

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 30, 2022, at 3:00 p.m. This meeting was held by electronic communication means using Zoom and a telephonic connection, due to the COVID-19 state of emergency.

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

ABSENT: None.

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

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. Donna Price. She noted that they were having issues with the Granicus recording system and would be sending out a press release in that regard. She said that the meeting was also being livestreamed and recorded through Zoom so they would continue.

Ms. Price said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." She said that the opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting were posted on the Albemarle County website, on the Board of Supervisors' homepage, and on the Albemarle County calendar. 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. Work Session: FY 2023 Operating and Capital Budget (ARPA, Housing Initiatives, Boys & Girls Club).

Mr. Bowman, Chief of Budget, stated that he would start with where they are in the overall process as they work toward the May 4 budget adoption, but he would also provide several updates regarding the schedule. He said the first update was around the April 6 work session on workforce stabilization scheduled for 12 –1 p.m., and this topic emerged from the March 17 work session and Q&A from the Board. He said that they would take a deeper dive into what workforce stabilization and budget impacts, and he would be joined by HR Director Mia Coltrane.

Mr. Bowman reported that there were three follow-ups underway related to athletic fields, as they had discussed on March 23, and the Board has wanted more time focused on this topic. He stated that these issues do not necessarily need to be resolved by May 4, and staff is proposing that the Board consider the Biscuit Run capital project for FY22-23 and divide the discussion in two. He explained that the first aspect would address the core infrastructure, access, and trail network item, then the athletic fields and those associated costs. He suggested that all of the decisions would still be driven by the Board, but the revised approach would relieve expectation of completion by May 4.

Mr. Bowman emphasized that staff tried to take a budget-neutral perspective in the budget, realizing that the Board had more work to do on this.

Ms. Price asked Board members to present questions.

Ms. McKeel said that she was very much in favor of the workforce stabilization discussion, but she would prefer to see the work session scheduled between April 6 and April 27. She stated that it may be that after the work session, they could move forward, but she would like not to put it off until summer or fall. She added that they've had the discussions and know what's fresh in their minds, and delaying it just pushes that off.

Ms. Mallek stated that she was fine with April 6 to understand the full picture of the workforce stabilization, and she was also fine to have the work session sooner, but only if all the information was available.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was also fine with April 6 and would like to have the discussion done sooner rather than later, ensuring they have all the pertinent information.

Mr. Gallaway stated that he agreed with his colleagues; the sooner the better, as they tend to lose the benefit of having the information fresh in their minds.

Mr. Andrews agreed, acknowledging the burden it may pose to staff.

Ms. Price said that she agreed with the other Supervisors and encouraged them to get their questions into staff, as she didn't want to fall into "analysis paralysis."

Mr. Henry stated that staff's intention is to respond as quickly as possible, and a decision would be made on use, scope, and allocation of the funding so they can hit the ground running by the start of the new fiscal year. He said there were some elements of the overall program that would take more time and require working with the Board and schools. He stated that it would make sense to first tackle the initial items that they know they can accomplish, and his thought was that they could hold a work session

in late April but would work with the Clerk's office on these. He said there were some questions asked the previous week that would take more work with the schools, as they were the primary owners of many fields in the County.

Mr. Gallaway commented that his only concern about having a conversation about all athletic fields and an analysis of the whole system, they can't lose sight of the fact that one project had received a vote: Darden Towe Park. He stated that he just didn't want this issue to grow from what the initial decision would ultimately end up being.

Ms. Price said that in observing the December 2019, it was apparent how long this had taken, and the Board needed to get questions to staff to have an opportunity to answer them.

Mr. Andy Bowman said the Board had seen the slide with the Budget timeline before. He said the work sessions would be an interactive approach, and staff would present information at a summary level between the County Executive's February presentation and the detailed document. He explained pauses were built into the presentation for the Board's discussion. He said staff was looking to find which items to bring back before the Board for more general information or items where the Board desired changes to the recommendations in the proposed budget.

Mr. Bowman said there were three topics on the agenda. He said the Board was not requested to take any action, but the discussions would inform future actions. He said the three topics were the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), housing initiatives, and the Boys & Girls Club of Central Virginia (BGCCV). He said the items were included together because of conceptual similarities in the budget process.

Mr. Bowman said while the FY23 budget made transformation investments in the community, it did not address all community needs. He said the proposed budget provided flexibility for the Board to address needs that were not explicitly mentioned. He said he would cover the ARPA recommendation for funding in FY23. He said the Board may amend the recommendation by reallocating funding amongst the proposals. He said if the Board so desired later in the process, there was a portion of the program that could be designated and programmed for a specific use at the Board's discretion.

Mr. Bowman said there was a Housing Fund balance of \$1.8 million and another \$3.1 million that was to be infused into the fund in the current fiscal year at the conclusion of the budget process. He said there were housing initiatives that, if issues were not addressed in the ARPA recommendation or the ongoing portion of the budget, provided flexibility to the Board to consider how to use the funding. He said the work session regarded the content of the FY23 proposed budget and specific proposals. He said he wanted to set the stage for the Board to show where there was flexibility to adjust funding and priorities without altering the current budget recommendations.

Mr. Bowman said the ARPA recommendation was based on a framework presented to the Board in August 2021. He said he would discuss the background to the ARPA funding the County had received, what had happened in FY22, and then examine the FY23 recommendations.

Mr. Bowman said the recommendation began to form a year ago with an update to the previous year's budget process. He said in March 2021, ARPA was signed into law, and the County was informed it would receive an allocation of \$21.2 million—half received in May 2021 and the other half received in May 2022. He said while the allocation was known, the federal government guidelines around reporting requirements, eligible uses, and the documentation had slowly been released as the US Treasury prepared the guidance. He said the guidance had been revised many times, including the most recent revision in January 2022.

Mr. Bowman said one of the differences in ARPA funding compared to the Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Securities Act (CARES) funding from a year prior was that the CARES funding was primarily a stop-gap measure to address immediate needs and provided a quick response to the pandemic. He said ARPA had similar intentions along with a focus on longer recovery projects and initiatives. He said there was a spending plan that was longer for ARPA funding than was available for the CARES funding. He said as a result, the County could be more deliberate and strategic in terms of using the ARPA funding for investments.

Mr. Bowman explained staff presented a framework in August 2021 to the Board to allocate \$9 million in immediate needs and to support \$4 million in economic vitality projects, such as economic development and human services. He said \$4.5 million would be used to leverage state funding for Broadband. He said the remainder of the \$21 million total ARPA funding would be included in the FY23 budget development process.

Mr. Bowman said in addition to the formula funding, the County received additional ARPA funding sources. He said the County received a \$400,000 revenue for a tourism recovery program from the Virginia Tourism Corporation (VTC) which was related to tourism marketing and development. He said the funding was implemented in partnership with the Charlottesville and Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB). He noted the City received an amount that was being provided to the CACVB. He said the County had an additional \$190,000 partnering with the Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) which was to support back payments for municipal utility customer accounts.

Mr. Bowman said for ARPA, there was a high-level reaction of how the funding could be used to fill any gaps in projects that had been prioritized by the Board or to align funding with projects within the

strategic goals of the County. He said the information was being monitored and gathered from the state and federal government. He said the County was in the early stages of learning what could be available for the County to draw down.

Mr. Bowman said he would discuss the FY22 projected use of ARPA funds. He said information was provided as part of the Board's quarterly financial report about how the funding was used and what was reported to the US Treasury for compliance. He said he would go through the information by category in more detail.

Mr. Bowman said the slide displayed the areas that were reported to the federal government by category. He said he would focus on infrastructure funding. He said the category was used as a match for the Virginia Telecommunications Initiative (VATI) 2022 grant related expenses. He said it was a regional effort where the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) served as the lead applicant. He said the intent of the funding was that there would be approximately 627 miles of fiber that would be laid in the County to provide a service to more than 5,000 locations. He said there was a three-year project timeline for the project with a projected end time in the spring of 2025, and a rolling service would be provided as areas completed work. He said broadband was one of the Board's nine strategic priorities so there was strong alignment with the Board's Strategic Plan.

Mr. Bowman said he would discuss the negative impacts and housing. He said there were a few examples for how the funding was used. He said the information was submitted in the County's fiscal class report through December 31, and as the year progressed, the numbers would increase. He said some of the funding was provided to The Haven to provide emergency shelter to 85 people experiencing homelessness. He said the Pathways program, a partnership with United Way, served nearly 1,600 households with average assistance of \$800. He said the County partnered with a local food hub to distribute food shares to Southwood.

Mr. Bowman said his next slide focused on premium pay, public health, and administration. He said premium pay spoke to what the Board discussed in December related to bonuses for police, fire rescue, and sheriff's sworn and uniformed employees. He said the costs to public health included the cost for the testing under the County Executive's order for employee testing. He said \$21 million in federal funding came with a notable administrative impact. He said the costs to ensure the funds were managed, planned, and remained compliant in reporting were covered with ARPA funding as well. He said this wrapped up the ARPA funding for fiscal year 2022.

Mr. Bowman asked if there were questions or comments on the material he had covered.

Mr. Gallaway asked Mr. Bowman to remind him of the order of the Broadband. He asked if there was a point when there was \$1.5 million allocated, then an additional \$3 million was added to reach the current \$4.5 million total.

Mr. Bowman said the original intent was \$3 million which was increased to \$4.5 million in August 2021.

Mr. Gallaway said he had the timeline reversed.

Mr. Bowman said he would fact check himself because at the same time the previous year the Board was considering local funding before the ARPA funding was available.

Ms. McKeel said under the negative impacts, the Haven was mentioned. She questioned whether the Haven was connected to the funding for Premiere Circle, or if it was a different allocation.

Mr. Bowman said more information would be provided regarding ARPA and housing. He said the Department of Social Services (DSS) Director, Ms. Kaki Dimock, would answer the question.

Ms. Kaki Dimock, Director of the DSS, responded that the funding for the Haven was directly to the Haven for the day shelter operations. She said funds were allocated for an emergency overnight shelter at Premiere Circle. She said the funds had not yet been used and were not included on the slide. She said the funds were specifically for the Haven's day shelter operations.

Ms. McKeel said she wanted to have the facts straight.

Mr. Bowman said the slide was a snapshot to look at the total ARPA formula funds of \$21 million. He said the slide provided a pie chart of the FY22 funds. He said he would cover the proposed use of the ARPA funds in the FY23 proposed budget. He said there were three categories he would discuss. He said as funding had been previously committed to Broadband, the budget recommendation added an additional \$2 million in infrastructure funding for broadband. He said the funding would be primarily for projects in the development areas. He noted the VATI grants had been rural oriented.

Mr. Bowman said the \$2 million in funding was part of the Broadband office's total approach to providing for all in the County. He said the administrative costs for planning, implementation, and recording for the ARPA state and local federal relief funding continued to be allocated. He said there was the creation of an ARPA reserve, under the standard allowance, which was terminology from the US Treasury. He said the concept had evolved a lot, from what was finally approved on January 6 from the US Treasury to what was originally introduced in the summer. He said in the pandemic, local governments were allowed to automatically claim \$10 million in revenue loss. He said the County's

proposal for the \$10 million revenue loss was to apply it in FY23 to public safety pay and use the one-time savings to create an ARPA reserve.

Mr. Bowman said it was a similar experience to the CARES funding when staff worked to provide the Board with flexibility.

Mr. Bowman said the ARPA reserve was an approach to streamline the administrative requirements effective on April 1, 2022. He said there was compliance in reporting requirements underway, based on the previous interim guidelines from the US Treasury. He said the requirements would become stronger. He said staff examined ways to simplify or streamline the administrative processes to allow more funding and time to provide services.

Mr. Bowman said the \$10 million dollar reserve was created so the Board would have flexibility to program the funds as it desired. He said staff's recommendation was to continue to meet the original intent of ARPA funds to meet the immediate needs and the longer economic recovery, and to focus on the ARPA eligible projects. He said staff recommended to meet the timeline of continuing to get the funding obligated and expended in making a difference in investments to the community based on the same timeline from the US Treasury.

Mr. Bowman said that the Board had flexibility on the \$10 million ARPA reserve fund to reprogram it and make changes as directed. He said there was more flexibility by this approach than was allowed by the US Treasury. He said the subtle difference was that while there was flexibility, staff was recommending an approach to program the funds in line with the original intent of ARPA in how the funds should be used in the community.

Mr. Bowman said in terms of the actual recommendation of the uses for the \$10 million ARPA reserve, the funding fell into two categories. He explained in August 2021, the Board provided direction in conjunction with the regular human services funding request process that was the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT). He said that coinciding with that, there was a process for the agencies to make formal requests for ARPA funding.

Mr. Bowman said the process took place, and staff received a number of applications for a whole range of services that were challenging to compare under the same criteria. He said those agencies were separated into three categories for funding. He said one category examined the negative economic impacts and the aid to the nonprofits; a second category was for infrastructure; and a third category for housing.

Mr. Bowman said the remaining funds of the ARPA reserve were approximately \$6 million. He said the funds were prioritized for infrastructure, economic development and tourism, and pandemic expenses. He said an unassigned fund of \$1.7 million provided the Board with future flexibility. He said the slide listed those agencies that were included in the \$900,000 of funding for negative economic impacts and aid to nonprofits. He said the process was done in coordination with the ABRT process for human service agencies, and many of the same staff were involved so that information was shared between the two processes and there was no duplication in funding recommendations. He said the details of the specific programs were included in the reports.

Mr. Bowman said water quality was a strong theme and intent of ARPA funding. He said the recommendation aligned with water quality. He said there were two projects for the Red Hill Water Treatment Plant (WTP) and the Scottsville WTP totaling \$750,000 provided to the RWSA. He said there was \$2.4 million provided for Premier Circle for the permanent supportive housing (PSH) apartments. He said the funding would support the construction and development costs for 80 studio units for permanent supportive housing in the County.

Mr. Bowman said there were many housing requests. He said the reason particular projects were prioritized for certain reasons. He said there was a wide spectrum that the DSS targeted for who needed assistance, from who was most vulnerable to least vulnerable. He said the Premier Circle PSH apartments tried to aid people in the most vulnerable part of the spectrum. He said when the project and the intent of ARPA funding on the timing were considered, the project was aligned to meet the timing. He said as the County's leveraging of other sources was examined, Premier Circle had leveraged other funding, and the \$2.4 million was to fill the gap to complete the project and bring it to fruition.

Mr. Bowman said there were other housing requests, and there would be an opportunity to address those requests through the Board's discussion on the housing fund. He said he provided the previous slides to explain what was included for housing in ARPA funding and why the Premier Circle project was specifically chosen.

Mr. Bowman said funding was included for infrastructure projects. He said as the capital projects were updated as currently budgeted, \$500,000 was added of the \$10 million to go to the currently appropriated phase of Biscuit Run Park, separate from the athletic fields project. He said the funding provided \$500,000 to fund what was included in the CIP. He said \$1 million was included for a County sewer connection program. He said the County Executive spoke at greater length on the connection in his budget presentation.

Mr. Bowman said the sewer connection was about individuals who were in the jurisdictional boundary for the public sewer who were on septic systems. He said there was a connection cost that could be out of reach for many. He explained the program was proposed to provide fiscal support to low-

income households to make the shift. He said as facilities were evaluated and were near a tipping point in terms of failure of aging septic systems in urban area, and the environmental hazards that arose from failing septic. He said there were approximately 250 households that, because of their location, could be connected to the public system, but the final number served was to be determined as the project was developed and implemented.

Mr. Bowman said there was funding of \$750,000 provided to the CACVB. He said the tourism industry was significantly impacted by the pandemic, and the funding continued to provide support to this agency as it served its role in regional tourism marketing to support the economic recovery. He said there was \$1 million of undesignated funds set aside as part of the FY22 immediate needs that could support other ARPA eligible economic development projects in the future.

Mr. Bowman said the final category he would cover was referred to as \$2.7 million in contingency, which included two items. He said the first item was to reserve \$1 million for future pandemic expenses. He said over the past two years, staff had learned, that, either through its own local reserves, CARES act reserves, or ARPA funding, there were likely going to be unexpected costs and new twists in the pandemic that would require flexibility to respond to. He said the \$1 million was not specifically designated for any project, and it was intended to allow flexibility to continue to provide a pandemic response.

Mr. Bowman said if the amount were not needed in full, the County could adjust, and the funds would be monitored as needed and be made available for other projects. He said the final point was that there was \$1.7 million leftover in the contingency funding. He said there were many community needs. He said the funds provided flexibility to the Board. He said staff could prepare a proposal, whether there be items discussed where the \$1.7 million could be programed specifically for the Board. He said the funds were left intentionally undesignated.

Mr. Bowman said he would pause for questions from the Board.

Ms. McKeel mentioned there were ARPA funds on reserve for public safety pay. She asked if the funds provided the flexibility that might be needed as the County completed the upcoming market study.

Mr. Bowman said the reimbursement of public safety pay was about the method that was eligible for how the \$10 million ARPA reserve was created. He said there was flexibility if the Board wanted to hold some of the \$10 million or the \$1.7 million in unallocated funds and to reserve a portion for workforce stabilization. He said the impacts of the public safety bonuses that were implemented in December were being monitored. He said it was intended as a one-year program.

Mr. Richardson said he did not have anything to add. He said Ms. McKeel asked a good question. He asked Ms. McKeel if she understood what Mr. Bowman said.

Ms. McKeel said there were critical positions, and the County had trouble with recruitment and retention. She wanted to know if the fund provided flexibility to the County as it completed the market study.

Mr. Bowman said the items included in the budget for workforce stabilization could be discussed during the April 6 meeting. He said there could be short-term and long-term flexibility.

Ms. McKeel said a presentation would be helpful. She noted there were two mentions of \$1.7 million in unassigned funds, but there was only one unassigned fund of \$1.7 million.

Mr. Bowman said Ms. McKeel was correct. He said \$1.7 million was what was allocated in the ARPA reserve for the Board.

Ms. Mallek said using the ARPA funds for public safety supplanted the money normally allocated as part of the regular budget, but it made it easier to report because it was one category which simplified the reporting to the federal government. She said the money was divided in several different ways that did not require reporting to the federal government.

Mr. Bowman said Ms. Mallek provided a good summary.

Ms. Mallek said the \$750,000 from the County was in addition to the \$400,000 from the VTC for the tourist bureau. She said she looked forward to more information on how the funds would be assigned. She said there was a lot of work to do. She said she had a question related to page 16. She asked if someone would explain the process for deciding the prioritization for the ARPA funding. She asked if there was an interdisciplinary staff group that reviewed the applications. She asked where the septic issues in the Southwood community were on the priorities list.

Mr. Bowman said the process taken at all of the agency requests, whether related to arts and culture agencies to the larger ones, there was a combination of the Finance and Budget department staff as well as staff who worked closely with the applicant agencies. He said an example would be staff from the Finance and Budget Department partnering with the DSS staff and including staff from other departments as appropriate, such as staff from the Department of Equity and Inclusion or communications and public engagement, to ensure there was a well-rounded approach.

Mr. Bowman said as projects were prioritized, it was looking at getting the intent of using the \$10

million for the same purpose as was laid out based on the timeline for projects. He said one of the reasons Premier Circle was prioritized was because of the timeline of obligated funding by FY24 and project completion by FY26. He said the combination of immediate needs and long-term recovery were considered.

Mr. Bowman said there was flexibility for projects to be addressed for housing not through the housing portion of ARPA, knowing there was a separate ARPA housing fund. He said for the other recommendations, there was not a clear fallback. He said part of this was knowing the reserves available for the Board to consider. He said a follow-up could be provided to the Board regarding an explanation of the entire process, from the application phase to the budget recommendations.

Ms. Mallek said there were some categories of request where there were other choices for funding. She said if those projects were to be presented later, she would wait. She said she was glad to see that there was flexibility to make decisions regarding prioritization.

Mr. Bowman clarified there was a request from Habitat for Humanity related to the Southwood community that was not included in the ARPA reserve. He said there was flexibility if the Board desired to reprogram items in the recommended budget, and to take any of the \$1.7 million and program that, or to look at the housing fund. He said the next part of the presentation included the DSS and a discussion of the housing fund.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley mentioned the \$1 million for the sewer connection. She said there were urban areas in each of the districts. She asked for clarification on how many homes were identified.

Mr. Bowman said 250 homes were identified.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if those homes were dispersed through the County or concentrated in one area.

Mr. Bowman said the households were in the jurisdictional boundary of the Albemarle County Sewer Authority (ACSA).

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said the households were not all in one district, but all over the County. She said she wondered if the \$1 million was in addition to the other discussions related to alternative ways to fund similar projects. She said Ms. Price had suggested a fee or recordation tax. She asked if the proposed funding was in addition to other funding alternatives or in lieu of those alternatives.

Mr. Bowman said the \$1 million was the proposal. He said if the Board were to make a policy decision in the future, it may be a different discussion. He said in the FY23 budget, there was \$1 million to implement the program funded by the ARPA reserved.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley clarified that the funding would be one-time and there would be no way to recoup the monies to help with future needs in the area.

Mr. Bowman said as the program was implemented and designed, it was focused on the implementation and first phase of the construction service side and looking at those who may be eligible to structure the program with ACSA.

Mr. Andrews mentioned the discussion on Broadband. He said the notes in the budget book mentioned potentially wireless broadband projects to address public safety needs in the rural areas. He asked if the potentiality of the project was clearer.

Mr. Mike Culp, Director of the Office of Broadband Access and Affordability, said there were potential wireless projects that would apply within the ARPA framework. He said those projects were being evaluated. He said the goal was to look at losses, feed, and reliability in the development areas first. He said for ARPA funds, the speed limits were higher, so the funds could be used in areas that VATI would not allow. He said resiliency and public safety were considered in any type of wireless situation. He said one or more projects were anticipated to be brought before the Board during the next fiscal year.

Ms. Price said she supported the \$1 million for the County sewer connection. She said she understood it to be largely already existing homes separate and distinct from the Southwood project.

Mr. Bowman said the desired outcome of the portion of the presentation on the housing initiatives was to lay the groundwork for the Board on all the work that was done in housing. He said there would be an April 20 work session on the housing fund. He said the County provided an array of housing services in combination with its community partners and state and federal funding. He said the presentation was a grounding in the work already done and provided an opportunity for questions and discussion about the housing fund to potentially position the Board for a productive session on April 20.

Ms. Dimock said supporting affordable housing was discussed generically, but there were many ways to support the development of affordable housing. She said the focus on the inside of housing policy making and how service providers thought about the various continuum of services as critical to a robust and meaningful affordable housing system. She said each one of the categories reflected a specific client population, a specific housing tool, and intervention. She said most often there was an agency at each type of intervention. She said sometimes community agencies performed more than one service. She said the County's response—there were direct service initiatives and funded housing initiatives, and it

collaborated with all service providers across the continuum to provide services to local residents.

Ms. Dimock said services moved from the most vulnerable to the least vulnerable: homelessness shelters and prevention activities, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, housing choice vouchers, affordable rental housing, affordable homeownership, and workforce housing.

Ms. Dimock said the DSS provided direct service using federal funds in three different categories. She said the largest category was in tenant-based vouchers—housing choice vouchers to support families living in poverty or who were severely housing burdened. She said the vouchers were a homelessness prevention strategy as well as an affordable housing strategy. She said more than 400 vouchers were provided. She said there were project-based vouchers which were funding tools to support renters in specific projects—they were property based. She said the DSS supported vouchers that supported people with disabilities, and vouchers that were connected to permanent supportive housing interventions.

Ms. Dimock said about \$3.3 million in federal funds was used to provide the direct service housing program. She said the funding translated into \$3.31 million in savings for the families that received the vouchers.

Ms. Dimock said moving from their direct service component to their funding component, they had \$3.59 million in ARPA funding, including in the budget of FY22 the support of projects in both the homelessness and emergency shelter categories, and the affordable rental housing. She said proposed in the FY23 budget was support for Shelter for Help in Emergency, which was a domestic violence shelter that was by definition considered a homelessness prevention and homelessness service strategy per the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and PACEM, which was an emergency overnight shelter.

Ms. Dimock said there was also \$2.4 million in the permanent supportive housing category for Premier Circle's 80 units that were identified, and there were lots of opportunities there with the Premier Circle project, notably they were being asked to provide gap funding, and the funding gap was already in place and the construction project was on the correct timeline to match ARPA. She said in addition, providing eighty units of permanent supportive housing for people who were chronically homeless in their community had been a very distinct possibility of ending chronic homelessness in their region.

Ms. Dimock said the Crossings had been built and was also permanent supportive housing, which that took a large bite out of the population of chronically homeless folks, and an additional 80 units at this point would help them get to a functional zero number of chronic homelessness. She said the Albemarle Housing Improvement Program, which was funded by ABRT, ARPA, and other categories. She said it was a program that defied definition that fit into multiple categories, but the Affordable Housing Preservation Strategy was a part of the continuum even though it did not fit nicely into every one of the categories.

Ms. Dimock said she would now discuss some ARPA-funded housing programs that they would be implemented, including the Moving Home Grant Program which addressed significant barriers to voucher recipients by paying security deposits and rental application fees which were generally not allowable to be paid using federal HUD funds. She said their Bonus Bucks program increased the number of landlords willing to rent to people using vouchers by incentivizing their participation. She said the Good Neighbor Program, which was meant to provide critical and supportive tools to help people stay in their house once they got it, and improved relationships.

Ms. Dimock said they also proposed in the FY23 budget a variety of support through their ABRT to support housing programs, including AHIP for affordable housing preservation, The Haven, a homelessness service and day shelter, PACEM, a low barrier overnight shelter, Piedmont Housing Alliance, in the category of affordable housing, the Shelter for Help in Emergency, as previously mentioned was an emergency shelter for domestic violence, and the Blue Ridge Area Coalition for the Homeless, which was formally known as the Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless, for the coordination of homelessness system of care.

Ms. Dimock said she would now discuss funds they did not provide themselves or manage themselves. She said there was a tremendous amount of money that came into their community that supported housing programs that were funded either directly from the federal government through their state partners, including the Vibrant Communities Initiative Grant and HOME Consortium, and potential grants included the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Virginia Brownfields Restoration and Economic Redevelopment Assistance Fund (VBAF).

Ms. Dimock said those were potential funds they were watching with great interest, because there was a tremendous amount of money that had potential to have significant impact in their community that they had yet to see how that money would be regulated or would funnel through other federal sources or state sources. She said it was not an exhaustive list.

Ms. Dimock said their own housing fund was created in FY19 specifically to provide support for phase one of the Southwood Redevelopment Project and to provide support for housing initiatives that were a one-time cost and supported the County's strategic and housing goals. She said past uses of the housing fund included Southwood and the temporary Southwood Project Manager recently endorsed by the Board.

Ms. Dimock said their current fund available balance was \$1.8 million and the next step would be to use the available balance to fill some funding needs not covered by the staff recommendations for ABRT or ARPA. She said there was also the proposed transfer to the housing fund of \$3.1 million in FY22 from available FY21 year-end funding to determine additional project funding once the FY23 budget was adopted.

Ms. McKeel said the housing initiatives were changing. She said on page 27, it mentioned the grants. She asked if the grants were competitive.

Ms. Dimock said it was a mixture. She said some were grants that came to the community based on population and entitlements, and others were competitive at the regional or state level. She said the County was waiting to hear how exactly the funds would be delivered to address local needs. She said it was unsure how competitive the grants would be.

Ms. McKeel said regarding the Premier Circle, the timing seemed good because the budget also implemented a mental health team. She said the team could make an impact on homelessness if it was connected and worked alongside as a parallel track.

Ms. Mallek said on page 26, ABRT housing programs were mentioned—she confirmed those projects were already included in the budget. She said she was interested in the timelines for the upcoming grants listed on page 27. She said she wanted to find ways to ameliorate the septic crisis at the Southwood development. She asked about that decision making in the near future.

Ms. Dimock said the spring might be optimistic. She said the decision making happened in the fall. She said timelines could be attached to the outside funding opportunities and provided to the Board during the April 20 work session.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said the Premier Circle would have 80 homes and all were studio apartments. She asked if the 80 homes would cover the needs.

Ms. Dimock said based on the number of people who met the chronic homelessness definition, the homes would solve that problem. She said there were more people becoming chronically homeless. She said chronic homelessness was defined as a period of time that one had been homeless plus a period of time with a disabling condition. She said there were more people becoming homeless in the community because they were unable to find housing services. She said the 80 houses would address the known need.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said as more people became homeless, hopefully the needs could be addressed. She asked if the funding allocated for the sewer connections for homes on septic systems addressed the need.

Ms. Dimock said she believed the funding did meet the need. She said the average cost for making the repair was used in the calculation—some repairs could come under or over the average.

Mr. Gallaway said he wanted to share a summary of the housing initiatives at the regional housing partnership. He asked if there was a way to be sent a selection of the slides in a separate document. He asked if the project manager position had been approved at the Southwood development.

Mr. Bowman said the position was approved at the January work session. He said the balance of \$1.8 million was after the approval.

Mr. Gallaway asked Mr. Bowman to remind him of the cost of the position.

Mr. Bowman said the position was for two years, and it was around \$170,000 a year. He said those years would be approximately \$85,000.

Mr. Gallaway said the housing fund was targeted to be at \$5 million. He said the proposal put the housing fund a few grand short of the \$5 million goal. He said he would like to supplement the housing fund with funds from the Board's strategic reserve. He said he supported getting the fund to \$5 million. He said there plenty of reserves to move a few hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. Andrews said he looked forward to future discussions.

Ms. Price noted the complexity of funding sources that totaled \$8 million. She said on slide 23, \$3.31 million was displayed three different times. She clarified there was only a single \$3.31 million revenue source coming into the County to provide benefit to members of the County—it was not three different instances of \$3.31 million.

Ms. Dimock said it was the same \$3.31 million revenue source.

Mr. Bowman said he would take a break if the Board desired before moving to the next part of the presentation.

Ms. Price said Mr. Bowman could move forward.

Mr. Bowman said he would give some introductory comments about the Boys & Girls Club of Central Virginia before turning the presentation over to their CEO, James Pierce, who would also be present for a Q&A with the Board. He said there was a longstanding partnership between the County and the Boys & Girls Club. He said currently included in the FY2023 Proposed Budget was the combination of operating support. He said the Boys & Girls Club had been evaluated through the ABRT process they talked about today, and they received about \$50,000 or more for those programs.

Mr. Bowman said they had also been through the ARPA Agency process and received approximately \$156,000 to support some of their programming. He said in addition to those outside contributions, the County also supported the Boys & Girls Club through \$1/year lease for space in the former Scottsville Elementary School for part-time after-school care programming and all-day summer care programming. He said this was information to acknowledge their existing partnership.

Mr. Bowman said the capital request was an item before the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 2020. He said as part of several topics that day, the Board received a presentation from Mr. Pierce, and there was some follow-up scheduled for later that March, but that never came due to the pandemic. He said the project cost, timing, and other changes would be discussed by Mr. Pierce, and stated that no funding was currently included in the FY2023 proposed budget for this initiative. He said that if directed by the Board, staff will prepare options in the context of the FY23 budget for consideration. He said that as they were considering what the FY24-28 CIP process looked like, Finance & Budget would be providing a more formal community request process for how these requests came in. He said that would not be discussed today but was a reference to their future work.

Mr. Pierce greeted the Board and staff and introduced himself as James Pierce, the CEO of the Boys & Girls Club of Central Virginia and resident of the Rivanna District. He said they at the club were grateful to each and every person who had spent time over the past six years with them on this project, from studying the need for out-of-school-time programming to discussing specific needs of populations attending school on Albemarle's most populated campus, to a market study of current offerings during after-school programming, to site selection and then relocation, they had been there alongside the club, the staff, and volunteer board every step of the way. He said he was there to share an update on the Albemarle campus for the Boys & Girls Club, which was scheduled to open this fall, and to formally request closing match funds of \$2 million towards completion of the facility.

Mr. Pierce said they had urged them to maximize collaboration, to show how this facility would benefit not only the students and families attending adjacent schools, but also how it fit into the larger strategic plan of the County. He said they and County staff had given needed advice and had asked to learn more, even sending representatives on site to see progress up close. He said he knew they had been keeping an eye on this important project and they were grateful. He said this afternoon, they would share details of the club's impact on this campus, the benefits to the County, and the importance of this location in supporting an extremely large and important population of Albemarle's students.

Mr. Pierce showed a slide of the club's service areas and membership demographics. He said 2022 marked the organization's 30th anniversary. He said they also received a clean audit with no management letter comments for multiple years. He said he hoped their trust went far beyond their reputation as a youth development provider and went into areas of finance, volunteer involvement, collaboration with community partners, and providing outstanding youth development programs for their area's club members. He said since 1992, they had grown the club's one club, serving 50 youth, to six clubs serving over 2,000 youth. He said this growth included an expansion to three county-based clubs in identified areas of need. He said Albemarle County now represented the largest population of overall members in their organization.

Mr. Pierce said they went where their partner agencies in the county say they should go, and before any expansion of services, always verified the county's needs by directing contacting schools, law enforcement, and other partners. He said in order to remain strategic, they tried to never act alone. He said that approach had allowed them to keep their high standard of quality. He said the new Albemarle campus club reflected the next transformational expansion in their thirty-year history, which had been vetted by partners within the County, including schools, law enforcement, and the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Pierce said the slide showed pictures of three programs highlighting their three focus areas, representing over forty programs they had running at any one time to serve their 2,000 members. He said on the left of the slide was the members of the teen book club and their volunteer leader, and other academic success programs included STEM, arts, career launch, tutoring, and financial literacy. He said in the middle of the slide was their running club from the Southwood club at the Cherry Avenue track. He said others in this area included wellness, sports leagues, healthy cooking, and nutrition programs. He said on the right, there was their youth of the year, Guadalupe Monroy-Flores, making a visit to the State House in Richmond with a staff member to lobby for equal access to higher education for all Virginians during a recently club legislative day. He said other good character and citizenship programs included membership-led service projects like coat and food drives.

Mr. Pierce said they were exceedingly proud of their efforts to continue service to the community during the spread of COVID-19. He said to please keep in mind their allocation of CARES funds to the club made these specific efforts possible. He said these three pictures on the slide were a reminder of the ways they adapted and continued serving the community during COVID. He said on the left was Mr. Jelani Simpson, the unit director of the Scottsville club, making a home delivery of books. He said during virtual programs, club staff delivered STEM, arts supplies, and over 2,500 books to over 350 kids. He said on the right was Mr. Myron Gray, helping distribute meals. He said during the COVID spread, clubs

became central hubs for food distribution, helping serve hundreds of meals per week in summer 2020.

Mr. Pierce said in the middle of the slide was Mr. Nick Fagans, director of the Jouett club, standing outside of a temporary location he led last year, appropriately holding a laptop. He said when they were unable to access the club to provide all-day academic support to members during virtual learning, Mr. Fagans formed a partnership with Frye Spring Beach club, where he and staff stood up an academic support center. He said this was one of five similar operations during the COVID-19 pandemic. He thanked the Board for helping them be the most responsive when their families needed them the most.

Mr. Pierce said that now they had talked about the organization-wide services they provided and their collaboration during the COVID-19 response, he would like to focus on their \$2 million request. He said on the current slide was a rendering of the front of the new 52,000 square foot club, which was already under construction on the campus of Albemarle High School, Jouett Middle School, and Greer Elementary. He said scheduled to open this fall, this state-of-the-art, freestanding facility would provide year-round services to over 500 Albemarle County students. He said their formal request to the County was in the form of \$2 million to support the final building cost. He said despite the increased cost of construction in materials during the past few years. He said the club had decided to keep its request at \$2 million because of the generous private support they had received from the community. He said at the same time, most of their private donations had already been identified, and this needed allocation could inspire the final push from their supporters, who did ask about County support for this effort.

Mr. Pierce said this facility would allow them to grow from a limited, school-year only location, to one serving members year-round. He said altogether, their capacity on-site would grow by 450%. He said this huge increase in service and return to the County was before they even factored in daytime use of the facility by schools and by government, and even weekend ability to reserve meeting rooms for community meetings and events, which they knew was a significant need of the County, especially in this area.

Mr. Pierce said the County's funding of their entire request to complete the building would continue their longstanding and strong collaboration and partnership. He said this process began in 2015 when, due to increased demand for capacity, their club began searching for alternative club spaces in the Jack Jouett District. He said in 2017, an Albemarle County Public Schools study reinforced this need, identifying the high-cost barrier to after-school programs in the area, as well as a capacity shortfall. He said the study prompted an RFP in 2018 to provide quality after-school opportunities for ACPS, and in 2019, the club was selected to build a freestanding facility on the campus of Albemarle High School, which was scheduled to open this fall.

Mr. Pierce said they focused on this area as it represented the largest population of students with the most significant economic need based on the free and reduced lunch rates available. He said when the club was selected for the RFP, the County granted the land for the new facility to be built, and they were incredibly grateful that the County had entrusted the club to transform this valuable location into a year-round resource for students, teachers, and the community. He said they then worked carefully with the schools in a collaboration beyond a typical lease, which would include daytime use of the facility and many other future considerations by the County and schools. He said altogether, the lease agreement process took two years, inclusive of a site change from behind Jouett to the current location.

Mr. Pierce said this transformational project originated from common goals between the County, Albemarle County Public Schools, and the Boys & Girls Club. He said the same held true today when reflecting on Mr. Richardson's February 23 FY23 budget overview. He said during that presentation, they noticed three main points of alignment between the County's strategic direction and this project, making it worthy of consideration for full funding. He said the club added value in three priority areas. He said the first was school space needs; during non-club hours, ACPS would use the club space for learning, which was shown on the left side of the slide with a picture of the STEM lab. He said they would also be able to use it for teacher training, P.E. classes, administration, administrative meetings, and other educational uses that the County may find.

Mr. Pierce said next they noticed the need for outdoor recreational parks and amenities. He said the multiple outdoor sport courts and multi-use athletic field, as well as the direct access to nature trails offered could lend a hand toward this priority. He said lastly, as they more strongly focused on climate action planning, the solar panel roof on this facility aligned with the County's efforts to become a more sustainable community.

Mr. Pierce showed a slide of a visual focused on their impact on the campus. He said on the left it could be seen that daytime use by the County schools and government could involve up to fifteen different uses at the same time with all of the different meeting spaces and areas. He said with 50,000 square feet of segmented indoor space, they envisioned a collaboration based on mutual priorities. He said on the right, they could see how easy access to the facility from three local schools would allow for the County's most densely populated campus, serving nearly a quarter of all Albemarle County Public Schools students to take advantage of an identified resource and high demand. He said that was high quality, low-cost after-school and summer programming. He said with the installation of planned sidewalks on campus, they knew the access would only increase. He said it could be seen that the population of members served at this location currently receiving free or reduced lunch was over 70%. He said the population of students speaking English as a second language was higher there than anywhere else in Albemarle County Public Schools.

Mr. Pierce said they were currently unable to run a summer program at the limited site within Jouett Middle School. He said after they opened, the increase to 300 members per day, plus the additional summer program would mean a jump from 64,000 to over 350,000 annual program member hours, which was a 50% increase and a significant boon to the community. He said they would also regularly welcome members from Albemarle High School for the first time, which was great news for the community.

Mr. Pierce said in the most recently available data, Albemarle County Public Schools' high school students planned to enroll in post-secondary education at a rate of 76%. He said from their recent surveys at the Boys & Girls Club, 84% of club teens expected to take that step. He said they were excited to work together with the schools for the best possible outcomes when it came to post-secondary education. He said year-round programs for more kids meant more parents could have their children in a safe and affordable place during out-of-school time.

Mr. Pierce said so far, they had raised \$18.9 million toward a project cost of \$21.9 million. He said these funds had come from private donors and the community, which he hoped showed the strong desire for this club's impact. He said the \$2 million commitment would help them get to 100% of the project costs by helping them to leverage the final \$1 million they hoped to raise privately. He said he would like to make one note of the impact that COVID-19 had on total costs. He said the pre-COVID estimate of the total project building cost was \$18.9 million, and today's cost, after the site relocation and supply chain challenges, was \$21.9 million.

Mr. Pierce said construction costs had gone up over the past two years, but they decided their request should remain the same as they knew the request was in line with previous strategic extra-budgetary requests through organizations in their community seeking to make an impact on the community, both within and beyond their mission. He thanked the Board for their collaboration and time, and on behalf of the tens of thousands of families who would benefit from this space over the next forty years. He said he looked forward to learning the Board's response to the Boys & Girls Club request.

Ms. Price thanked Mr. Pierce. She asked Mr. Bowman if the Board should now make time for questions and comments.

Mr. Bowman said yes, and that he did not have any further comments at this time.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated the graphic on the last slide, because she knew they had raised a good amount of money, but it was great to see the landscape for the fundraising and their need. She said it sounded like there was about \$4 million in additional costs that occurred because of the increasing costs and supply chain issues of the pandemic. She asked if that was correct.

Mr. Pierce said the original project cost was \$18.9 million and was now \$21.9 million, so it was about a \$3 million difference.

Ms. McKeel said that was significant. She asked Ms. Price if she should ask questions or only give comments on the presentation.

Ms. Price said she should give both questions and comments.

Ms. McKeel said this facility was located on the campus in the Jack Jouett District, and she was aware of the need that the families in this community had for this facility. She said she was very supportive of the discussion of how the County may be able to support the \$2 million request. She said they would have to discuss where the monies would come from, but this facility would impact not only the schoolchildren, but the families of the District. She said this was a critical facility to support the families in this urban ring in a way that she did not think any other facility could with the outdoor space and the ability to have recreational space as well as educational facilities and after-school and summer programs. She reiterated her support of the \$2 million request, which was very similar to what they supported with the YMCA as well as the center.

Ms. Mallek said she understood and was supportive of the work they did and the tremendous return it would provide in extra and wonderful experience for the children as well as benefitting the whole operations. She said her only question at this point was considering the large space benefit the school would be able to use on their campus, and she would like to know if they would be able to help with their fundraising at all themselves.

Mr. Pierce said they would be happy to make a coordinated approach at this time. He said at this time, they were coming to the County, and if it were the County Board's desire to have them seek a meeting with the schools, they would happily do that.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said this was an incredible project, and they could do no better than to invest in their children and their families who were in need. She said she was supportive of the project and had a question for Mr. Pierce about whether or not they would be able to charge private entities to rent space for meetings.

Mr. Pierce said currently, when they owned a facility, which was not 100% of the time where they operated, their building went in concentric circles. He said the first at the core was the Boys & Girls Club mission focus programs, the second was the area's children, so kid-focused but not club-driven, and third was community use. He said those were the order of operations for determining how they would utilize

their facilities. He said there would be no chance of them ever charging a school or County government for use of this facility, but beyond that, if there were for-profit entities or organizations with whom they did not have relationships, they would charge for use of the facility outside of those three times.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was referring to a situation where a local business may want to rent space for a meeting or conference.

Mr. Gallaway asked Mr. Pierce to describe where they were in their fundraising timeline on March 5, 2020.

Mr. Pierce said they were approximately at \$15 million toward the goal of \$18.9 million at the time the pandemic started, and they continued to hear roundly from those private citizens that they spoke to that they wanted this project to happen, so they continued to raise funds. He said there was a time during the pandemic when they canceled all fundraising, so there were peaks and valleys there, because it was inappropriate for them to ask people for more money for a new club to open during most of the pandemic. He said there were a handful of conversations already lined up, and those came to fruition with support from those people, but they would not have made it through the pandemic operationally if it were not for their relationship with the County government.

Mr. Pierce said they received multiple different federal sources, some passed through local governments, and they relied on their relationships to make it through. He said it had been a turbulent two years. He said to Mr. Gallaway's question, they were able to fundraise, but it was in no way linear, and was more about capitalizing on what relationships they had started and those that they had a chance to speak with were generally supportive of moving forward with this project.

Mr. Gallaway said it was one thing to come and ask for funds when 5% of the target goal was in hand versus 80-90% of it done, and had the pandemic not hit, they would have been well on their way to having the cost of the project being met. He said he thought it was compelling that a lot was raised, and they were kind of coming on the back end and asking for the target amount to help get them over the edge. He said they mentioned the bulk of children they serviced were from Albemarle, but they also mentioned Charlottesville, Madison, and Orange as service locations as well. He asked if those were included generally in the organization or if they were specific to this facility. He said he was leading to the question of if those localities had been asked to give funds.

Mr. Pierce said he appreciated Mr. Gallaway's request for clarity. He said those were overall organization statistics not related to this building. He said the lease they had with the County allowed only for County students to attend this facility, and 100% of the funds that this Board directed towards this project, and any time the Board directed funds through the ABRT process or CARES funds, or any allocation went directly to the source they named. He said for this request, it would go to this building specifically if funded, and would serve 100% of members from Albemarle County as stated in the lease for the schools.

Mr. Gallaway said he did not remember all the details of the leasing of the land. He asked if there was a value equation that they should be thinking about.

Mr. Pierce said the lease was a 40-year land lease. He said they expected their ability to locate right next to the schools to be beneficial to families, students, and the County. He said they consulted with some local commercial real estate experts and learned that the land from a valuation standpoint was extremely limited. He said to most non-governmental entities, it did not have any value, but when talking it through, its use was either a school, County, insular, or student support building, which were always the main uses mentioned. He said the building had been planned in part as an alternate location for County and school system activities, they felt like they brought the space to life in one of the only ways allowable for pennies on the dollar to Albemarle County Public Schools and the County.

Mr. Pierce said they appreciated the land was allocated. He said he was unsure of how an evaluation for the lease of the land would impact their request, especially when they considered other factors like construction cost increases. He said the reality was that \$2 million of construction in 2022 was equivalent to about \$1.2 million in 2017. He said they had worked hard for several years to raise private funds as much as possible, and they were hopeful the County could help them with the remaining gap.

Mr. Gallaway said that was a fair response. He said he thought it was obvious that the people who were being served here were certainly worthy of the investment from them. He said the question now was how and how much to get there. He said he knew for the center they allocated the same amount, \$2 million, but it was spread out over four or five years at \$500,000, and there were performance agreements and claw-back measures in place to protect the investment. He said this one seemed different to him, and he thought it was because they were in a different point of the development and fundraising when they asked for the funds. He said he thought the rationale was there for support of the investment of money. He said he believed Mr. Bowman asked if they needed to come up with options if the Board was interested in providing funds. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Bowman said that was correct. He said if they could get clarity from the Board on their desire to move forward or not, they could proceed accordingly with what they could bring back to the Board to assist them in that final direction.

Mr. Gallaway said he would like to see options they would consider and how they would do it, preferably in increments up to the \$2 million investments and if it would be a one-time payment or paid

over a couple of years. He said he would like to know what his options were so he could compare it against the other needs for the resources they would pool from.

Mr. Bowman asked Mr. Gallaway if he meant it was not an all-or-none situation, and there may be questions around the timing of when that was provided and the total amount. He said he also heard comments from a Board member about the partnership with the school, and the majority of the Board was on all of these questions. He said this was really a discussion that they would be working towards today as the Board continued to go through comments of how they could come back with what the Board ultimately needed to make a decision for this project and the overall fiscal year budget.

Mr. Gallaway said he thought it was a good idea to partner with the schools who were being served. He said he was open to the formula and breakdown, but having the discussion was the best way to go about it so he knew that \$2 million was the number and gave him time to consider that. He said he wanted to see where that \$2 million was coming from, because that was really the value proposition, or what they were taking it from. He said he was not doubting that it was worth the investment, but for him it was more about the timing and release of it relative to how they had done this with other projects similar. He asked if the YMCA funding was a lump sum or spread out over years.

Mr. Bowman said he believed that was spread out, but he would have to go back and fact-check that, but the payment to the center was in \$500,000 increments over four years, most recently completed earlier this fiscal year.

Mr. Gallaway asked if this year was the last year they were doing that.

Mr. Bowman said yes.

Mr. Gallaway said that structure was an example of how they paid for things like this in the past, so he would want to know how exactly that would work if they spread it out over a couple of years, because this project seemed in a different development phase than that one. He said he did not say that was where he wanted to go, but he would like that option available to try to understand how this would work.

Mr. Bowman said that was helpful. He said typically in these agreements, there were milestones associated with them in terms of when the funding was released rather than an automatic date when that was, but that could certainly be considerations that they bring back to the Board in terms of how to best proceed.

Mr. Gallaway said the fact this served Albemarle County children and serving an area that was in the Jack Jouett District, but especially the urban ring would benefit from this. He said it was a dire need, even for just the after-school programming alone. He said the rationale was here for him to be supportive, but he wanted to clarify what the final number was or should be and how it was paid out.

Mr. Andrews said he thought it was a worthwhile project, benefited the schools tremendously, and was located ideally. He said he noticed on page 37 in their timeline, it was opening this year, so that was exciting and may have an impact on how they want to time things. He said he appreciated they needed to figure out where the money did not go if it did not go here. He said in their planning, he knew there had been discussions about different programs. He asked, when this opened, what would the impact be on the operations and operating budget.

Mr. Pierce said it would increase their annual operational budget by about \$950,000 to \$1.1 million each year, which was something their Board of Directors and staff and community were committed to raising. He said they thought the enthusiasm around the STEM program, art program, athletics, and mentoring would just drive more support to the organization. He said that they had been bold in their planning, and were feeling strongly about their future prospects as far as raising funds, which was something they did not take lightly. He said the cost of not doing it was far greater than the cost of doing it based on the impact that could befall the area if they did not have great out-of-school-time programming.

Mr. Andrews said it was an ambitious but worthwhile undertaking, and he understood they were not putting anything into this, and he had no issue which district things were in, but recognized that they had programs at Southwood and other places that would benefit children throughout the region and County, which he fully supported.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said he had a question for Mr. Bowman that followed what Supervisor Gallaway was saying regarding whether or not they wanted to put a certain amount of money in a certain pot, and then perhaps decide they did not want as much money in that pot and allocate it to the Boys & Girls Club and replenish that amount the following year or something like that, or do it in increments. She asked if it was correct that they were free to do whatever they wanted with the proposed funding.

Mr. Bowman said yes, what he imagined they would bring back to the Board was to look at this and other items on the list to present the Board's flexibility and options for one-time items in order to present it in a concise framework so they could see what could be achieved and what the consequence of that lost flexibility in the future would be. He said without knowing exactly what that would look like, a general structure based on what he had heard from the Board tonight was to bring back these options and where they may come from.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said to Mr. Pierce that she understood the opening was in the fall, so the

money he needed was more urgent than over time.

Mr. Pierce said to let timing not be a question, because if the Board would like to support this effort, they would find a way.

Ms. Mallek said if it were similar to what happened with the senior center, just having the commitment from the County, even if the payments were over several years, would help to assure their other donors that the County was involved and would assist in attaining the remaining \$1 million to raise, since they had already done the very hard work to get where they were now. She said they should follow that model if they were to do something over three or four years to make it gracefully fit in with the other needs they had heard about this afternoon.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Pierce what the non-club hours would make the facility available for Albemarle County Public School use.

Mr. Pierce said 6:00 a.m. through whenever the first school bell rings, for example, if there was a before-school use that wanted to happen, they could arrange it. He said up through 3:00 p.m. was when they started seeing their first elementary numbers, and after typical club time would be 7:00 p.m. or after. He said there were certainly parts of the facility which were available at 6:00 or 5:30 from time to time they could carve out space if there was a specific use, until 9:30 or 10:00 in the evening. He said summertime was different, so their typical summer hours were 8:00 a.m. with occasional earlier opening times until about half an hour or 45 minutes after a typical workday, so 5:45 p.m., and in the evenings, the club space would be open, and they often had other uses during the post-5:30 time in the summer.

Ms. Price said it was helpful to have a sense of what that would be. She said she also supported looking to see if they could coordinate some additional financial support from the school system, recognizing that they had already made the land available, so there was a substantial contribution, and while the valuation of the land may be difficult to articulate, it did avoid the club having to find land somewhere else where there would have been an expense associated with that. She said it also further solidified for the County why they needed to have a comparable process for these major projects similar to their ABRT process for their agency annual appropriations, and she knew County staff was working on that.

Ms. Price said finally, she had a couple of fact points. She said slide 33 laid out a number of substantial and significant data points really demonstrated why it was imperative the County supported this program, with 23% of their public-school population, 76% of those eligible for free or reduced meal, 70% minority and 52% from single parents. She said with the Jack Jouett District having an annual income of half that of the wealthiest magisterial district in the County and two thirds of the County average, this clearly was the place where the need was the greatest, and she fully supported the County helping them get to that.

Ms. Price said she concurred with Supervisor Gallaway's request to Mr. Bowman that they provide the data that helped them best decide where and how to support them. She said it was also interesting that 66% of high school students nation-wide applied to college, and they were looking up to 84% not only applying, but completing college, which was the greatest way to avoid and break generational cycles of poverty that was largely experienced by many people within that magisterial district. She said she could think of no greater support for the County than by positively changing lives of these children, and if they could find support for the YMCA and the center, she believed they needed to find support for their programs as well.

Ms. McKeel said she wanted to say thank you, and she looked forward to getting the options back and how best they could structure this, not only for the Boys & Girls Club, but for the County and their budget process as well.

Ms. Price thanked Mr. Pierce for his presentation.

Mr. Pierce thanked the Board and said he was humbled by their consideration.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Bowman to continue.

Mr. Bowman said he believed staff had the direction they needed today from talking through these three topics.

Mr. Gallaway said two years ago, Steve Allshouse did a lot of revenue projections and prognosticating, and in 2019, there was an event where the inversion of the yield curve happened. He said he remembered that specifically, because Mr. Allshouse presented that to the Board, and it was where the short-term yield was better than the long-term yield, which did not happen very often, and only happened for a few minutes yesterday, but it was important enough to talk to the Board about it. He said back then, they got hit with a pandemic, so they did not know if what it had predicted before would really be what it was predicting this time, because the pandemic was an unknown at the time. He said it had been theorized as a predictor of a recession, so it was one that, while he did not need an answer today, it may be helpful to know that they were looking out for these data over future years.

Mr. Gallaway said in past conversations in their consideration for the Department of Social Services, they had talked about some positions that were staggered to start until January 1, so he would ask the Board to pull those positions forward to start on July 1 at a minimum, and then how they would

make that happen. He said he also thought it was worth considering if that department should consider receiving another FTE at minimum in addition to pulling the departments forward, so knowing they were getting to the times where Supervisors should think about what they wanted on the list, because where they were now with the tax rate was when they had to move things around. He said it was worth having the conversation for that department on those two items so they could see what that would mean budget-wise elsewhere. He said he hoped other Supervisors would be okay with adding his request to the list for some consideration.

Mr. Bowman said they certainly had the information on what the budget impact would be of those positions, so they could bring that as part of the list of options to the Board on one-time funding and discuss those positions.

Ms. Mallek said she would like a reminder of what was on the list.

Mr. Bowman said to date, there were many things that had been requested for more information. He said in terms of the list for adjustment, there was adjustment of the housing fund, support for the Boys & Girls Club, and the Board had the flexibility to go between other reserves such as the housing fund or the Board's Capital Advancement and Strategic Priorities Reserve, but they could certainly recap what those items were and their flexibility prior to bringing the list of options back to the Board. He said if there were other items the Board would like to see differently in the budget, whether it be more or less, or whatever that may look like. He said that would be extremely helpful feedback for staff today as they prepared for the final month of the budget process.

Ms. Price said if staff had other comments unavailable right now, they could always email them to Mr. Bowman and Ms. Birch.

Ms. Birch greeted the Board and introduced herself as Nelsie Birch, Chief Financial Officer. She said one of the areas they would have to pay very close attention to was the balanced budget they had currently, and they had to make sure these additional requests and where it was appropriate to use one-time and ongoing funding would be analyzed thoroughly by Mr. Bowman and his team. She said it would become important when they needed to identify what the things out there were that they needed to pay attention to with the knowledge they were good financial stewards and had sound financial analysis and great economic outlooks in the past.

Ms. Birch said as they knew, Mr. Allshouse used to be in the Department of Finance & Budget and was moved to the Community Development Department. She said he had since left, and that position was moved to something different. She said that the need to have some sort of economic outlook was needed as a skillset, but finding someone to do that in-house was unlikely as a possibility, so they were looking for external resources to do that. She said they were currently in negotiations right now to bring out a third-party economist to provide economic outlooks much like those seen in the past to the Board more frequently. She said there was a budget request in the budget for the Department of Finance & Budget, which they would see in their budget funding set aside for FY23, because they knew there was a gap in the service delivery of the County that they wanted to fulfill. She said that was forthcoming and would be before the Board again in the fall.

Ms. Birch said the other piece that would help them make sure they were prepared for any sort of recessionary pressures and their budget's response to that was the budget analyst that was also in the budget for FY23. She said having someone who was constantly thinking about and analyzing their revenues who would be able to advise herself, Mr. Bowman, and Ms. Lin so they could involve the County Executive's Office would be vital, because they were entering some interesting times in the country and in their world. She said when they close out FY22, they had historically been in a position to use that funding to pay out one-time projects. She said they may be in a different situation this year, but she was unsure of how FY22 was going to end.

Ms. Birch said it was possible they would propose to the Board putting some of that funding aside to offset some of what may be coming in the future with respect to any recessionary tendencies they were seeing such as unemployment rates, sales tax, and people's spending habits. She said they were trying to pull together a lot of elements to make sure they stayed nimble and financially responsible, knowing it was not cause-and-effect yet, and that the inverted yield curve did not necessarily translate into a recession, but there were indicators that suggested something may be there, so they were setting themselves up to be able to respond to that.

Mr. Gallaway said he appreciated that response, especially knowing how they were filling that gap, because he did not think that was immediately clear. He said when they moved positions around, he did not realize that the gap existed. He said the fact that there was one, and it was identified, and they were filling it was good news to hear. He said the Board certainly knew when they did one-time monies and moved things around, but it was very specific to his request for the Department of Social Services after it had been set, because he was asking now how they could pull this off now that they were balanced, and that was different than asking for it prior, because he was not just asking for it to be added to the revenue. He said the timing was intentional for his request.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Bowman if he had anything further.

Mr. Bowman asked if there was anything else Board members wanted to discuss or adjust about the list of options and one-time funding or ongoing.

Ms. Mallek said when they were looking for sources of money, she would like to discuss the septic issue at Southwood as part of the list.

Mr. Bowman said it was noted.

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

Ms. McKeel said something received in her email today was that VDOT had announced the restroom facilities on both the eastbound and westbound sign of Interstate 64 would be closed starting April 1 and would have temporary restroom facilities on both areas through September of 2023. She said it was a long construction time, and both areas would remain open but initially portable restrooms. She said she wanted to let the public know of the change. She thanked Ms. Price for mentioning staff's work on a process for dealing with these particular funding requests such as the center and YMCA as well as the Boys & Girls Club. She said they all felt there should be a process to help them when looking at these decisions and how the organizations' strategic plans would work.

Ms. McKeel said she was increasingly concerned about the number of small brush fires on the side of the road recently. She said Chief Eggleston told her it was likely due to improperly disposed cigarettes, which were causing damage and the need for Fire and Rescue to respond. She said they had been doing the same type of fire safety for many years, and it may be time to begin thinking about new strategies. She said as a community, they should consider some targeted signs in areas where there were population centers.

Ms. Mallek said she would have more official information about well-water testing next week. She said she agreed about the fire dangers, and she wished they would get rid of the fires after 4:00 p.m. for a while, because the smell of smoke makes her anxious due to her seeing burnt properties in her district. She said there used to be a sign near Station 1 on the bypass with a dial about dryness and fire danger, so she hoped they could think of ways to do more public safety announcements that their Fire and Rescue staff had done over the years to great effectiveness. She said it was easy to burn down a neighbor's house if the wind went the wrong way and the conditions were dry as they were currently.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said perhaps they could do some sort of PSA with the news channels and the Fire Department regarding what had been happening and prevention.

Mr. Andrews wished everyone well for tomorrow when there were predicted winds of 25 miles per hour and even stronger gusts, when these hazardous conditions could be magnified.

Ms. Price said two years and two months ago, they started going virtual. She said in that time since the pandemic hit, they now had 980,000 Americans who died and 80 million who had been infected. She said the stealth-Omicron-BA2 variant was now the predominant strain in the United States, and the CDC just announced yesterday that older Americans and others with health issues would be eligible for an additional booster shot. She said she looked forward to getting information from the Blue Ridge Health District on the availability of that. She said they would be going back to Lane Auditorium next week for their live hybrid meeting. She asked Mr. Kamptner if he was present.

Mr. Kamptner said he was.

Ms. Price said she wanted him to be visible one last time for the County he had served so well. She said for the public, they had an opportunity yesterday to send off Mr. Kamptner with the highest honors and recognition they could for his dedicated service over many years, and on behalf of the County and everyone he had helped, she thanked him for his years of public service to make this a better place.

Mr. Kamptner said she was welcome and thanked her for her kind words.

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

There was no report.

Agenda Item No. 5. Adjourn to April 6, 2022, 12:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

Ms. Price announced that this would be their last virtual meeting,

At 5:08 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to April 6, 2022, at 12:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium. Ms. Price said information for the public on how to participate in the hybrid meeting will be posted on the Albemarle County website Board of Supervisors home page, and on the Albemarle County calendar. She said participation would include the opportunity to comment on those matters from which comments from the public would be received.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date 11/15/2023
Initials CKB