment, and taking this to the Board by consent July 7th.

Mr. Butch said after the public hearing, staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached resolution (Attachment F) approving the FY 22-27 Secondary Six-Year Plan and authorizing the County Executive to sign the FY 22-27 Secondary Six-Year Plan. He said staff also recommends that the Board vote to approve the final FY 22 Albemarle County Priority List for Secondary Road Improvements, Unpaved Roads (Attachment D) for the record if the Board chooses to make any adjustments or not.

Ms. Mallek said she was looking for a list that went with the roads removed on the map, and someone could perhaps send her a link later. She said she had been trying to identify them from the staff report. She said she knew the Knights on Wesley Chapel could hardly wait because that one-tenth of a mile of dirt for them has been really challenging for their health.

Ms. Mallek asked if they should talk that day about the criteria for the do-not-pave list or if that was for another time. She said Mr. Butch had mentioned they needed to have criteria, and she thought they did, but she is glad to have another day if that was what was planned.

Mr. Butch said basically from the public hearing if the Board decides to remove a road from either the secondary six-year plan or the priority list, roads that were removed that do not have a justification, they are basically asking just a description of reason for this for future reference. He said to answer the first question, this was Attachment D, second page, roads that were removed by the Board. He said that would show the roads on the map that were removed.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley noticed in the current priority orders that both numbers 12 and 13 were Stony Point Pass coming in on both ends but not in the middle. She said that area has the highest number of crashes of everybody. She said she knew it was removed by the former Supervisor in 2019 for unclear reasons, but she understands it is back on the list in two parts. She said with its location, really the entire

road should be paved because it is a fantastic east-west corridor connection from Franklin and Keswick to 29. She said she noticed it was in red on the two ends of Stony Point Pass and asked if Mr. Butch could tell her where it was at.

Mr. Butch said they did have VDOT recently reevaluate this and a lot of the roads that have been on this priority list to confirm that they still are eligible for rural rustic paving. He said this was in spring of 2020. He said VDOT confirmed basically the middle section of Stony Point was not eligible for rural rustic paving because of geometry, the width of the road, a minimum 16 feet, so they agreed that both ends would be able to be paved. He said it is currently in the secondary six-year plan projected to be fully funded, both segments, in FY 24.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley repeated FY 24 and asked when it would be actually paved.

Mr. Butch answered July 1, 2023, was when it would be fully funded; they would start the letters to the property owners, and VDOT would be doing the scoping. He said typically they assume spring paving if VDOT workers and maintenance issues allow it.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if he were saying on July 1st of this year that the letters would be sent out.

Mr. Butch said for Stony Point Pass, both segments are funded FY 24, so it would not be the current year, but if nothing changed on the secondary six-year plan and they just bump up the next year, then it looked like they would be pursuing that process.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if they could start work as soon as 2023 or 2022.

Mr. Butch said probably more in 2024 if it stays as is. He said they are noticing that their paving program is assumed typically in the spring, but one year, there was a lot of flooding and so a lot of the schedule of the paving was pushed back on hold to address maintenance issues.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was concerned because it has the highest crash rate of any of the projects on the list. She asked for verification that it was fully funded.

Mr. Butch said it is projected to be fully funded; it is outyears of FY 24.

There was no one signed up for public comments.

Mr. Gallaway closed the public comments section.

Ms. Mallek asked if after the public hearing and after the adoption of the plan, they were supposed to go over the list of unpaved roads and give Mr. Butch the information about why they were taken off or if that was another day. She said she had the list and could certainly share later what the reasons were for the ones she is familiar with.

Mr. Butch answered that in their assumption, if any roads were removed after the public hearing that are currently on the priority list or the six-year plan, and he did not know if they needed to go back to previous roads that were removed.

Ms. Mallek asked if White Mountain Road was on the list somewhere that she could not find. She said since Ms. Palmer was out of town, people had contacted her and asked for help.

Mr. Butch said it was priority #19 and projected to be fully funded FY 26.

Ms. Mallek said the people who had written to her had said it was a major cut-through already, even with part of it being dirt, and they were very concerned that it being paved would only increase their misery and the speeds, and that is why they were requesting it be put onto the do-not-pave list. She noted those were very similar circumstances to the people on Dick Woods Road, who finally got that shifted back in 2014. She said she would pass that along and did not know what would happen next.

Mr. Gallaway said he guessed that particular project since it was not fully funded and was just in a projection for an outyear could be removed if so needed at a future time.

Mr. Butch said that was correct. He said the prior year, there was a road petitioned, Reservoir Road, that had a high traffic count, so it jumped higher to within the secondary six-year plan for paving; there could be another road petitioned that could bump ahead of White Mountain Road prior to FY 26.

Mr. Gallaway asked if roads could get bumped down or could get removed, and that nothing was getting locked in here.

Mr. Butch replied correct.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **moved** to adopt the adopt the Resolution (Attachment F) approving the FY 22-27 Secondary Six-Year Plan and authorizing the County Executive to sign the Plan.

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

May 19, 2021 (Regular Meeting)
(Page 45)

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE SECONDARY SYSTEM SIX-YEAR PLAN (FY 22-27)**

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 33.2-331 provides the opportunity for each county to work with the Virginia Department of Transportation in developing a Secondary System Six-Year Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board has previously agreed to assist in the preparation of this Plan, in accordance with the Virginia Department of Transportation policies and procedures, and participated in a public hearing on the proposed Plan (FY 22-27), after being duly advertised so that all citizens of the County had the opportunity to participate in said hearing and to make comments and recommendations concerning the proposed Plan and Priority List; and

WHEREAS, local and regional representatives of the Virginia Department of Transportation recommend approval of the Secondary System Six Year Plan (FY22-27); and

WHEREAS, the Secondary System Six Year Plan (FY22-27) is in the best interest of the County and of the citizens of the County.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves the Secondary System Six-Year Plan (FY22-27) and authorizes the County Executive to sign the Secondary System Six-Year Plan (FY 22-27); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the clerk of the Board shall forward a certified copy of this resolution to the District Administrator of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

Mr. Kamptner asked if the Board needed to take action on Attachment D, the priority list.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to adopt the adopt the priority list for the FY 22-27 Secondary Six-Year Plan.

Ms. Price **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. Price.
NAYS: None.
ABSENT: Ms. Palmer.

Current Priority (Recommended)	Roads Number, Road Name Priority	Location From - To	Length (mi.)	Funding Status	Current Traffic Count	Year of Count	Current Crash Data YTD - 2018	thru or dead end	Description/Comments	Year Project placed on	VDOT's Cost Est
1	712 Coles Rolling Road Phase 1	From: RL 713, To: 1.40 mile east of Route 713	1.4	Complete	165 avg	2018	2	thru	Public request. Provides thru road connection to primary route (RL 20).		\$383,414
2	712 Coles Rolling Road Phase 2	From: 1.40 mile east of Route 713, To: 2.75 mi east of Route 713	1.35	FY 21	165 avg	2018	4	thru	Public request. Provides thru road connection to primary route (RL 20).		\$366,500
3	671 Wesley Chapel Road	From: Rt 668 Chapel Spring Rd, To: Rt 669 Fox Mountain Rd	0.09	FY 21	270	2018	0	thru	School transportation request. SOS request	2018	\$57,000
4	702 Reservoir Rd	From: paved portion of Reservoir Rd, To: Holiday Trail, Ln.	0.97	FY 21	255 avg	2015	2	dead end	Public request. Serves Camp Holiday Trails, Ragged Mountain Natural Area and access to Ragged Mountain Sanctuary.	2018	\$434,445
5	784 Bunt Mill Rd	From: RL 600 Waste Passage, To: Cndy Ln RL 1009	0.71	FY21-22	210	2018	1	dead end	Public request. Provides access to Fembrook Natural Area and school bus route. Only portion is Grade Lane can be under BRS.	2018	\$319,500
6	612 Hemlock Gap Road	From: Route 20, To: 0.65 miles south of Route 20 at bridge	0.65	FY22	170	2018	0	dead end	Public Request - Only portion closest to RL 20 can be done under Rural Road Program	2016	\$180,000
7	720 Harris Creek Road	From: RL 20, To: Dead End	0.38	FY23-23	155 avg	2018	0	dead end	Provides thru road connection	2007	\$102,500
8	780 Red Hill School Road	From: RL 29, To: RL 712	1.53	FY 22-23	85 avg	2018	1	thru	Public request. Provides access to school. Serves former DA Village Park zoning. Provides thru road connection to primary route (RL 29), previously killed by residents	2011	\$375,000
9	633 Cove Garden Rd - west	From: 1.75 miles east of US 29, To: 3.04 miles east of US 29	1.29	FY23-24	80	2015	0	thru	Public request. Provides thru road connection to primary route (RL 29)	2004	\$320,000
10	633 Cove Garden Rd - east	From: 3.04 miles east of US 29, To: 0.10 miles west of Plank Road	1.23	FY23-24	80	2015	0	thru	Public request. Provides thru road connection to primary route (RL 29)	2004	\$300,000
11	789 Beem Road	From: RL 1484, To: Dead End	0.27	FY 24	80	2018	0	dead end	Public request.		\$90,000
12	600 Stoner Point Pass-southern segment	From: Route 20, To: 0.80 miles south of Route 20	0.9	FY 24	70	2015	9	thru	Public and SOS requester-connection from bridge to RL 20		\$225,000
13	600 Stoner Point Pass-southern segment	From: 1.59 miles north of Route 231, To: Route 231	1.29	FY 24	70	2015	9	thru	Public and SOS requester-connection from portion to RL 231		\$315,000
14	721 Old Dominion Road	From: RL 6, To: RL 630	1.21	FY 24-25	70	2018	0	thru	Public request. Serves active quarry site (rock quarry)	2006	\$300,000
15	707 Star Park Road	From: RL 691, To: end of state maintenance (before railroad tracks)	0.35	FY 25	70	2018	0	dead end	Public request. Serves large orchard operation		\$110,000
16	805 Henderson Ln	From: RL 29, To: RL 22	0.34	FY 25	70	2018	0	dead end	Public request. Provides access from RL 29 to church.	2018	\$78,500
17	723 Sharon Road	From: RL 6, To: RL 722	1.85	FY 25- 26	60	2018	3	thru	Public request.		\$490,000
18	813 Starlight Road	From: RL 712, To: Dead End	0.5	FY 26	60	2018	0	dead end	Public request.	2004	\$125,000
19	736 White Mountain Road	From: RL 635 Craig Store Road, To: RL 636 Bellevue Rd	2.6	FY 26	50	2018	1	thru	Public request. Opposition to the project has been noted.		\$455,000

NOTES: All undated traffic counts are of 1.13.20

VDOT makes the determination as to whether a road is eligible for RRR paving. All projects are placed on the regular paving list until the determination is made by VDOT. (Some projects may not be completed as prioritized due to project complexity and/or available funding)

REGULAR PAVING PROJECTS IN PRIORITY ORDER (HIGH TO LOW)									
Current Priority	Route Number, Road Name	Location From - To	Length (mi.)	Funding Status	Current Traffic Count	Year of Count	Current Crash Data 2011-2018	Year Project placed on Priority List	Description/Comments
20	643 Rio Mills Road	From: RL 28, To: RL 743		in VDOT SSYP	545 avg	2015	6	2003	Staff request. Serves Devel. Area; provides access to quarry; provides thru road connection to primary road (RL 28). Recommended in Comp. Plan and LTRP. Will need reevaluation upon completion of Connector Road.
21	761 Briery Creek Road	From: RL 622, To: County Line	1.35	not yet funded	140	2018	2	2005	Public request. At current ranking due to traffic count.
22	629 Horseshoe Bend Road	From: RL 601, To: Dead End	1.22	not yet funded	120	2018	1	2004	Public request. At current ranking due to traffic count.
23	640 Gilbert Station Road	From: Ashleigh Way Rd 1094, To: paved section	?	not yet funded	120	2015	0		Public request. At current ranking due to traffic count.
24	683 Shelton Mill Road	From: RL 751, To: Dead End	1.48	not yet funded	110	2015	2	2007	Public request. At current ranking due to traffic count.
25	698 Hungrytown Road	From: RL 633, To: Dead End	1.81	not yet funded	110	2015	1	2006	School transportation request.
26	682 Broad Axe Road	From: RL 637, To: current paved sections	1	not yet funded	90	2015	2		Public request. At current ranking due to traffic count.
27	634 Spring Valley Road	From: RL 630, To: Nelson County Line	3.02	not yet funded	65 avg	2015	3	2007	Public request. At current ranking due to traffic count.
28	688 Burch's Creek Road	From: RL 250, To: RL 635 Miller School Rd.	2.35	not yet funded	60 avg or 226 avg	2015/2018	3		Public request. At current ranking due to traffic count. (previously Pounding Creek Rd)
29	737 Mountain Vista Rd	From: Tolliter Creek bridge, To: 20 Valley St (Scottsville)	0.93	not yet funded	37.5 avg	2018	3	2018	Public request- town of Scottsville. not be eligible for traditional paving funds due to traffic counts below 50.
30	629/624 Browne Gap TP/Headquarters Lane	From: RL 810, To: end of RL 624	1.5	not yet funded	30	2015	1		Public request. May not be eligible for traditional paving funds due to traffic counts below 50.
31	668 Fox Mountain Rd	From: 810 Browne Gap Turnpike, To: 671 Wesley Chapel Rd.	4.93	not yet funded	30	2015	0	2018	SOS request. Waiting for resident petition.

UNPAVED ROADS SECTIONS REMOVED BY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS									
	Road Name/Rte.	Location from - to	Length	year removed	Updated Traffic Count	Year of Count		Year Placed on Priority List	Description/Comments
	667 Catterton Road	From: RL 601, To: east of RL 676	1.83						
	662 Bleek House Road	From: RL 665, To: paved portion	1.03	2010					
	637 Dick Woods Road	From: RL 691, To: RL 738	2.17	2014					
	785 Glenheim Road	From: north of RL 713, and To: south of RL 713		2012					
	671 Sallards Mill Road	From: RL 668, To: RL 674	3.12	2017				2007	School transportation request.
	674 Sugar Ridge Road	From: RL 614, To: RL 673	1.47	2017					Public request.
	678 Decoe Lane	From: RL 676, To: RL 614	1.72	2017					Property owner opposition to the paving has been noted. Public request.
	672 Via Ln	From: RL 810, To: dead end	2.75	2019				2018	SOS request.
	856 Burton Lane	From: RL 711, To: Dead End	0.4	2019				2007	Public request. RL 711 also unpaved (310/100 avg).
	600 Stony point Pass	Both segments 1 & 2	2.19	removed 2019					Was in FY20-25 SSYP; resubmitted and in current FY22-FY27 SSYP.

Agenda Item No. 23. Adjourn to June 2, 2021, 2:30 p.m., electronic meeting pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(16)

At 7:36 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to June 2, 2021, 2:30 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 Board of Supervisors home page.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date 05/03/2023
Initials CKB