



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Albemarle County Board of Supervisors Regular Second Meeting, Wednesday, March 18, 2026

Date Wednesday, March 18, 2026
Place Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length 7h 40m (video)

- Official meeting video (Granicus): https://albemarle.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=1472
- Official agenda: https://albemarle.granicus.com/AgendaViewer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=1472

Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-14. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:00] Good afternoon. I call to order the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors for our March 18th, 2026, 1 p.m. meeting here in Lane Auditorium. The supervisors present are Supervisor Mike Pruitt of the Scottsville District, Supervisor Ann Malick of the Whitehall District, Supervisor Fred Missel of the Samuel Miller District, Supervisor B. Lapisto-Kirtley of the Ravana District, Supervisor Sally Duncan of the Jack Jewett District, and myself, Ned Galloway, of the Rio district. Also with us we have our county attorney Mr. Andy Herrick, our county

[00:00:36] executive Mr. Jeff Richardson, our board clerk Ms. Claudette Borgeson, and our senior deputy clerk Mr. Travis Morris is with us as well. We want to extend our appreciation for our Albemarle County Police Department officers that are present with us here today. Officer Kayden Painter and Officer Hunter Harmon, thank you gentlemen for joining us. And with that, if everyone would please rise as

[00:00:59] you are able for the Pledge of Allegiance. And if everyone would please join in a brief moment of

[00:01:24] silence. Thank you very much. All right, board, we have an agenda in front of us. Are there any changes to the agenda or requests for changes? Yes, sir. All right. Is there a motion to adopt

[00:02:00] the final agenda? So moved. Second. All right. Without objection, if the clerk would please call the roll. Ms. Lapista-Kirtley? Aye. Ms. Malik? Yes. Mr. Missel? Aye. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway? Yes. Thank you, board. And that will take us to number five, brief announcements by board members. Supervisor Malik. Thank you very much. It is, it doesn't feel like spring outside with the cold wind, but April is coming, and at the Ivy Solid Waste and Recycling Center, Dickwoods Road, it is the time for the special collection days, where without

[00:02:37] fee but pre-registration required for the e-waste on april 11th household hazardous waste no registration required and it is being offered on two days friday april 17th 9 to 3 and saturday april 18th 9 to 3 special collection days on the 25th of april furniture and mattresses saturday may 2nd household appliances great place to take your refrigerator etc they will drain all the coolants in a proper way. And Saturday, May 9th, tires. And the special collection days are 8.30 to 4. So I encourage everyone to take advantage of these services which are provided

[00:03:17] by Ravana Solid Waste Authority. Now, let me jump over here. Second announcement is that the White Hall Ruritans, this is a save the date for April 25th, which is their plant sale. Hard work going on now growing and planting and digging up from people's gardens wonderful well-rooted plants all different sizes from mother's day 50 cent things to trees and it's a great way for funds to be raised for the maintenance of the historic whitehall community building in whitehall village

[00:03:51] so come and see us there 8 to 12 would be the best time to come and shop and lastly and most urgently renew your real estate tax relief by april 1st so that's coming the most quickly and uh if you were the owner already participating in the program if you received tax release last year you must file your application or certification renewal by tuesday april 1st if you need help please please call the tax department at 296-5852 and very helpful people there will help you to

[00:04:30] make sure that you are squared away. And check my list. That is the only thing. Thank you very much. All right. Thank you. Supervisor Pruitt. Yes. In Virginia, it is always election season. And before the next general election, we actually have two periods of voting, one of which is ongoing from now until April the 18th is early voting on a single issue matter. That is the redistricting CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. THE ELECTION DAY ITSELF WILL BE ON THE 21ST. ADDITIONALLY, BECAUSE OF THAT REDISTRICTING AMENDMENT, PRIMARY

[00:05:08] VOTES ARE NOT WHEN THEY NORMALLY WOULD BE. SO THE PRIMARIES FOR THE HOUSE RACES AND THE SENATE RACE ARE GOING TO BE CONDUCTED EARLY VOTING FROM JUNE 18TH TO AUGUST 1ST WITH ELECTION DAY ON THE 4TH. BOTH OF THESE ARE UNUSUAL IN OUR CALENDAR AND THEREFORE WORTH MAKING SURE YOU KNOW THE ACTUAL DATES. IN ALL OF THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, YOU CAN VOTE early at the county office building on 5th street and then on election day you can vote at your respective precincts it is always worth voting early because you know guaranteed you're going to the right place and you have plenty of time to make sure you've made a plan rather than being

[00:05:45] beholden to the whims of fate on election day that's all i have supervisor lapisto kirtley i have no announcements thank you supervisor missal no announcements thank you supervisor advisor, Duncan? No, no. All right. The only reminder I would send is we do have the first of our budget town halls will beginning tomorrow evening at the center at 6 p.m. So look forward to folks starting to come out. All the other town halls are listed on the budget webpage and have

[00:06:17] been sent out via email as well. So looking forward to joining with the public and hearing what they have to say in that form, but that's all I have this afternoon. All right, we will then move to item number six, proclamations and recognitions. Today, we do have a proclamation recognizing March as Red Cross Month, and we have with us the board vice chair of the Red Cross Central Virginia chapter, Mr. Bill Fisher. Good afternoon, sir. Supervisor Lapisto Kirtley is going to read the

[00:06:53] proclamation in the form of a motion. We'll go ahead and take a vote, and then we're going to provide you an opportunity to say a few words. Excellent. Thank you. It is my honor to be able to read this proclamation recognizing March's Red Cross Month. Whereas the American Red Cross has provided critical humanitarian services, including disaster relief, health and safety education, blood donation, and support to military families for over a century, and whereas the efforts of the American Red Cross are made possible through the selfless contributions of volunteers, donors, and supporters who give their time, resources, and compassion

[00:07:33] to help others in need. And whereas the American Red Cross continues to embody the values of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, independence, voluntary service, unity, and universality, promoting a world where people are cared for and protected, no matter their circumstances.

[00:07:54] And whereas March 26 marks the celebration of the Red Cross's longstanding commitment to providing essential services, fostering resilience in communities, and supporting the well-being of individuals across the nation and the globe.

[00:08:11] And whereas by recognizing March as Red Cross Month, We honor the dedication of the countless volunteers, donors, and staff who make the mission of the American Red Cross a reality and inspire others to become involved in these efforts.

[00:08:29] Now, therefore, be it proclaimed that we, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, do hereby recognize the month of March 2026 as Red Cross Month in recognition of the invaluable contributions of the American Red Cross makes to our communities and the world and observe this month with gratitude, reflection, and an invitation to support the continued success and impact of the American Red Cross's work and be it further proclaimed that we, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, urge all community members

[00:09:09] to participate in activities that support the mission of the American Red Cross, whether through volunteering, donating blood, or contributing to disaster relief efforts, as we work together to strengthen our communities and foster a more compassionate world.

[00:09:30] Signed this 18th day of March, 2026, Ned Galloway, Chair, Abomorra County Board of Supervisors. second okay just the motion has been made and seconded if without objection if the clerk would please call the roll miss lapista currently hi miss mallet yes mr. missile hi mr. Pruitt hi miss Duncan yes mr. Galloway yes we'll have remarks and go through then we'll have you go down after we finish the remarks mr. Fisher thank you chair Galloway members of the board of Supervisors, on behalf of the Central Virginia Chapter of the American Red Cross, I want to thank

[00:10:10] you for this proclamation, recognizing March as Red Cross Month. We are deeply grateful for your partnership and for your continued support of our mission, helping neighbors in need one day, one family, one moment at a time. The Red Cross has been part of Albemarle County community for

generations, standing ready to respond in times of crisis, to comfort families displaced by disaster, and to help prepare our communities for whatever may come. Locally, our volunteers respond to home

[00:10:44] and wildfires, floods, and other emergencies, often in the middle of the night and often traveling only a few miles from our own front doors. For me, that commitment became very personal last August when a home gas explosion occurred in my own Albemarle County neighborhood of Glenmore and Keswick. Within minutes our disaster team was on the scene. As the disaster team supervisor I had the privilege and the responsibility of reaching out to all the families whose homes were destroyed

[00:11:18] or heavily damaged. Together with four additional dedicated volunteers we worked side by side with Albemarle County Fire and Rescue, offering immediate relief, care, and compassion. This collaboration exemplifies the best of what makes this county so strong. Neighbors helping neighbors supported by local leadership that values preparedness and partnership. As we celebrate National Red Cross Month, we recognize the countless community members who make this work

[00:11:53] possible. Our volunteers, blood donors, partners, and supporters, many of whom live and serve right here in Albemarle County. Together, we continue the legacy started by Clara Barton over a century ago, turning compassion into action when people need it most. Thank you again for your recognition, your trust, and your continued commitment to building a resilient and caring community.

[00:12:21] Thank you, Mr. Fisher, and I'm going to invite the supervisors to make comments, sometimes a question pops up. Supervisor Malik? Thank you, and thank you very much. In addition to all the emergency response things that you mentioned, for generations your agency has been providing training for young people, me in the 60s, and in the last five years my grandchildren in life-saving and all those kinds of things, so that they can go and get their first job, and it's really wonderful. Thank you for that. Thank you. Supervisor Pruitt? Thank you for your work and all the work of your organization and thank you for being here today to receive

[00:12:57] this proclamation. Supervisor Lapista Curley. I think the proclamation says it all. You're an organization that is respected worldwide and especially in this county in this nation so thank you for all you do for all of us. Thank you. Supervisor Missal. Yeah I echo the thanks congratulations on the proclamation and one of the great parts about being in this seat being the new person is really understanding more the depth and breadth of the work that a lot of your these organizations do and and yours is obviously a great example of that you mentioned you know

[00:13:33] relief and care but just adding that word compassion right is so important and so critical in this world so thank you supervisor duncan yeah as a teacher i get red cross certified every year and so it's you know great to have it's something that has existed for so long that you don't even think about it. But it makes me feel better. It's something that I think everybody should do. And so I appreciate how easy it is to do. And yeah, I'm really thankful that we have so many community volunteers that participate in doing this sort of work. So thank you. Yeah, Mr. Fisher, I always remain in awe of this organization. Different people in different organizations answer the

[00:14:10] call for service in different ways. But the Red Cross really and truly personifies love in action. It's not something we say or state or proclaim, it's something we do, and you all prove that day in and day out.

[00:14:25] And you do so without saying, who is it that needs the care, or where do they come from who needs the care? You just say, they need care, and we're going to provide it. And I think that's a remarkable and profound thing you all do for your local communities, for our country, and for the whole world.

[00:14:45] So I hope you'll share the sentiments of this board with your fellow volunteers and your board, and we really appreciate you being here today to join us with this proclamation. Thank you. Supervisor Lephisto-Curtley will bring the signed version down to you.

[00:15:10] Mr. Chair, it's not normal for staff to speak after the board has on a situation like this. I would like to add a couple of comments. Mr. Fisher mentions the home explosion in Glenmore.

[00:15:27] Every situation that Red Cross is at is a terrible situation in and of itself. But on that evening, there were approximately 80, 8-0 staff in first responder mode to that scene. 11 homes were determined to be inhabitable.

[00:15:45] 41 homes were damaged within a quarter of a mile. Mr. Fisher was working side by side at that scene well into the night trying to reach every single family that were away when that happened, that were out of town, out of the country, whatever the circumstances were.

[00:16:04] I saw it firsthand and I was absolutely amazed at the synchronization of how this organization works with county staff at, frankly, a terrible situation that my staff said, we just don't see these things. So you can't train for certain things, but when you are thrown into it, as our teams were, and we have a wonderful organization right here in Albemarle County that just did absolutely tremendous work.

[00:16:31] So from the staff's perspective, publicly, I would thank you so much for what your team does every day to create these relationships that are really, really working well. So thank you, sir. Well said. Thank you, Mr. Richardson. Thank you, Mr. Fisher. All right, board, we will move to item number seven, public comment.

[00:16:55] Matters previously considered or currently pending before the board, other than those scheduled for public hearings. I know we have some signups today, so Vice Chair Missal will read the rules and then walk us through the speakers.

[00:17:06] Thank you chair and good afternoon everyone during the time set aside for public comment on matters previously considered or currently pending before the board other than scheduled public hearings individuals may address the Board of Supervisors concerning matters previously considered by the board or matters that are pending before the board other than items listed on the agenda for public hearing individuals are allowed one opportunity of up to three minutes to speak at each board meeting a sign-up sheet is managed by the clerk's office up to 10 persons may speak during each matters for the public session timekeeping is conducted through a timer and light system at the podium. The green light will go on when you begin speaking, which begins your allotted time. The yellow light indicates you have one minute to finish speaking.

[00:17:45] The red light indicates your time has expired and you will be asked to end your comments. In order to give all speakers equal treatment and courtesy, the board requests that speakers adhere to the following guidelines. When addressing the board, state your name and if you live in Albemarle County or Magisterial District, address comments directly to the board as a whole. Any written statements or other supporting material may be given to the clerk.

[00:18:06] If representing a group or organization, you may ask others present to raise their hands in recognition. Speakers may not share any unused time with another speaker. Back-and-forth debate is not permitted. Do not speak from your seat or out of turn. All comments are live-streamed, recorded, and published on the Albemarle County website.

[00:18:26] And just as a reminder, please speak into the microphone and state your magisterial district if you're a county resident. Number one on our list is Gary Grant. Maybe I should mix that up next time.

[00:18:46] to stop signing up so early so we don't have to be number one all the time you'll always be number one to us oh thank you oh there you go i'm gonna be at rio tomorrow night you won't think that uh gary grant rio district activity is not achievement participation is not performance anecdotes are not accountability. I have read all 300 plus pages of your \$724 million recommended budget for FY27, and I had some questions that the staff have answered.

[00:19:26] Quote, unquote, broad feedback without records, data, and statistics about what supervisors and staff quote-unquote hear from county residents about quote-unquote expected government services cannot be trusted and does not support this budget, the county-wide 6% average reassessment increased, or any increase in the current tax rate. There are also three major reports related

[00:20:01] to this budget. I commend the measurables tracked and tallied in the FY25 SPEAR report produced by staff. Taxpayers need to see more of this kind of reporting from county government. I ignore the 2024 annual community report, also produced by staff, which displays activity but does not show measurables, what was targeted versus what was accomplished. What I trust is the valid and

[00:20:39] reliable 2023 Albemarle Community Survey conducted and produced by an outside agency, the Center for Research at UVA. The survey has a margin of error of 3%. However, from the survey, Only 36% of Albemarle residents say the quality of life here is excellent.

[00:21:06] Only 11% rate the quality of services as excellent. Only 8% rate the county executive office's leadership as excellent. And at the very bottom, only 7% of those surveyed rate the Board of Supervisors' leadership as excellent.

[00:21:26] So, before you take more and more tax dollars from those of us hesitant about Albemarle's excellence and the community's alleged service expectations, we need to be able to better trust this board, your county executive, our reassessments, and your tax rates through achievement over activity, performance over participation, and accountability over anecdotes.

[00:22:00] Thank you, Mr. Grant. Thank you. Thank you. Tom Strasburg. Mr. Chair, members of the board, my name is Tom Strasburg.

[00:22:17] I've lived in Earliestville in the Rio District for the last 35-plus years, and I'm here just to comment on one very, very small item of the budget, recommended budget. I see that the, and I'm, by the way, I'm not affiliated in any way with the Charlottesville band, but I am very much a beneficiary of many of the things that they do, and I see that they have requested \$11,000, and I'm here to ask you to really seriously consider that and ask you to fulfill that request.

[00:22:54] Many of you know much of what the band does, but they provide everything. All their concerts are free. They're wonderful. They serve the community, the high school and middle school students who are incentivized to be involved in music at a high level.

[00:23:13] Kids who are, as you know, they're involved in music at that level are not getting into trouble, and this is good for all of us. But, I mean, they have facilities they make available to over 20 nonprofit agencies for rehearsal, for meetings.

[00:23:33] They're just a tremendous boon to the community. The board expenses are going to increase this year, not only because of inflation. The expenses are going to increase not only because of inflation, But we have this sesquicentennial celebration coming up that will additionally impact on their costs.

[00:24:00] And since that's a public sort of event, it would seem that government ought to support that fully. And I'm looking now at page 186 of the recommended budget, and it seems that there's an average six-tenths of one percent reduction from previous year but for the charlesville band it's 37 and a half percent um it should be going the other way and i just ask you to to consider that um i mean

[00:24:37] they they received 8 000 last year with the things i noted why they're going to need more this year it's just fairly clear and if we could get to that 11 000 i mean it's it's almost it's hardly close even to a decimal point in the \$724 million budget.

[00:24:58] So I strongly ask you to do that. I advise young families about how to manage their finances. I use a budget worksheet for that. And I find that certain items in the family budget entertainment for these young families is zero.

[00:25:16] And so they really appreciate and need these free programs. Thank you very, very much. Thank you. Thank you. Alicia Lanahan. She's usually a 6 p.m. speaker. I hope she knows she's not signed up incorrectly. Don't see her.

[00:25:33] Janasha Bradford. Good afternoon, supervisors. I'm in the Jack Jewett District.

[00:25:49] My name is Janasha Bradford, and I am the founder and executive director of Mahogany and Friends Foundation. At Mahogany and Friends, we focus on building financial stability across generations by equipping youth, families, and the adults with the tools, confidence, and habits needed to create long-term economic security. Our work is preventative. We are not responding to crisis. We're working to prevent it. Through financial literacy programs, savings initiatives, and financial coaching, we help families better manage resources, make informed decisions, and build stability

[00:26:26] before challenges escalate and we're seeing real impact. Over the past two years, we've served more than 500 youth, adults, and families with over 300 of those being Albemarle County residents and that number continues to grow. And this year alone, our FY27 commitment is to reach over 250 Albemarle County residents through our programming. We've also seen measurable change with financial knowledge increasing from 42% to over 90%, along with strong growth and confidence in decision making. And beyond the numbers, we hear it directly from youth. One student shared, I used to think

[00:27:04] money just appeared. Now I understand how to plan for my future. We've built strong partnerships across the community to do this work, including the Boys and Girls Club, UVA Star Hill Pathways, Ready Kids, and Albemarle County Schools. And as Michael Gulley, COO of Boys and Girls Club, share, Mahogany and Friends helps youth build decision-making and long-term planning skills and helps them envision their own financial success.

[00:27:30] Our work is making a difference, and it has been recognized by you all. Albemarle County has honored Mahogany and Friends with two proclamation awards for the impact we're making in this

community. Our work directly aligns with the county's priorities, supporting youth development, Expanding economic opportunity and strengthening thriving communities and now we're asking you to partner with us in a bigger way We're requesting that Albemarle County makes a forty thousand dollar investment to expand financial literacy Programming serving Albemarle County youth and their families and adults of that investment

[00:28:08] 17500 will directly support 50 middle school students through our high five savings program, which is a five-week cohort, helping them to build early saving habits, financial confidence, and real-world money management skills. This is not just a program.

[00:28:25] This is about giving families the tools to not only access resources, but to use them effectively, sustain them, and build long-term stability. So today, we invite you to join us in making a strategic investment and preventative work that strengthens families before challenges become crisis.

[00:28:43] This is not just an investment in a program, it's an investment in the long-term stability of Albemarle County families. Thank you. Taylor McLeod. Good afternoon.

[00:29:00] My name is Taylor McLeod and I am the Development Director at Computers for Kids, or C4K, a Charlottesville-based nonprofit that has provided free one-to-one STEM and STEAM mentoring to young people in this region for 25 years. I'm here today to respectfully ask the board to consider allocating \$25,000 to C4K in FY27.

[00:29:21] C4K has been a partner to Albemarle County since 2020. Last year was the first time in that partnership that we were denied funding, not because our program changed, but because Tier 3 through 5 organizations were structurally excluded from funding that cycle.

[00:29:37] That decision has now created an unintended consequence because in FY27, guidance applies level funding from FY26 and our FY26 allocation was \$0. Our funding baseline is effectively zero despite receiving a tier three solid rating in this year's review. We understand the board may be hearing this from other organizations as well. We're concerned that without intervention C4K could be caught in an indefinite cycle of non-funding not because of our performance but because of how the formula is applied.

[00:30:13] And the stakes are real. 36% of our participants are Albemarle County students. We currently provide transportation from Journey Middle School, Burley Middle School, and Albemarle High School directly to our clubhouse. Because without a ride, many of these kids simply can't get there. We've maintained that service throughout FY26, even without county funding, because we believe Albemarle youth deserve access to these opportunities.

[00:30:37] C4K is the only provider of free one-to-one STEAM and STEM mentoring in this region. There is no backup option for these students. If they can't get to us, they go without. We're also absorbing the loss of approximately \$100,000 annually from Best Buy, which is sunsetting its teen tech centers nationwide.

[00:30:57] That makes local investment more critical than ever, not just for the dollars, but because counties support signals to foundations and other funders that Albemarle stands behind this work. A \$25,000 investment, less than 3% of our budget, keeps transportation running, keeps your students connected to mentoring and 21st century skills, and protects the foundation funding that multiplies every local dollar.

[00:31:22] Without it, we may have to make difficult choices about what schools we can reach. We'd rather be expanding access, not reducing it. Thank you for your time and commitment to Albemarle's young people. Thank you. Thank you. Todd Cohn. Michael Monaco.

[00:31:46] Good afternoon, Supervisors. Michael Monaco. I live in the Whitehall District. I'm here on behalf of myself, my neighbors, and my friends at Livable Seville. Also, I never get to see you all before dinner time. It's a real treat.

[00:32:04] It is a plain truth that we have an affordable housing problem in Alamo County. Just to orient us a little bit, I'll quote from last year's housing report, May 2025, over half of renters in the county are cost burdened, spending more than 30% of their income on housing. 61% of households making less than \$75,000 are cost burdened. Looking at census data on my own, I can tell you that just about one in four renters in the county are severely cost burdened, spending more than half of their income on housing alone. In fact, 95% of renter households making between \$20,000 and \$35,000 in the county, so 95% of those households, are cost burdened by housing.

[00:32:44] That represents folks between about 15% and 30% AMI. Now while we're talking about last year's numbers, I was glad to see the 0.4 cents dedicated to the Affordable Housing Fund last year. It's a good start. I'm glad to see it again this year, which is about \$1.3 million. But I also see that even in its nascency this year, the investment fund received applications totaling, I think it was just under \$8 million. About \$3.6 million of that made it through the review process.

[00:33:12] I don't personally see the need lessening next year or the year after or the year after. It sounded like also from one of the work sessions last week that the county does not currently have a plan to increase dedicated funding for the housing fund. That plan may materialize along with the housing advisory committee and tweaks and improvements to the application review process, but there's no getting around the fact that \$1.3 million a year just isn't going to cut it for the future.

[00:33:38] And as a resident of Almar County, I'm not particularly comfortable with my government's strategy for affordable housing boiling down to shaking out the couch cushions every year and seeing what we can toss in from the general fund i recognize that strategy and budgeting are not the same the need though is quantifiable it's apparent and it's not going anywhere uh you may have heard me speak at other public comments and know that i'm a housing supply booster but in the world that we share there remains a vital and unmet role for local government in outmorrow county um a role to play in providing for all members of our community.

[00:34:12] The market can't do everything. Now, I've appreciated your thoughtful leadership on this matter so far, and the conversations that I've heard both in and out of this budgeting process are very heartening to me. I trust and hope that you will continue that thoughtful consideration into this afternoon's work session. Thank you for your time.

[00:34:28] Thank you. Thank you. And our last name is Otis Emery. How are y'all?

[00:34:44] Good. Otis Emery. I'm Jack Jewett, district taxpayer. Don't represent anybody but myself. I don't know if I'm in the right place. Mr. Emory, I'm just going to ask that you point those mics up just a little bit. Okay. Thank you. I'm really here to talk about the new debt y'all are looking to take on.

[00:35:04] Is that something I can talk about here? Okay. You know, we've had 13 years of consecutive increases in our assessments, and that's kind of a feel-good tax increase.

[00:35:20] You know, we all love it. Our house is worth this. But in reality, when you get those checks written twice a year, it doesn't feel as good. But you feel good if you can sell your house. But we're not going to do that. We love where you are. You all do a great job running this place.

[00:35:37] And we're not going anywhere. But it does hurt when we're at those checks. Let's tell you all know. The debt service in 2025 on our debt right now is like 50 grand. I mean, that 50 million, that's scary. If you had that 50, we could take care of this fellow.

[00:35:55] You know, we could help a lot on that affordable housing if we had \$50 million more. Really, all I'm saying is I kind of run my household. I don't have any debt. Luckily, I've worked a long time, and I guess as an old guy and one who's, you know, run a business for all my life, I've been lucky, really lucky.

[00:36:16] So that \$120 million, that scares me. And then physical 27 through 31, they're talking about maybe 340 some additional million. Now, that's what I've got to say. You all got a tough job.

[00:36:33] But do the best you can. Thank you. Thank you, sir. That concludes our list. All right. Thank you to all who provided public comment today. Board, we will now move to the next item on our agenda, which is the consent agenda.

[00:36:52] I'm not aware of any items needing to be pulled. Are there any? All right. Is there a motion to adopt the consent agenda? So moved. Second. All right. Without objection, it's been firsted. Firsted?

[00:37:08] Is that a word? Firsted? A motion has been made and seconded. Let me try that language on. And without objection, if the clerk would please call the roll. Ms. LaPista-Kirtley? Aye. Ms. Malik? Yes. Mr. Missel? Aye. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway?

[00:37:23] Yes. All right. Thank you, board. Consent agenda is approved. And now we can move to our first action item, number nine, the proposed projects for affordable housing investment fund. This was pulled from consent the last time. Ms. Dimmick is here to join us at the dais.

[00:37:42] Good afternoon. Good afternoon. Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Galloway and members of the Board of Supervisors.

[00:38:07] As you recall, you considered this matter at your last regular meeting and requested that we return today. Thank you for this opportunity to share our process, revised calculations. When you just pull in these, Mike, yeah, you've got to, I think, really need to be on them. It seems to be a thing in the last few meetings.

[00:38:23] Okay. I rarely am told I'm not allowed enough. Speak up, still enunciate, project. All right, I'm going to try. Thank you for the opportunity to share our process, revised calculations, and recommendations with you today. I'd like to apologize for placing this matter on the Consents Agenda in the first place.

[00:38:40] Even without process or calculation concerns, this is exactly the kind of item you'd like to consider on the regular agenda, and I'm very sorry. I'd like to start with a brief history of the application process and how we got to the first competitive process.

[00:39:00] Until this year, this process was operated on a first-come, first-served basis. It was created in 2019 with the intent to support affordable housing projects that are one-time cost, support, county, strategic, and housing goals.

[00:39:17] Board members, area nonprofits, and developers, and staff all wished for a more predictable method for distributing these funds. So we asked the board to consider some process changes before we opened and implemented our first competitive application process.

[00:39:35] We were before you in May 2025. The Board approved a structure of 40% grants, 40% loans, and 20% staff identified emerging needs project for the available AHIF balance. Applications were to be reviewed by non-Office of Housing staff, and applications must score at least 75% of the maximum possible score to be considered for funding.

[00:40:00] In the interest of addressing the Board's interest in transparency in the application process, I'd like to share some details about the application itself and the criteria used by the reviewers to determine whether an application met the minimum thresholds for consideration.

[00:40:19] Our application was open on January 9th and closed on the 31st for a slightly constricted process. We generally prefer to have four weeks for consideration of those applications. An interdepartmental team review team scored the applications and housing staff were available for any questions or support for that group. We received seven applications, totaling \$7,343,652 of requests. Applications were scored in sections. Four sections, readiness to proceed,

[00:40:54] capacity and experience of the applicant, project budget, and consistency with counting priorities. While the four broad evaluative categories were the same for all applicants, the criteria within in these categories changed whether the applicant was seeking funding for affordable rental units, housing rehabilitation and preservation activities, or affordable home ownership as appropriate.

[00:41:23] Application scoring criteria in each of the four categories described as readiness to proceed included issues around site control and zoning approvals, the strong emphasis on likelihood of starting within 120 days. Capacity and experience of the applicant, project budget with a preference for projects in which the county provided less than 25 percent of total project cost and consistency with county priorities including consistency with existing priorities policies and plans addresses strategic priorities an extended period of affordability energy efficiency a focus

[00:42:01] on 80 percent or below area median income units that are accessible and focus on the most vulnerable members of our community. Based on the issues raised at the last meeting, staff conducted due diligence on the AHIF process.

[00:42:19] We made adjustments to total scores achievable in each category and rescoring applications. We checked our math and checked it again. We made adjustments to that process based on a review of calculations, including a specific issue that we identified that duplicated the affordability score in the total available score, which skewed the percentages off for several. We thank Dan Rosenzweig for bringing that to our attention. It was in two places calculated in a different way, and that was really important that we identify that as part of our process. And based on Board of Supervisors

[00:42:55] feedback, we eliminated the section on per unit cost, and we distributed recommendations. We include recommendations that distribute the full amount available. Complicated slide, some of which should look familiar. While the adjustments were made to both the budget and county priority categories and scores recalculated, the primary ranking results remained the same. The four applications highlighted in light blue reflect the highest scoring applications, which are the same as presented initially. Importantly, two of the applications that had previously not reached the

[00:43:34] 75% threshold for eligibility when recalculated did, and that includes Woda Cooper's application with a score of 155 or 76% of the total points available, and Habitat for Humanity's Home Ownership Project at 139, which reflected 77% of the available points. We can come back to this.

[00:44:03] I'm going to move on, and then we can come back to this slide if you'd like to study it more directly. Staff are recommending four projects for funding for this round. Support works for 80 units of permanent supportive housing at \$377,970. Habitat for Humanity for 20 units of deeply affordable rental housing for \$1,211,464 in grants and \$450,000 in low-cost loans.

[00:44:33] LEAP for \$679,124 for 70 units of housing preservation with a focus on energy efficiency. And Piedmont Housing Alliance for \$1,249,618 for 194 units of housing preservation to keep units long-term affordable.

[00:44:54] Those reflect the four recommended grant projects as part of the competitive AHIF process. Before the board is also a request initiated by staff of \$110,000 to support seven family shelter units available at the Salvation Army.

[00:45:11] So you're aware the staff intends to come before the board on several additional affordable housing matters in the next five to six months. Depends on our schedule, your schedules, and our availability to get on the agendas because they're all fairly significant, including the Southwood Phase II Performance Agreement, Security Deposit Risk Mitigation Fund, Family Preservation Housing Assistance Pilot, the consideration of our fiscal year 27 AHIF process, the establishment of a housing advisory committee,

[00:45:49] and the review and renovation of housing albumorals requested by the board as attached to its review of AC44. I'm happy to answer any questions or go back to any previous slides as you wish. Thank you, Ms. Dimmick. As we go through with the supervisors, I know that a handful of us were interested in pulling this the last time, so I just want to make sure you all track your questions and make sure any concerns were met from then as well.

[00:46:16] Supervisor Malik? Thank you very much, and thank you for this. I was scrambling trying to keep up because we didn't get it in advance. And if you could go back to slide eight, I guess. This one, are these amounts combinations of things on the previous slide?

[00:46:35] So is this the one at the top plus the fourth one down? Those are both at Premier Circle, I assume. Are they separate or are they combined? They're separate.

[00:46:51] Separate applications, four separate applications. The first for support works does reflect an interest in supporting a permanent support of housing units at Vista 29 at Premier Circle. Piedmont Housing Alliance's application is not related to Premier Circle.

[00:47:08] Where is it? It's related to all of their affordable housing units in the county getting renovated. So that's the modernization of all the scattered places? Indeed, yep. And there is more detail that you will get before money is sent on those as far as where and what and when? If approved by the board, this will launch the Office of Grants and Agreements and the Department of Finance and Budget to enter into agreement and MOU with them about performance and deliverables based on their application.

[00:47:35] Okay. That answers that question. That's great. So back to the second one on this unit. In the previous description, you separated out the grants and the loans rather than having them both cause a

lower score being added together.

[00:47:53] So what does this mean in the second one here? Does it mean that the grant ones that were, no, the homeownership ones that were previously denied because they had the combined ROI score that threw them out, are they now funded? Because I've heard that go by, but it went by too fast.

[00:48:09] They scored, with the revised approach to scoring, they scored a 77%, which makes them eligible for funding, but they were not recommended in this round for funding because the top four applications exceeded the available amount of money that scored higher than 77%.

[00:48:29] So there is no home ownership potential support period this year? None for this AHIF process. For this round? Yes. I still find that very troubling because some amount could have been perhaps remastered from some of these other applications as partials to be able to provide some small element for the longtime residents who have been in trailers for 40 years and would be able to buy, have some support to buy a unit that's under construction.

[00:49:06] So that's something I will throw out to the rest of the board because it is still a great concern. And the board made a strong commitment to these 400 families almost a decade ago. And it has been an extremely long, drawn-out process.

[00:49:22] I'm very glad to hear you mention the performance agreement that we were told by our attorneys was going to be done with the zoning thing in 2017 or whenever it was. So I've been waiting anxiously to have that come back. It's a little out of order, but I would encourage that to be the board.

[00:49:40] I would hope the board would consider putting that on the agenda rather than saying it can't come for six months because we don't have time. We have lots of meetings when there's time to talk about this. So please, let's make sure that we move that along because not having the performance agreement done means that they have difficulty getting other things to happen.

[00:50:01] So I'm glad to at least have it be recognized that it's coming. All right. So, as I said, I'm very disappointed that \$36,000 per unit for home ownership subsidy is not considered worthy at this time, and I will stop.

[00:50:20] All right. Supervisor Pruitt. Thank you. Kind of consistent with our conversation on Monday, you know, when we were talking about our role in the nonprofit agency funding, I see this board's role as being weighing in on the lens and the process that is used.

[00:50:46] And once we have a decision made through that process, saying, well, I may not like the results, but that is the decision that came through the process. So I'm going to focus rather than on the output that we have this year, because I think that becomes, if we did that, then I would sit here and every year argue that Dan gets all the money because he's working in my district, right?

[00:51:11] And that's obviously not a productive way to do this kind of dialogue. So I'm going to try and focus entirely on process questions. And I hope you can help me understand a little bit more. I know you just got... My concern was that the fusing, having a single application running both loans and grants caused it to potentially be to your own detriment if you asked for both sources of funding rather than them separately.

[00:51:40] Can you help me understand, you indicated that there was a change in how, between when we first saw this and now, there's been a change in how projects that are requesting both streams of funding

are reviewed. Can you help me understand just a little bit better how that changed?

[00:51:56] Yes, there may be more to discover here with additional time in review. However, the place where that would show up would be in the per unit cost, which was a scored item in our rubric. And we tried to separate those things out so that they weren't disadvantaging someone applying for a loan and instead decided that we would remove the scored category completely from the sum total for this go-round.

[00:52:26] Because homeownership costs per unit will be different from housing preservation costs per unit, et cetera, the use of loans, et cetera, we did not have that kind of nuance baked into our process, and so we eliminated it both from the sum total available scores and the scores that the applicants had achieved in the initial round so that we could eliminate its impact on this process.

[00:52:48] That will be something that we will look to best practice in other jurisdictions before we come back before you to propose a process or a lens for fiscal year 27 process. I know an alternative that stakeholders have suggested be used in lieu of eliminating that criterion altogether would be to review the marginal value of capital, right, as in the interest that is being saved per year by receiving that low-interest loan rather than securing that loan on a private market and that being the per-unit cost that's affected.

[00:53:25] If this is the first time you're hearing this, then great, But if this was heard previously, can you help me understand why that might not be the path we would go rather than instead eliminating per unit cost generally? We eliminated per unit cost for this process to make sure that we recognize that every time we reviewed it, we saw another nuance that we hadn't considered before.

[00:53:47] We were not going to be able to solve all of those issues before this discussion, so we eliminated the consideration. I do think per unit cost is an important consideration for the board using taxpayer dollars going in the future, but it seems like we could not measure the impact of that scored item appropriately in all three of those categories with or without loans. And so instead of trying to rush to try to find a solution to that, we removed it from the consideration for this round. Okay, thank you. That is helpful. I would say as an amateur at this, I could see the marginal value of capital approach

[00:54:22] of measuring it being perhaps more accurate, and then we do still get to weigh in, right, we are still making decisions based on per unit cost, which is a thoughtful way to do it for government, but in a way that's not prejudicial in that same way. And I suggested this previously, but for future processes, because the types of projects that would benefit from loan financing and the kinds of projects, it is a depth versus breadth kind of question in the ideal markets. I could see the value in those being separate processes or separate criteria, separate applications.

[00:54:59] And it would also give stakeholders the ability to go for broke in both directions, right? Apply for \$5 million in one, apply for \$5 million in the other, and then the county through our own vetting of which ones are the best use of our own dollar. It's just one more iterative way I think might be stronger, avoid these problems for the stakeholder, and also get us a better result of how we're delivering value per dollar.

[00:55:24] Thank you. I just want to also state my understanding of how this has been presented is there's kind of a but-for thing, happening, which is the Southwood Homeownership Program and the Woda Cooper, who I understand has not been someone we've worked with in the past, correct?

[00:55:40] They have not received AHIF funding in the past, yes. Both of those would have been funded, but for the dearth of funding available in this year's rounds. That'd be one way of saying it. The 75% was the board approved threshold for consideration of funding, and then we can't predict how many requests will come in versus the amount available and then we have to like with the human services funding process back into recommended funding based on what's available understood um and the last one this is i would say slightly adjacent to the other points the

[00:56:14] less directly on point but um when we're looking at the salvation army request this cycle um i know we also have a salvation army request in the cip non-profit funding prop how do we make that decision of whether or not to use this set aside in this 20% fund, because I assume this is coming out of the 20%, correct?

[00:56:38] How is that decision at the staff level being made between being a capital project and being a 20% emergency reserves project? The \$110,000 that's being requested is not a capital request. Coming through the AHIV, it's an operations request. Those seven family units came online faster than expected, and they want to ramp up as soon as they possibly can to offer those to families.

[00:57:01] They are disproportionately used by Albemarle County families through families in crisis referrals, and it is in our interest, I think, to have those units online so families can stay together and not be in hotels if at all possible. So the difference is operating versus capital in this case and that we would expect that Salvation Army would go through the human services funding process for the next available year for operations.

[00:57:24] This would allow them to get online faster than waiting for traditional fundraising. Understood. I just to kind of close with a statement rather than a question I've said before that I like that we have this set aside for emergencies sometimes things are being proposed for it that don't feel like for example previously it had been discussed potentially using that for the component that is in the capital request this year for the Salvation Army that was something that was floated I want to say two years ago and I pointed out well that's not actually an emergency because we're planning

[00:58:00] for it a year or two out. And some of the proposed uses that have been floated by Dr. Pethia previously are also not emergencies. For example, it was floated that could be used as a landlord hazard fund, which I'm not going to weigh in on whether or not that's a good idea, but I would say that's also not an emergency. And so I'm not saying that's wrong. But if we're thinking of this as a fund for initiatives, an initiatives fund is very different than if we're thinking of this as an emergency fund. And I would like maybe a little

[00:58:39] bit more clarity at some point on just how staff is conceptualizing this fund and its valid uses, because I don't think we're saying what we're thinking currently. And I would close on that. Any reaction? You don't have to. Yes, I think we were thinking of them as about staff-initiated items and emerging needs.

[00:59:03] And so we were thinking there's an and in that. It's a both and. Yes. It's initiatives and emergencies. So the board had something to respond to emerging needs, also the county staff if we identified something, but also as an opportunity to start to move forward on those more discrete items that are embedded in housing Albemarle.

[00:59:21] Understood. All right. Supervisor Lepisto-Kirtley. Thank you. Probably everybody else understands this except me, But I noticed for the LEAP, it's for housing preservation. For the Piedmont

Housing Alliance, it's for housing preservation.

[00:59:40] One is a lot cheaper if you divide it, you know, \$679,000 by \$70,000 or \$1.2 million by \$194,000. It's about \$3,000 difference. Could you, how are they different?

[00:59:58] LEAP is proposing housing preservation that's based on energy audits and making houses more energy efficient so that people can stay in their houses longer so their houses are more affordable to maintain. They're more discrete, smaller scale, usually replacing windows, for example, or improving the caulking around the doors and windows to allow for less draft, those kinds of things.

[01:00:26] whereas Piedmont Housing Alliance is proposing a more significant renovation of all of their currently affordable units that are in significant states of disrepair in order to preserve them as long-term affordable opportunities for the community. So more comprehensive versus discrete and focused on a specific activity around energy efficiency, so lower cost.

[01:00:51] The Piedmont Housing Alliance is a lower cost? No, I think the Piedmont Housing Alliance is a higher cost based on the more comprehensive approach. That was like \$6,000-something, whereas the LEAP was \$9,000-something, you know, if you divide it by the units.

[01:01:09] The difference is exactly those kinds of activities. And so the Piedmont Housing Alliance is proposing significant renovations to all of their currently available units, whereas LEAP is proposing or predicting what kinds of activities they'll be asked to do based on energy audits.

[01:01:28] And so that might include caulking. It might also include replacing all the windows. Okay, I understand this. So you're saying that Piedmont Housing Alliance has 194 units already that need preservation. Yes. All right, thank you very much. That's all. Supervisor Missal.

[01:01:45] Thank you. I'll start with maybe stating something just to clarify the obvious. So we need, the asks were for \$7.3 million, correct? Remind me, what's the total that we have applied to these awards?

[01:02:01] \$3.969, roughly. Slightly under \$4 million. And at the beginning we talked about, and actually I think at the last conversation we talked about, applying as much of the funding as possible, right, to these.

[01:02:17] It feels like we're still under funding, so we're holding back some funds, correct? Based on the board's, and this is getting to what Supervisor Pruitt was talking about, based on the board's approval of the process, we had slightly less than \$5 million in the full AHIF funds going into this year.

[01:02:35] And if you split 80% for the grants and loans and 20% for staff directed related to initiatives and emerging needs, that would give you 3.969 available for the grants and loans, And that's what we're recommending it.

[01:02:54] In the first recommendation round, we left about \$435,000 on the table. And this distributes the full amount based on your feedback. Thank you. And then one in the weeds question, why was the 120 days chosen as one of the benchmarks for the application?

[01:03:12] Best practice for shovel readiness. And maybe we'll get feedback after this round that that was too arduous for people. Yeah. We were also focused on one measure of readiness was applying for the spring round of LIHTC credits, which is a little bit why we're in this compressed phase in January that we otherwise wouldn't need to be, is to make sure that we're providing whatever match might be claimed in a LIHTC application to make that LIHTC application stronger.

[01:03:42] I got you. Okay. Okay. Got it. Got it. Understand. We talked a bit about the importance of diversity with rental and home ownership, and I'll just echo that. And as we think forward and try to get better with affordable housing and with funding affordable housing and initiatives like that, I would just underscore the need for us to think about how to best diversify that through this process.

[01:04:11] Talked about some of the other things, and I guess I'll just sort of continue on that line of thinking as we go forward with this. I know we're still learning, but continuing to refine this, continuing, I think you used the words, best practices, reaching out to development, the development community, asking how we can do better, I think is absolutely critical and should be an ongoing process, which I'm sure you're already undertaking.

[01:04:36] And I think as, this is just me speaking, but as a board member, I would like to hear when we talk about this subject, how that's going, what new things have you learned, where can we be better, and what are some of those strategies. That's all. Thanks.

[01:04:53] Good. Any reaction? Supervisor Duncan? Yeah. I have a lot of questions about all of this, so I'm happy to, like, wait until the summer when all of the things you bring back to get into the weeds on it. So how much now is left in the fund?

[01:05:14] Did you spend all of it, or is there still some? No, there's about \$870,000 left for whatever the 20% activities might be. Because, yeah, I wanted to point out, because it's not on here, I was doing the math quickly between the two presentations, that you've added like \$485,000 to all of these funds, which is great to see.

[01:05:37] Thinking about the level of applications, the need, also the email you sent with the total affordable units we need, the fact that there are 800 people on the wait list for housing vouchers, Just, you know, comprehensively, clearly, as we keep saying, we have a need for more housing, period.

[01:06:03] We have a need for higher wages. We have a need for, you know, housing that people can afford. One thing I want to point out is that on our consent agenda tonight was we agreed to set a public hearing for developers' fees, which are increasing, which is also another kind of slight mechanism that adds to the increase of how much housing costs, of how much it costs to build.

[01:06:28] So, yeah, I don't really have any questions, just I'm happy to see that more money was put towards this, but we clearly need a lot more housing and a lot more money for it. Okay. Any reaction there?

[01:06:45] I had one bounce back. Any other bounce back questions here? Supervisor Bissell, I'll come back around. I just had one. Maybe it's obvious I missed it. When I look back at the previous presentation a few weeks ago, the numbers are different, right?

[01:07:01] So Leap had, could you remind me why that is? Because we recalculated not only the percentage, but we took out the per unit cost. And so we took it out of the balance of the total available points, but also out of the points that they had been awarded for that.

[01:07:20] And so some of their scores were changed based on how much they had in there. We also moved a couple of components or reduced a couple of components from the rental units. no that's not true the opposite from the housing preservation units and the home ownership units that did not apply and

were only applicable to the rental units which is why the total number reduced three times the pha went i'm sorry habitat went down leap went down pha went down right

[01:07:58] woe to cooper went up two points and that's the only one and the others went down because you Because we removed the points that had been applied to the per unit cost item that we reduced from the total. Thank you. All right.

[01:08:14] I'm going to Supervisor Malek and Supervisor Pruitt. Or I can go last. Supervisor Pruitt. I just wanted to, can we look very briefly at, I think it was the previous slide. The blue one. Is this kind of data and the individual scoring made available to applicants?

[01:08:35] It is after the process is completed. That's been our history with the human services funding process. I would imagine we do the same. I think we already have one debriefing appointment already set up with an applicant to walk through the scoring and how things got applied. Okay. We would do that.

[01:08:52] To be clear, we would not provide the individual reviewers individually. We'd supply them as a rolled-up number rather than looking at individual reviewers. I'm just thinking through, one, making sure that applicants are equipped with the ability to succeed, right?

[01:09:13] We are always going to have our own idiosyncrasies as a government, and being able to have as much insight as possible onto how we think through processes is surely going to shape how applicants make those, and it shouldn't be a crapshoot.

[01:09:30] It shouldn't be guessing how we're going to review and consider individual things. This is something I'm not expert on. I'm wondering if there is a value or if there is any precedent in making that available. Essentially almost creating like a bid protest process, because obviously we see that process playing out in a certain way.

[01:09:53] If there is any value in making the scoring available prior to final award so that there can be kind of a formalized process for jockeying and for respectful disagreement with evaluations. Maybe it's staff's belief that that is not a desirable thing to happen, but I guess I would reflect instead that it is happening.

[01:10:15] It's just happening outside the process and through this, and so having a structure through which applicants can express their own disagreements with evaluations might have value. I think we have similar things in contracting processes, so I could see that being imported here.

[01:10:35] All right. Supervisor Malik? Thank you. I have a few more things that I would like you to put on your think-about list. Very much supportive of the idea of allowing applicants to provide corrections or understanding when they were particularly affected by one particular rubric.

[01:10:56] And the one that jumps out, I mean, I'm not an expert on this either, but the thing that jumped out was that if you applied for a grant or applied for a loan, That was added to the penalty side as far as cost of living instead, because it was going to be paid back.

[01:11:12] So why that, that was sort of the initial, I think, thing that raised a lot of concerns. In my mind, I didn't understand it. The board adopted this policy. To me, it is completely appropriate that when changes are made in the interpretation, in the rubrics, that the board be informed.

[01:11:33] So I've been scolded by asking questions that seemed inappropriate to some. I don't think they're inappropriate at all. One question I would leave before you go forward. Before the per-unit cost was

thrown out, was it corrected to remove the loan section and evaluate it to see what the changes were?

[01:11:57] Because otherwise that seems rather abrupt to approve something that regular people could understand. We removed that process after trying to correct for it on our own, but we removed it at the board's request from the last meeting, was to remove the impact of the per-unit cost, which is what made the homeownership project that was listed score go from 71% to 77%.

[01:12:23] Because it was not given credit for a 30% per-unit cost. It was charged a 97%. It was not given as, because the per-unit cost was higher than other applicants, it had a disproportionately negative impact on them.

[01:12:38] Right. I will reiterate that it's a great concern, I think, that we're not putting anything into even the very small investment to help people get a highly subsidized home ownership to be able to have some equity.

[01:12:57] I have heard from several people who would like to move into LIHTC-supported apartments, but they cannot afford it at all. If the \$2,000 per month minimum is unaffordable for people who are working three jobs, then we're putting a lot of our county tax dollars into a program in order to help an application win a funding that isn't really helping the people under 60 percent AMI, which is, I think, where we've been told all the time our greatest need is.

[01:13:28] So that's a concern. As I said, this is a little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing, but I don't think it's really achieving what we want. And I appreciate Mr. Missile's comment about needing to hear regular feedback because that helps us to understand I may not be the only one who does better with little bits of information than a whole barrage all at once on the day we have to make a decision instead of having some chance to think about it.

[01:13:56] Okay, I've talked about that, talked about that, talked about that. All right. And just one addition, LEAP does a lot more than caulking. They do a whole house weather.

[01:14:15] They've done a lot of work, actually, with the Dominion Dollars to insulate and things, the trailers at Southwood. Because when you have a solid floor and 12 inches of coal there underneath, it's impossible. So it's total unit affordability, total unit upgrades is really helping those folks, even on a temporary basis.

[01:14:36] So I just wanted to add that little bit of extra information that what was added is. And I will stop there. Thank you. All right. Yes? I was just wondering whether or not we could actually see, as these things are completed, data.

[01:14:54] I mean, maybe you already provide that. Like, yes, 194 units, that was completed in this timeline, so that we have a feeling, because we're putting so much towards affordable housing, as we should, but so that we can see what is being done with the monies that are being given.

[01:15:15] Absolutely. I think the board's request for AHIF investments to date and their project status was important to share and is important for us to remember that you'd like more regular updates on progress even before things are completed.

[01:15:30] But if we have an agreement for 194 units, if 100 have been completed, I think that could be helpful information for you as the public as well. And so we have dreams of an outward-facing dashboard

on our website, but in the meantime, we can send those status reports to you directly even without a beautiful externally-facing dashboard.

[01:15:53] Thank you. All right, we're at time, but final question, then we'll move. What was it? Oh, crap. Well, it was a really good short question, and it's just run out of my brain. You'll have to ask by email, I suppose. I appreciate all the questions raised by my fellow supervisors.

[01:16:12] I endorse those and have the same concerns but don't need to repeat them. I think some of my major concerns will be worked out as we get into affordable housing Albemarle and the policy changes. So I will be bringing things up there. All right, last shot. Remember what it was. So the process began in May, but the grant applications opened in January.

[01:16:32] Is that going to be a standard nine-month delay before applications could even be accepted? No, ma'am. Because that compresses everything ridiculously hard. We hope to have this application annually open in late summer, early fall. That's the timeline so that you all are in a position of considering the funding requests and recommendations outside of your traditional budget cycle, but also in time for plenty of time for LIHTC applications.

[01:16:58] And so late summer, early fall seems to be the sweet spot for that, and that's what we would plan on doing for the fiscal year 27 process. Okay, so there will be a timeline built in and established when different things have to be done. I think that probably applicants spent three solid months getting these applications ready.

[01:17:14] And so they had a crunch, too. Thank you very much. Did you have any final thoughts? Otherwise, we're going to move to a motion. I will just say that if the board approves this, we wish to give you a heads up that there will be a corresponding item on the consent agenda on April 1st that serves as administrative approval to move these funds from one accounting bucket to the ones associated with approved uses, just so you're not surprised when you see it.

[01:17:40] All right. If there are no other questions, then looking for a motion to approve the funding for the recommended projects from the fiscal year 2026 AHIF at the recommended funding levels. So moved. Seconded. All right. The motion has been made and seconded. Without objection, if the clerk would please call the roll.

[01:18:00] Ms. Lapisto-Kirtley? Aye. Ms. Malik? Yes. Mr. Missel? Aye. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway? Yes. Thank you, board. That motion carries. Thank you, Ms. Demick. Thank you very much. All right, board, the next item on our agenda, number 10, is our budget work session.

[01:18:20] We've got some seat shuffling going on, but we have Mr. Bowman joining us. Mr. Sumner. Good afternoon to the board. I will actually turn it over to Chief of Budget, Kate Malcolm, who will kick things off, and I will be popping up and down from the audience as needed.

[01:18:40] Thank you, Andy. Ms. Bowman, good afternoon. Okay. Thank you. Caitlin Malcolm chief of budget here for our fourth work session on the proposed Excuse me the recommended FY 27 budget, which will today based on the board's action move to the proposed budget for FY 27 So as a reminder to the board in the public, this is our fourth work session We have one more scheduled in April should the board need it

[01:19:13] And as chairman Galloway mentioned earlier this meeting the series of town halls town halls begins tomorrow evening There are six town halls upcoming for public input staff and board members will be present at those and there's one for each Magisterial district scheduled so our agenda for this afternoon First we want to walk through the recommended technical adjustments that staff first shared with you in Monday's work session On Monday those were kind of for information and questions today We'll be asking the board to take action on those recommended technical adjustments

[01:19:50] and include them in the proposed budget for FY27. The next piece is consideration of the board's requested adjustments or the parking lot topics. Again, we started talking about these on Monday. Today, we're planning to continue that discussion and leave lots of room for the board to discuss and ask questions of staff if necessary.

[01:20:13] At that point, we would recommend taking a break if the board desires, And then following the break, Mr. Bowman will come up and walk the board through the proposed actions with respect to setting the tax rate for advertisement and adopting a proposed budget for FY 2027. So going back to the technical updates that we talked about on Monday evening with the board, just for the public's general awareness, as the board heard on Monday, when the budget is printed and recommended by staff in February, that is a point-in-time estimate.

[01:20:47] It's pretty standard that after that time, there are changes that are made by various agencies that participate in the budget process, and staff bring those adjustments back to the board as recommended technical adjustments. So on the slide here, you see several technical adjustments that are recommended impacting the general fund.

[01:21:06] You see the staff review, continuous review of the revenue projections. We do not recommend any technical adjustments to revenue projections in this budget at this time. After that, you see three changes that are net positive to the good for our bottom line and expenditures.

[01:21:24] Those are adjustments made by the various boards and oversight groups for those specific agencies. So they include the Albemarle Charlottesville Regional Jail, Charlottesville Area Transit, and the Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Center, all of whose budgets came back a little bit less than what we were expecting in the dollar amounts you see on the screen.

[01:21:45] I know in Monday's session, a member of the board asked for us to potentially sort of put the Charlottesville area transit adjustment into a reserve fund. We have that in your list of parking lot topics that we will cover shortly. So for now, this is just kind of captured here.

[01:22:03] And we also have the administrative change that we're recommending based on a staff error on the Reclaimed Hope Initiative, and that would be an addition to the budget of \$40,000. And so based on those recommendations, you see the amounts in front of you. The board has approximately \$800,000 of ongoing funding in the reserve for contingencies, which also used to be called, I think, the board's reserve.

[01:22:28] Thank you. And you have about \$510,000 in one-time funding in that contingency at this moment. With respect to other revenue funds, we talked about an adjustment to the opioid abatement fund that was not available at the time that we published the recommended budget.

[01:22:44] This amount is really budget neutral. It's state revenue coming into the Opioid Abatement Fund and then being spent out of the Opioid Abatement Fund. So the budget for that amount is \$125,000. So staff recommends that these be incorporated into the board's proposed budget today.

[01:23:01] And as I said previously, Mr. Bowman will come back up later in the presentation to walk you through that process. So as we start talking about potential adjustments the board wants to make this afternoon, I want to kind of go through those buckets of funding that are available for use by the board in today's session Either to make those changes today in time for the proposed budget or after today But before April 22nd when the board would adopt the budget so in the ongoing fund Reserve for contingencies again, there's that same balance of around eight hundred and fourteen thousand dollars That is one option the board may consider to make adjustments within the budget

[01:23:39] Another option for the board would be reprioritizing any other ongoing funding that's included in the budget recommendation. Another option available to the board is use of one-time funding. Again, \$510,000 is available in the reserve for contingencies.

[01:23:56] Or the board may consider reprioritizing other one-time funds that are in the FY27 recommended budget. and then finally as we talked about on monday there's about 394 000 available in the cip under the advancing strategic priorities reserve that is available to the board should you want to make one-time adjustments to this budget and another option available to you is reprioritizing capital projects that are in the recommended cip so the next item is a follow-up that the board requested in our work session on monday you specifically asked for an easy to find location for the value

[01:24:34] of a penny on the two main tax rates the real estate tax rate and the personal property tax rate so on the left side of the screen you see the value of a penny for the for the real estate tax rate which every penny equals about 3.3 million dollars in the recommended budget and below that you see the funding split if that penny were to go through the traditional funding split and not be dedicated for a specific use by the board also to flag for the board if the board were to decide to add a penny to that tax rate, for every penny added, it would generate \$1.67 million

[01:25:09] of one-time funding in FY26 based on the way the tax calendar year works. So on the right side of the screen, you see that same information, but for the personal property tax rates, which includes machinery and tools. So for each penny on that tax rate, it would generate \$113,000, and then you can see the split by formula as well as the one-time funds generated if the board were to choose that option. This information has been emailed to the board yesterday afternoon, and it's also posted online within the Department of Finance and Budget in our site on the FY27 recommended budget.

[01:25:47] We have several questions and answers that have been provided to the board in writing. Those are all posted online for transparency, including this one pager on the value of a penny in case anyone wants to reference that. Okay so transitioning now to adjustments that the board has flagged for staff that they want to discuss further or have questions about. So these are the eight topics we plan to bring to the board in your work session this afternoon. My goal this afternoon is to go through these first seven at a high level all at once and then go back to number one and give the board time for discussion, questions for staff, etc. But just to give you a high level overview

[01:26:26] of all the topics we'll be covering first. So the first item is budgeting for the Charlottesville area transit technical update that I mentioned previously. Staff is recommending a technical update of \$151,000 in savings based on an update from Charlottesville area transit. We have three options for the board to consider and again you don't have to wait on this right now. I'm going to go through the rest of the topics and then we'll come back to this. The first option would be that we take the technical adjustment for CAT and we budget that as ongoing savings in the

[01:27:02] budget. The second option would be that we take the technical adjustment for CAT and we budget that as one-time savings. In other words, we allocate it to something else that's a one-time cost in the budget. The third option, and this was suggested by a board member on Monday, is that we take the savings and we put that in a TBD transit contingency for FY27, meaning it would be available to be applied to other transit priorities in FY27. The second item that we're going to talk about is the Albemarle County Emergency Relief Program. So this program in the

[01:27:37] FY27 recommended budget includes funding of \$360,000 to address urgent one-time financial needs. To give you a little bit of history here, since the inception of the program in FY24, the board has invested a total of \$1.5 million in the program. That's about \$980,000 from the general fund and the balance from different ARPA and ARPA reserve funds over time. This board has been particularly interested in data and understanding where your investment is going, and so we provided that on this slide. For the first six months of FY26, the program has

[01:28:13] dispersed a total of \$263,000, which is a monthly average of \$42,000. Of that amount, we've had 396 households apply for the funding of those 214 have been approved that has resulted those 214 approvals have been 68 for eviction avoidance and 31 for utility shutoff avoidance in addition to that not on the slide 188 individuals have received housing navigation assistance so again we'll come back to this topic but that's just to give you a sense of of what we're going to talk

[01:28:53] about. The next item is the Affordable Housing Investment Fund. Again, in FY27, the recommended budget includes \$5 million for the fund, which matches the amount that was provided into the fund in FY26. That includes the dedicated 0.4 cent tax rate increase that the board approved in the FY26 budget process, plus an additional investment of \$3.7 million. As the board is very familiar, To date, this fund has had over \$22 million invested into it by the board since the program was set up in FY19.

[01:29:31] Those investments have supported the construction or preservation of over 1,700 units of affordable housing, shelter and supportive services for over 280 victims of domestic violence and 539 individuals experiencing homelessness, and housing, counseling, navigation, and support for over 788 individuals.

[01:29:52] not listed on this slide and not part of this fund but applicable in the area of affordable housing and as a reminder to the board the fy27 budget also includes a 20 increase to the tax relief program for the elderly and disabled mr bowman's going to speak to the next couple of slides thank you miss malcolm i'm just going to summarize what i presented to the board on monday evening and that there's a series of decisions the board of supervisors would need to make by april 22nd

[01:30:25] Related to the school budget so the first one is the total amount of the public school operating fund more than 70 percent Of that is funded by the general fund transfer county executives recommended budget has a general fund transfer of 218 million dollars that with state revenue and other revenues makes up 304.9 million dollars at that budget So that would be option a option B would be the school board's request that is balanced operationally on 307.2 million C would be any option the board of supervisors would like to determine in between those.

[01:31:02] Related to that, if the board is desiring an adjustment, the board would have an option if they would like to toggle between the one-time transfer to capital and the ongoing transfer to public schools. There's a \$2.3 million difference in that between the county executive's recommendation and the school board's request that they presented on Monday evening.

[01:31:21] And of course, option C, the board could pick something in between. And these are decisions that need not need to be finalized today. They're decisions that would need to be settled by the board on April 22nd, though any update the board may now could be incorporated into the proposed budget. On the next slide, there are two other decisions the board could direct into the proposed budget, including the adopted budget in April, or also extend these beyond April 22nd.

[01:31:47] The decision three would be how should that CIP placeholder be programmed in the future? The county executives has that undesignated to be determined by the Board of Supervisors and located at fiscal year 31 The school board has requested that be for to be determined public school projects And then finally number four this really goes ahead to the multi-year planning strategy in fiscal year 28 How should that be programmed into the CIP?

[01:32:13] The strategy in the county executives recommendation is through this transfer to create some Additional security should there be a change from the state and the local composite index or the Virginia retired system rate in fiscal year 29 So if there is 6.4 million or 4.1 million dollars of one-time savings in fiscal year 27 But then they are spent on ongoing operations in fiscal year 28. They would not be available to support Ongoing operations in fiscal year 29. So that's the reason for the two-year nature of that approach Again, that's not something that has to be decided today.

[01:32:49] Whatever is programmed in fiscal year 28 would be part of the CIP and subject to review in next year's process. The last four years of the CIP are just a planning guideline that becomes a starting process for next year. Now we'll turn it back over to Ms. Malcolm. Thank you, Mr. Bowman. So the next three slides cover what's kind of been a frequent topic this budget season, and that's around nonprofit funding recommendations.

[01:33:14] So I have at least three slides on this, one per process. In addition to the slides I'm presenting today, the board received a fifth QA document earlier today that's focused on agency process, and so there's a lot more information there.

[01:33:30] That is also posted online and available to the public should they wish to access that information. This slide focuses on the human services funding process. You only see a small sliver of the agencies that are recommended to be funded through that process or applied through that process.

[01:33:46] That is based on input that we've received from board members to date. One of the questions the board has had on this is the number and percent of county beneficiaries funded by each agency. And so you see that information on the slide. For the human services funding process, as it was discussed in the work session on Monday, the number of county beneficiaries is available in the appendix of the budget book.

[01:34:10] The percent is not calculated for you there. So we've done that here on this slide for the agencies that board members have raised as ones they want to look at more. And so that's kind of the design of these next couple of slides. The next one is on arts, cultural, and festival agencies.

[01:34:30] Again, the ones that you see here are a selection based on areas of interest raised by board members. Again, the board has asked to see the number and percent of county beneficiaries served by each of these organizational programs. for arts cultural and festival process agencies that information is not available in your budget book but it is available in qa number five that was provided to the board this morning and is posted online so you have all that information accessible to you now again here we're

highlighting the select ones that the board has raised so far but sort of as mr bowman to alluded to with the prior item you don't have to make a decision about these today we can continue to work on these

[01:35:09] before the adoption on April 22nd if you'd like since although these dollar amounts are of course important and meaningful to the organizations they are kind of less likely to be impacted by the tax rate discussion so we can save this full discussion for later if you prefer and then the last agency process i want to cover is the community capital non-profit request a board member asked for more information about the dogwood vietnam memorial foundation and what the basis of their funding recommendation. So that funding recommendation is recommended at \$250,000 by staff, and that is to

[01:35:45] align with the contribution plan by the city of Charlottesville. I think it was also requested how much the foundation asked for. They asked for \$600,000 in their application process. So having gone through all of those, I'm going to go back to slide 11. Excuse me, too far. So the first option for, excuse me, the first topic for the board's discussion this afternoon is how they might like to budget for the Charlottesville area transit technical update moving forward.

[01:36:17] I'll just add what we found has worked in the past for boards is to really walk these through one at a time. If the board would like to go in a different order, that's fine. We will also have, if should numbers change in the budget, our staff is taking thorough notes, and I will pop back up and down if the board has questions, but really this is the time for the board discussion, and I will turn it over to the chair to kind of walk through these options one by one as we assist the board in preparing the proposed budget. Great. Thank you. And again, we're kind of getting kind of consensus and direction of where we're going. We can certainly take votes if we need to.

[01:36:50] This item would impact the total pool available if it gets locked away, which this was an item I raised about putting it in a transit reserve. We know transit costs are going to go up, so let's not send away the operating dollars to something else, which was the basic rationale.

[01:37:07] Supervisor Malek, any thoughts? I support the reserve. Supervisor Pruitt? I do not support the creation of a transit reserve. I would like to see that just rolled back into the general fund. The 150? Yeah. All right. Supervisor Lapista Curley?

[01:37:24] I support the reserve, and I did have a question regarding option C. Would that be available for, like, microcat when you're talking about other things? I don't know if that's an appropriate question to ask, but when you gave your presentation, that's what I was thinking.

[01:37:45] I think it could be used for all of the above as it relates to transit. Yes, at this time, there is no request that it would be used for in fiscal year 27 for that transit contingency. Really, what it would do is, should something come up mid-year specific to transit, that could be an option for the board.

[01:38:03] If that funding were to live in option B, it could be used for transit or anything else that came up. option a provides a little more flexibility I'm sorry excuse me option so I got lost my train of thought yeah option B was what would allow the the flexibility should be used for one time and something else option a is really about that would limit the board's multi-year flexibility to ensure that programming would be there for transit in fiscal year 28 for the amount of \$150,000 okay so C is the reserve that we were talking about you know in all

[01:38:43] options it will be placed into a reserve it's just what is the designation of whether the board intends that uses a one-time savings versus an ongoing savings and also whether that reserve and so that's

the difference really in a and b and then going to see would be if it were to be designated for transit only in fiscal year 27 with the intention that a fiscal year 28 it would fund some of the increases in transit which is a total of eight million dollars and all else being equal, we will probably have an increase of greater than \$150,000 in fiscal year 28, \$48 million transit system.

[01:39:18] Thank you. Supervisor Missal. I thought I completely understood that until you came up and started describing it more clearly. So I apologize for that. Just one clarification on option A again. So we're talking about the 151, right?

[01:39:36] Correct. And so that 151 in option A is not there it's yeah miss balcom if you don't mind going back to the technical adjustments for just one second so in the initial recommended budget the county executive's ongoing recommended contingencies was a little over four hundred thousand dollars and so the net change of these items on the slide yeah all else without absent board direction just to park it somewhere before the board makes decisions we would increase that to 814. the first item on the list because it

[01:40:11] help shape what other items may be available to fund the other items on the list is should that \$150,000 which reserve should that live in I got you thank you that was helpful so I in that case also support option C the contingency supervisor Duncan yeah I also agree I think option C makes sense and just add some commentary my my intent I think supervisor Pruitt's comment made me think

[01:40:48] about this. And we haven't had a point to really discuss it further yet from Monday. But my intent here is not to cordon these dollars off. I just figured by the time we got to the end of the budget, I'll give you an example of where I could potentially think it. Ryan, when you threw out potential fare costs, wasn't it in like the 60 grand range for microcat? Yes. Over the course of the full fiscal year, it would be approximately \$150,000. We're anticipating starting those mid-year so it's around eight seventy five to eighty thousand dollars depending on the concessions and that and the other fare structures as we work through those now i don't know and have not

[01:41:27] brainstormed a ton of ideas of how that 150 could be used for transit in the coming fiscal year but that's one we could delay having to do fares for another year if we so chose to do so so my intent by calling it a reserve was to park it let's learn some more but i'd like to see the monies be used for transit in the highest and best used way for the next year given the realities of the situation so when you said create a reserve and you're right to think that way because i i in the past have asked for reserves where it's parked and now next year we've got this money still sitting around not

[01:42:03] being used so i'm just going to offer that out for for common commentary and i'll just go back through supervisor malik the only follow-up i would have is that at the end of the fiscal year things that aren't spent can roll to the next year we have that big omnibus thing in may june to do exactly that so there is no crisis to spend this by a certain date unless there's a really good reason to do it so which we have to flush out which we have to develop that's why i just i think from a transit standpoint if this 150 gets either used for another operating purpose which i'm not saying is not legitimate um we know that this is going to be an increasing cost category

[01:42:42] FOR US IN FUTURE IN OUTLYING YEARS, SO LET'S NOT LET IT ESCAPE TO ANOTHER CATEGORY. SUPERVISOR PREWITT? I JUST WANT TO MAYBE FLESH OUT MORE OF MY THOUGHTS ON THIS. I WOULD SAY I THINK THE AMOUNT THAT'S IN DISCUSSION HERE IS INCONSEQUENTIAL ENOUGH THAT I'M NOT GOING TO WALK AWAY FROM THIS WITH ANY HARD FEELINGS.

[01:43:01] BUT IN ADDITION, THIS BOARD KNOWS THAT I GENERALLY AM ALLERGIC TO RESERVES, GENERALLY. IF WE'RE GOING TO TAX PEOPLE, TAKE THEIR MONEY, I WANT TO KNOW THAT WE'RE DELIVERING them a service in that same year rather than holding on to it um but in addition to that i worry anytime we have earmarked funds or or uh targeted reserve funds appreciating your point but i think everyone here is old enough to remember having to manually like go through a hard drive defrag process right where you have over time the storage on your computer you've deleted things so

[01:43:37] the storage isn't quite all the right amount in different blocks for new programs, so you have to defrag it to move everything together. I worry that the creation of targeted funds like this, and this is much more of a me trying to manage staff's workload thing, but I worry that we're fragging our own hard drive, right?

[01:43:56] We are creating discrete savings pools that can only be used for discrete things when at the end of the day all this money is fungible, and if we wanted to put it toward a transit project at the end of the year, we could. and instead we're just making it so that these discrete pools sit in highly allocated amounts that maybe we can't use for a given priority at a given time.

[01:44:15] Again, I don't think this 150 is going to be one I'm going to stay up at night clenching my teeth, but that would be my philosophical opposition to it. Any other commentary here? It doesn't impact the tax rate, so there's time for more discussion.

[01:44:36] My count has us a five-to-one kind of deal situation So are there any other questions or comments but now from a process standpoint Do you would you have what you need to be able for us to continue today? This is helpful? I would just add to the board kind of has the math in their head or their notes is really as we talk through the remaining items If they're looking to adjust the reserve contingency that ongoing one-time portion would be option C the 663 ongoing or the 510 one-time obviously the board could also reprioritize anything else in the budget but those would be the the easier solution so it would be let just less

[01:45:10] disruptive to other services all right very good all right so the second item we have is the discussion of the ACER program which miss Malcolm is reviewed and so if the board would desire a change to what's in the recommendation I'll turn it over chair to discuss that with the board and I'm just gonna ask which supervisor raised this just so I can resist I raised all right so I'm gonna go ahead and let you start and then we'll go through for commentary so sure so I will just add this is I see that a SERP is I would think it's fair

[01:45:47] to characterize as our deepest subsidy in a lot of ways it is targeting the most vulnerable of the vulnerable and I I said this and again I hope I'm not offending anyone on county staff but I see our I see our affordable housing strategy focusing primarily on breadth right now right we are mainly talking about a hip a hip is targeting a level of affordability that does not necessarily benefit the deepest of the deep most of the time and maybe mr. Rosen swag would disagree with me about the beneficiaries of some of his projects being amongst that deepest of the deep but generally a construction subsidy is one that is

[01:46:25] targeted for breadth rather than depth. This has overall I think public savings benefits because it prevents eviction when it is used for eviction rather than utility shutoff. That means that there are cascading problems, homelessness prevention problems, public health and services problems that are being prevented through this disbursement. It is tricky and maybe Ms. Dimock would disagree with me, but I think it is hard for us to measure the funding versus the unmet need on

[01:47:01] this because of the way we cordon it off, right? I've been told before, we have so little funding and such high need that we could burn it in two months in a given year. I'm getting a nod. We could burn it in two months. And so it is cordoned off in very small amounts, right? \$42,000 per year or per month sorry this is a place where we know that the need is almost bottomless and it is in a lot of ways the sole program that is meeting this need so I think it is always worth every year giving ourselves a hard look and determining whether or not this is the appropriate amount of funding I do

[01:47:41] believe this is a decrease from prior year on the amount of funding but maybe I'm mistaken because I think we plus that from the board strategic reserve into a sir so I think it I think it hit half a million last year and I'm going to look for help yeah just to clarify this was one last year there was a total of four hundred sixty thousand dollars that was funded ongoing two hundred sixty thousand and one time an additional two hundred thousand to get the four sixty so this ongoing dollars has increased one hundred thousand dollars but the one-time money is not there in the past as we can see on the slide this has been

[01:48:18] supplemented with our putting our reserve funds at this point those are essentially all exhausted understood so the board knows that I have very tangible goals on housing I have committed very publicly to seeing 1 million dollars to a hip every cent I can think beyond that target that this board has remaining at the end of the budget I think would be well spent on a ASERP. And if we are hitting exactly \$10 million, there may even be, I think, a serious discussion as to whether or not so that would be better and more prosperously spent on ASERP in a given year.

[01:48:59] All right. Supervisor Malik? You said \$1 million to AHIF. Did you mean \$1 million or \$10 million? \$10 million. I meant \$10 million. I was going to say, oh, we can do that. We've done that. Yes, I know. I just wanted to get clarified. Very good. Actually, before you go, were you making a specific money move?

[01:49:21] I am not. I wanted to, if we were going to have a discussion about, I anticipated that we were going to have a big picture discussion about housing and money. And I think we're about to, when we start talking about the tax rate, probably after the break here. I want to make sure that this is a program that is not away from anyone's eyes.

[01:49:40] I'm not going to call a number out right now. I don't feel like I'm equipped because I don't know what all the other moving pieces are. But I want to name this as my baby. I'm tucking her under my arm, and she is going to be my baby throughout this budget process because I know we've got other people who are fighting for AHIF with me, but I want to make sure that we're calling out to remember the importance of this program as well.

[01:50:02] Got it. We'll have a good metaphor. Supervisor Malik? Thank you, and I agree that this provides absolutely direct help to the people who need it most when they need it, and that is an excellent thing. So I will be looking forward to more discussion about implementing more because the ARPAs are all gone.

[01:50:20] And I don't have anything else to add on this slide. Supervisor Lopisto currently. Yeah, I also support the ACERP program. And I did want to ask something I know regarding evictions. How often does a person qualify for eviction benefit?

[01:50:41] Because I know it's not every single month for six months or 12 months. it's a pain there. I think Ms. Dimmick is coming up to speak to that. Yes, correct. Thank you. Tried to keep you from having to stand up. I apologize. I'm sorry, it's good for many. Kaki Dimmick, Chief Human Services Officer, 66% of

the folks who are approved for this money are, actually it says 68% are approved for eviction avoidance. You may, our restrictions or our guardrails around this money changes, changes based on how much money we have available at the

[01:51:20] time. We do try to make this money last throughout the year, which is why we apply guardrails so that we don't know what the emergency that a young family might have in June, and we would like to have available funds in June to be able to solve that for them. As a result, we ask for people to come maybe only once a year as a restriction or if they apply a second time that we have additional layers of review before we consider it's not up to staff we ask for supervisors or directors to review the request and see if the emergency is something that we can respond to

[01:51:59] but it's not an automatic we also have a cap on the amount of money that we distribute at any one given time so those are the kinds of the restrictions that we we frankly play around with a little bit to try to hit the sweet spot so we're pushing the money out the door but also reserving some for future months okay yeah that's what i thought that it was uh once a year um being able to help people and um yeah more money would be able to help more but i mean there are i'm happy with our our restrictions also i just um when you say the households that have applied 396

[01:52:35] That would be because we didn't have enough money that we couldn't approve all of them. Your needs are help thanking me. That's true. It's all good for me. Yes, I could do an evaluation to try to determine for these six months what the reasons for ineligibility would be.

[01:52:58] It could be that they've applied before. It could be that they actually don't live in our jurisdiction. it could be that they're applying before they've actually received any threat of eviction action or utility shutoff. And so we do, one of the levers we use or the restrictions we use is that we are an emergency fund. And so right before you're about to be evicted or right or after you've received a shutoff notice. And so families, of course, are usually aware that they're facing such action and they may be applying before they've actually hit that eligibility moment.

[01:53:35] Okay, so when you say 68% avoidance, that's because the rest of the percent up to 100%, they didn't, quote, qualify. The rest of that percent would be the remaining funds were used for utility shutoff.

[01:53:53] So 68% received funds related to eviction action, 31% for utility shutoff. Okay. And I would like, personally, I would like to know whenever we're getting, that we have more of a need than we can provide. I know you have, you know, guardrails, so to speak, but that would be nice to know that if we're getting to a certain point that maybe we could do something.

[01:54:17] Thank you. We'll try to keep that data. Supervisor Missal. Thank you. I had similar questions as Supervisor Lapista currently. And I guess um it's sort of like our conversation about housing that the need uh is really an important number to know i think so if i'm my takeaway here is essentially since 24 we've invested 1.5 million and we're saying next year we're recommending 360 000 right so it's a significant reduction in the total number the 1.5 is cumulative over all the years that the program has been in existence It's three years of funding, right?

[01:54:54] But it's still significant. It's about half a million dollars or almost \$600,000 less. Okay, that was it. I just wanted to clarify that. Supervisor Duncan? Just a clarifying question of what you just said. So for households that applied, that's just all the applications or those are qualified applications?

[01:55:16] Those are all the applications. And so usually people don't send us applications in a sort of blind way. They call us first. So there would be a group of people who called to say, I have a financial emergency, I need to repair my car, and they might hear from our staff, don't bother applying through this fund because we only provide funds for these two circumstances.

[01:55:37] So is the 214 who are approved, is that 100% of the people that qualify that apply are getting some sort of relief? At this point in the year, yes, that would be the case. if we receive funds in the third week of January and we've allotted \$45,000 for January and we're above that, if the emergency met our requirements and it was legitimate, we would probably distribute those funds. So we don't have a wait list. We don't have a rolling wait list because we're asking people to apply in the state of emergency. A wait list is not going to help you

[01:56:16] if you have a five-day or quit notice, for example. But so far, it feels like the people that are coming are getting some funding, but it might not be complete as to what they actually need. Certainly there are a number of people who are not applying because they're directed elsewhere for a variety of reasons who may have a legitimate need and may be qualified. And then there will be folks who are receiving up to our cap. And if our cap is floated, I think in the last couple months between fifteen hundred dollars and two thousand dollars they may owe five thousand dollars for

[01:56:53] their eviction notice and we're supplying two of it for example um and then i just had a question on the eligibility requirements there's like a list of five things is it you have to have all of these to qualify you just have to have one of them you have to be an admiral resident with a shutoff notice or an eviction notice to apply if we had 15 applications in front of us and three thousand dollars on the table we would prioritize based on vulnerability like we do for other programs we haven't been in that situation so far thankfully but we wanted to broadcast our interest in in prioritizing vulnerability should we have to say no to a family who otherwise qualifies

[01:57:29] in favor of one that has a vulnerability if money in this fund like increased would you be able to increase the cap or would you keep the cap the same and you just be able to help more people this is an amazing philosophical question that we could spend most of my career answering but i will say probably a little bit of both okay that's all i have yep it would seem that as we jiggle around the puzzle pieces that if we infuse it with one-time money we'll be back here

[01:58:03] having this conversation again next year so the way to kind of plus up a little bit and count on it would be the ongoing monies into this pot and i'm not staking out a position yet on it just pointing out yeah what is blatantly obvious that what we choose for this one i think has some significant uh re uh impacts for next year from a budgetary standpoint um i would you know i think obviously we're going to go to some of these ongoing dollars for some other things just knowing

[01:58:38] what people have brought up and understand Supervisor Pruitt's point of like well let's see how that maneuvers yet to start directing these things but this shouldn't impact the tax rate either so it sounds like one we're going to come back and address in terms of where to where because at some point we have to start talking about actual dollars where it comes from or where the monies and the technical adjustments are going to go and live but we don't have to finalize that today yes that's correct particularly for items that are not driven by the tax rate, there's still ample time to adjust those as they need to.

[01:59:16] Anticipating some of the conversations around housing, I guess I will float this out there just in terms of what for us all to be thinking about. If it gets down to a couple hundreds of thousands of dollars,

let's say \$200,000, moving it in a technical adjustment to AHIF versus it moving it here, my guess at that level of funding, there can be a quality question of where could it have bigger impact.

[01:59:40] And that's something that I would be interested in having discussion about before we make the final call. Meaning if \$200,000 in AHIF doesn't have the same push as in ACERP or vice versa, I think that's important for us to think about before we make where we want it to go.

[01:59:59] And I'll say for past boards, at the risk of throwing too many options out there, I know there have been times where boards have said, you know, we can't address this in the 27 budget, but if we were to look to year-end funds or an ability to create some one-time money in the current year, just giving that direction to staff with an expectation that would be brought back if it's available, that could be another approach if the board intends to do something but is not ready to quite make that call in the budget. And the small board reserves that are there, if they remain, is a place where we've directed, if you run out, come to the board so that we know what time of year it is, et cetera, and see what mechanisms we have available to us. We don't have

[02:00:38] get into that further today but that's what some of those reserves are set up for any Mike any you've heard everyone any additional it's there you have what you need for this so we can move I think there's no direction other than to come back and discuss it in the cut as other items are I guess they shouldn't say there's no direction to set a dollar amount but this is still an item the board desires as they work through the budget on April 22nd I mean I don't know how to put a dollar amount on this one yet, frankly.

[02:01:08] I don't know if this is worth thinking about. Just looking at the, if you look at the monthly average of \$42,000 a month and you take that times 12, you get to \$504,000. We're only funding \$360,000 of that. That's another \$144,000 in reoccurring funding that could be applied to this that meets the average.

[02:01:29] I'm not saying that there's not greater need, but I'm just trying to figure out a way to get to a number. So what was your number? \$144,000 annually. So, I mean, we could maybe plug that in as a concept as we move forward. I mean, like how we've got the 150 for cats floating. Sure. And then we can see where it goes.

[02:01:44] I just don't want the board to feel like we have to. There's wiggle yet in this budget so that we can still. And how things, other things shake is going to determine where this lands. Chair, I actually do have two quick comments. First, as this is a program that is pretty new and I feel like was built.

[02:02:03] It's a house that we built around ourselves or a car we built around ourselves while we were driving, right? As it becomes something that this board expresses more and more interest on and I think relies on it more and more for our public, it would be interesting to get a level of more granular data that I don't know we don't, I believe we don't currently have.

[02:02:24] Sorry, I'm trying to make eye contact, which is with eviction deferral programs and eviction prevention programs, you'll often see like a one-year or six-month success rate. And I know with a program like this, it might be low. It might be 50%, but I would still appreciate that.

[02:02:43] Moving forward, this might be a level of data that would be more valuable because we are so invested mentally and also increasingly dollar-wise in this program. Being able to have some insight on efficacy could be valuable. And the one other thing is just as we weigh different options, I just want to, as a

form of endorsement of the idea of evaluating year-end funds and technical adjustments, and this is a home for those in the future, AHIF does not do well.

[02:03:14] It does not use, effectively, off-cycle funding because it has an iterative competitive grant application process. So if it gets money in September, oh well. If ACER, however, got a significant funding infusion in the final month of a fiscal year, they can probably still use it.

[02:03:39] It can accommodate explosive growth in its budget, I would assume, much more effectively than our other housing programs. So that is, it is a sensible home for that kind of funding that might be unpredictable and might just pop in your bank account.

[02:03:57] And if it goes unused, it could be rolled over. Yeah, good point. All right. Andy, I think we're ready to leave two questions. Oh, I'm sorry. That's fine. So the data for the baseline year, since we're just starting, this is a great time to have a baseline, even if it's not everything we hope sometime in five years.

[02:04:17] So if a rent, you mentioned the cap per person per one time is \$2,000. Is that enough to pay rent? I mean, it sounds like it's not really, but I don't know. It's not always. sometimes it makes the significant amount it's the if they can if they have some funds themselves they can match it with our contribution and pay whatever rears are required or whatever fees have been assessed and sometimes it's not sufficient and so they're seeking additional emergency funds

[02:04:51] from other sources and our navigators are helping to refer them so additional dollars means sometimes which is why answering the question about whether it's the number of people or whether it's increasing the cap, there is a philosophical argument to be made that says use all the funds you have available to solve someone's emergency completely in this moment and not hold back funds for some money in June.

[02:05:16] And so we've done a lot of best practice research around this. There's no clear path. And so what we've said is we're going to titrate out the available funds so that we have some money available in June for the young family who comes and says we're getting evicted we have no place to go this summer and then we have something to support them with the other worry that i just learned about the time is there time for most of your clients when they get an eviction notice to actually go through the hoops to get help i mean five days or ten i mean the legislature just pushed it to 10 days whoopee you know that really doesn't give anybody a chance to plan it's not a lot of time but most of the both court

[02:05:56] systems landlords and others are receptive to somebody calling from our office and saying we're working with your consumer we have money that's coming your way it'll be there and we don't turn those things around all that quickly ourselves and so but it's essentially a promissory note from a local government says we're going to help this person avoid eviction and 99 out of 100 times that's sufficient. That's wonderful. Thank you. I'm done. Thanks. All right. Andy, if you want to knock that coffee thing over again before you come up. I just want to apologize to our police

[02:06:32] officers here today for startling them. I would appreciate feedback from the chair, maybe skipping up the order a little bit, because number three and four with the housing fund and the schools are larger dollar amounts. And so perhaps to assist the board as we started with some smaller items moving ahead to the agencies in five through seven and then coming back to number three and four but i would look to the chair for that guys i think that's that's wise all right so let's go to uh number five miss

malcolm walked through the human services funding process with additional data there is i say with the understanding the board may have not had a

[02:07:10] chance to read it because we sent this morning some additional q a that was out there and we've talked about this process in prior meetings so i'll turn it over to the board for any changes they desire on any agencies on the screen or otherwise in this process thank you i think board as we go when we go through here you have technical adjustment dollars there so i would think that if you ask for an additional amount than what was recommended you have your pot of money there to target but if you're thinking outside of not adding from that then you have to i would start trying to brainstorm where you could maybe go get it from because if it's not

[02:07:48] from the technical adjustment dollars, then it's from some other bucket that it's already programmed to. So we want to start, I think with these ones, we need to start illuminating or targeting where they're going to come from. Supervisor Malik. Okay. Is there any discussion planned for today about the ones that have not Amal County focused, that have pretty large dollar amounts? So I don't know. These are brand new figures here that we were given as far as, oh, that's not even the

[02:08:24] the percentages of beneficiaries, even for the housing ones, that was all new. And, oh dear, where did I write that thing down? Oh, for crying out loud, I made notes.

[02:08:44] Everything's turned around. Hold on a second. All right, the change of order has messed me up. I guess I know that quite a few of these have very high percentages of, here's my question.

[02:09:09] Does your office have the total budget of the agency in your files? So if they're 25% of our county beneficiaries, is there a relationship of that to the total budget?

[02:09:25] In general policy, that's something that's always been something on my mind because that's where the county benefit versus somebody else is really important. Yes, ma'am. We ask as part of the application process for their agency budget, and then we also ask for their program budget.

[02:09:44] So if they're applying for funds to support county beneficiaries for a specific program, we would anticipate that we'd receive from them a program budget related to that thing and then also related to an agency budget. So agency, what I would call admin, basically.

[02:10:00] I think that would be the all-in budget for everything. So, for example, on the screen you can see Computers for Kids, which is based in Northern Virginia, which is why the NOVA shows up there. And 22% of their total beneficiaries are Albemarle County residents. You just misspoke.

[02:10:19] It's communities and schools and NOVA. What did I say? Okay, you said. Computers for kids. Computers for kids. I apologize. I mean communities and schools in Northern Virginia. And so 22% of their total beneficiaries are county residents because their administrative focus is actually in Northern Virginia.

[02:10:38] So they serve other clients. They're asking for funding for the 209 folks that they serve here. And this is a brand-new program that's starting now going forward. So how did they get the 209 people? They have been. This is a brand-new program to us that they've asked for funding for us.

[02:10:57] They've been in the schools for 18 months. Ha-ha. Okay, so that answers one question. And I guess this, I'll stop there because I think this slide is one I don't have as many questions about.

[02:11:16] So I'll stop there. Supervisor Pruitt? I think at our last work session expressed my philosophy on this. I have no desire to make modifications from my position as a political decision maker. Supervisor Lapisto-Kirtley? So from what I understand, if we wanted to allocate some additional funding for some other agencies, we would have to take funding from whatever is listed.

[02:11:44] Is that correct? If you wanted to add money to the fiscal year 27 recommendation to any of these, it would either come from the technical adjustment ongoing monies, or you would have to identify a subtract or a deduct from some other category that already has the dollar amount.

[02:12:02] So, for example, if you said, well, I want communities and schools to get \$32,250, and I want to take \$1,000 away from Foothills Child Advocacy Center, that's another way to balance. Right. Well, okay. So I would be in favor of taking monies away from the communities and schools.

[02:12:24] And do you have a dollar amount, all of it? Flexible, because I think other people might want to put additional funds into something else. So, you know, I wouldn't want to put all that money into something else, but I think that's a good way to, frankly, break it up and be able to get, and maybe leave some money there, but also be able to give some other supervisors the ability to use some of that \$31,250.

[02:12:57] Understood. Do you have a rationale for why that particular one should be reduced in funding? Well, their percent is low. It's an ongoing school. It's in the schools. It's something that is new when we have things that have been going on for years and years and years that are not being funded, frankly.

[02:13:22] All right. Any other comments or I'll move on? That's it. Supervisor Missal? Thanks. This continues to be a challenging process for me, to be honest. I mean, I hear what Supervisor Pruitt's saying and what has also been said in our work sessions.

[02:13:39] So what I'm trying to do is kind of get my feet, right? I'm trying to understand really how to go about this. And all of these are human service organizations, right? We're talking about providing services to humans. And it feels wrong for me to just, I'm metatutorializing here, to pull things away because I've gotten more emails on one than another.

[02:14:00] So what I've tried to do is be as objective as I can in my thinking about this. And what I've fallen on is where is the greatest service to the county, number one. And number two, are there areas that and where supporting one of these human service organizations can help reduce costs in another area?

[02:14:21] And so I'll just mention one, and you guys know I've talked about this, the Offender Aid Restoration Therapeutic Docket, for example. You know, there's been research that it reduces rates of criminal activity, it's improving public safety and reduces recidivism, et cetera, et cetera, which then reduces, I would assume, I don't have the specifics on this, but I believe there have been studies that are documented that show reductions in costs.

[02:14:54] in the jails and in those and so for me i think supporting that and also understanding the amount of conversations we've had about mental health and the increasing burdens on people that have with mental health issues um it seems to me to all align to something that is more objective to support um at an amount that is i don't know right so i mean that's the challenge i mean i i part of me says well you know we're we're at 63.5 they're asking for 139 let's go to 100

[02:15:29] and if that's the case then i would pull that additional roughly 35 37 000 out of the technical adjustment funding that's all all right i'm just tracking somebody supervisor duncan yeah just on principle

i think the way the system is sort of set up makes sense and i look forward to in the

[02:16:05] summer kind of diving into when the board is supposed to sort of have input i'm just very hesitant to get into the weeds of a scoring system and moving money around when i assume qualified experts are the ones who have made these decisions and have read through all these applications and know what's going on and i just i don't feel like it's my place to at this point get in and mess with the money um all right my one question that i do want that i don't if it's

[02:16:44] been answered already then then um i apologize for re-asking the this piece about how the tiers resulted in no funding last year and now the level funding piece where now they're stuck with the decision from last year can you just speak talk to me about that because that seems to be so i i don't know what the i need help remembering what the intent was but then how it doesn't isn't just a procedural or bureaucratic way to be like well this gets rid of funding for people

[02:17:21] talking about a computer for kids anybody yeah yeah yeah that thank you supervisor i forgot to introduce myself last time ryan davidson deputy chief of budget and so each year when we go through there's a these tiers are determined based on the prioritization prioritization rubric that the board discusses and sets in the summer as part of that process and last year each year we look at the available applications the amount requested and the available funding and we start with prioritizing those that meet tier one that meet the more of those check marks in that prioritization rubric and then

[02:17:57] we work our way down to see how far down this list because there's infinite needs in this community as you all have heard from more constituents and I could even imagine at this point. And so with that, we work our way down to a point where, okay, this is where we can meet the most amount of needs and get the most amount of funding to these higher tier priorities, giving preferential treatment to that. Last year, it just so happened that there were more agencies in tiers one and tier two. And so by the time we got to that point of getting to tier, those tier three categorized agencies, we had run out of funding. We were able to increase funding this year in the overall pool, and as we worked our way down and the way that those agencies

[02:18:35] fell in those prioritizations, we were able to be able to level fund some of those agencies that are now in Tier 3. If you look at those agencies, some of those have moved in the prioritization, some have moved up, and some have moved down to the various tiers. So with the, you know, I will speak specifically to Computers for Kids because that was brought up, and they're the one that was in Tier 3 in both years.

[02:18:55] They're the one Tier 3 program that did move. It just happened to be a coincidence that they were the one program in tier three both times based on the prioritization. And as we were looking at our framework, we have also considered new agencies, any programs that did not receive recommended funding in the prior cycle.

[02:19:15] So that is also something when we look at, and we discussed this at the summer, if the board so desires to say we need to look at that differently as to what constitutes a new program versus an existing program, that is something staff is definitely open to that feedback as well. Based on the prioritization rubric and kind of the framework we had in front of us, that is how we made those decisions on who got funded in what tier and at what amounts. We had to just work with the figures and work with the percentages based on the amount of available dollars. I follow that logic. The thing that I'm concerned about would be if dollars never change

[02:19:50] and we're always looking to level funding of the prior year and that number is always zero, How do they get back in without changing their tier? I mean, I get it. It's a competition, for lack of a better word.

[02:20:07] And the tier ones and the tier twos, you're saying compete better for the rationale that you've provided. But we've also, in years past, not just given to all those organizations. I think it tracks that if we don't have enough funds, that we can't fund everything and you have to make some decisions.

[02:20:23] but as a criteria point for consideration this last two passes seems different to me because now we're saying that the level funding the year before is a weight a weighted answer that's like oh well they didn't get funding last year so we're not going to give them any this year and they're a tier three tier three on the end of the list the board has made significant but incremental changes over the last three years about the funding process and approach to this

[02:20:58] human services funding process. One of the, we have not quite gotten away from consideration of historic funding in our decision for future funding. It is one of the last pieces of the old way of doing this that we need to stop doing because we had historically sort of had a group of organizations that we predicted we would fund every year. And we made some decisions, you all made some decisions two years ago to shake that up and say every year we look at the needs and we

[02:21:34] look at the applications anew. And so your past funding is not necessarily indicator of future funding, which makes good sense to folks. The consequence of not quite cutting that full cord of the history completely means we look at last year to determine this year. So if you had zero funds last year and we call you new this year, you don't get any funds. One of the things we hope to change for fiscal year 27 process is to look at all applications anew without looking at

[02:22:11] their history of funding from us so we're not in this position so i i hear the concern of always if your history is always zero then you're never going to be able to jump back in and we we hope to stop that for next year and stop looking at the history of funding and any kind of decision making about future funding does that make sense it it makes sense i'm in the camp of what supervisor pruit and supervisor duncan have said for the current cycle but it seems to me that as the board has weighed with this and as the board has decided and endorsed what we're doing, then the board has to go, hmm, it sounds like we're not thrilled about it, so we need to

[02:22:51] revisit it. And that's not an indication or a criticism of staff. It's just where I'm hearing supervisors are at. I'm going to go back through for everyone because this is where it gets a little interesting to figure things out. I have not heard any endorsement of reducing Community and Schools Nova beyond Supervisor Lepisto currently to provide other places.

[02:23:19] So I'm just saying that as a point. I did hear Supervisor Missile raise \$35K from the technical adjustments to go to a therapeutic docket. So we may have to speak to that or take a vote on that at some point to see if that's what we're thinking I'm going to go through with additional questions and comments to see where we're at supervisor Pruitt or I'm sorry supervisor Malik first okay either fine so I guess in my mind I'm thinking about partners in the state agency and I am embarrassed to say that until there was communication about the foothills this year

[02:23:57] that turned out that ours is the only one in the state that isn't publicly funded that was a shocker And it's a very important three-legged stool with the Commonwealth's attorney and whoever the

third DSS may be, to be able to help these kids.

[02:24:15] So that is someplace where I don't have a dollar, but that is something that I've had a different category in my mind, as is the therapeutic docket that we've been working on for literally 10 years and finally got authority for three or four years ago.

[02:24:31] So those two things, I hope, would be perhaps in a different category where they, in the future, would move to the budget as AHIP did, which is something we should be funding all along. And rather than putting them through this annual thing, as long as their performances continue A-plus, that kind of thing, they should be in this other category, as opposed to lots of little nonprofits that jump up and do special things, which are all very good.

[02:24:59] but it's different than a state or court participation thing in my mind. I am welcoming of the – oh, dear, what is her name?

[02:25:18] Shoot, gal who spoke about mahogany earlier. Janisha. Janisha, that's right. And perhaps just the \$17,000 for that program for the Amara County students rather than the whole amount.

[02:25:33] This is where getting into a partial seems to be fair, more fair perhaps, than some getting none and some getting everything they ask for or more. And so if the technical adjustment is needed for those two things, the 37 for Foothill and the whatever is needed for the U.S. suggested meeting halfway for the OAR, I don't know if I didn't hear anything from them about that this year, so I don't have any more details to offer.

[02:26:07] but that's where i am on that thank you so i can and just to confirm my understanding you're saying that in her public comment she mentioned 17-5 for the middle school program as the mentoring yes and that's the number you're honing in on that is all right supervisor puritt um to the specific ask i will just begin by saying like if i were to try and make my own policy and discretionary decisions based on I want to also just note that the selection of agencies we have on the screen right now is kind of arbitrary they're ones that have been selected as ones that this board wants to know right they're not the entire

[02:26:46] universe of what we're considering I'm just saying that for the public and for our own just to reiterate what I think is an important point these are kind of seven random things that don't have much to do with each other they just are the ones on the screen of the ones on the screen if I was to sit here and put on my let me make a decision all by myself I would also probably want to plus up the therapeutic docket I see that as the one that I would assume has a really high and urgent demand it it also has a high funding ask and received relatively a pretty small percentage of that funding ask I think it's important to try and

[02:27:24] he was best I can to the philosophical underpinning of this and to again do what I see my role as a supervisor do which is be to look at I think as chair Galloway was gesturing toward what are the policy elements that I think got me an undesired outcome here to that point right like I could see the strong argument for why this would be a tier one agency it provides direct services to a vulnerable population.

[02:28:01] I'm not sitting here with the application in front of me to know how I would make that argument, but I could see there being an argument to be made, and figuring out kind of what opportunities we can create for people to submit for re-evaluation on tiers seems like an important step.

[02:28:18] And also just, this is kind of neither here nor there, but I would just say, I might hope that we can kind of be more prescriptive and guide our various nonprofit agencies into a little bit more coherence,

consistency, and compliance with how they're doing their respective tracking metrics, which I know are agency selected. They are all over the map. They're not accomplishing the same thing. I'm going to take some what feel like low pot shots. I love all these agencies. On our own does not answer their own metrics whatsoever. Loaves and

[02:28:55] fishes has a metric but it's post hoc it's not monitorable and it's not goal based lighthouse has one that's monitorable right it's a percentage of served but they don't actually have goals for what they're so it's it's really all over the map and and sometimes that comes with a lower evaluation for those as being a fair rather than exemplary but it is all over the map instead of the ones that I have critiques therefore are rated as exemplary. It does, I think, make our, as we're sitting here defending the decisions that have been made by staff, it becomes harder to defend when I know

[02:29:34] that the data inputs that we're getting from agencies are mixed and subpar and not necessarily tending toward showing the establishment of goals and the seeking of goals. Supervisor Lapisto-Kirtley? Yes, I do agree with supervisor Malik regarding putting the therapeutic docket and the Foothills Child Advocacy Center perhaps in a different category and be able to receive funding but I also agree with supervisor Pruitt and making sure that we can get

[02:30:09] measurable goals and measurable data measurable outcomes because I think you And I think that would be important to be able to find out whether or not they're serving, actually serving people, how many, et cetera, et cetera.

[02:30:31] So those are my, there was something else, and it just absolutely slipped my mind. So I reserve the right to come back. Yeah, well, none of this is final today. I know. And I've got an idea. So Supervisor Duncan, Supervisor Missal.

[02:30:51] Thanks. I'll just say two things. One is I do like the idea of the metric piece, and I know that that was part of the analysis that was done by staff. My mind craves objectivity on this kind of a process. So if there were another column that said, you know, like we did great this year, or there was really more need than we had the capacity to be able to handle, or whatever it is that can help us to get a grasp of that sort of objective measure of success on each of these, I think that would be really helpful.

[02:31:22] And then the other thing I'll mention is on the therapeutic docket, I just want to almost take off the record the number that I threw out. I just keep it open-ended. I know that they would prefer full funding, which I would also support. So I don't want the number that I threw out to make any kind of an influence on that.

[02:31:39] But I also still think that the source of those could be the technical adjustment funds. Supervisor Duncan. Yeah, I love data, too. I am wondering, and I guess this is some of the stuff that I'd like to learn about this summer, is what sort of, how much extra work that is causing these organizations, like what sort of data do they already kind of track, but like not making them have to do, you know, a ton of extra work to get, you know, \$2,000 from us.

[02:32:13] Because I have heard from some people that run organizations that said the process already is so difficult that it's not even worth going to the county to get help and so that's part of what I want to learn more about this summer and so kind of the request for data is you know what is reasonable what do other jurisdictions require how do they do it I mean I know we ask them to provide an audit that not everybody does and just I guess being aware of what we're asking of them, and if it's even worth it.

[02:32:50] Do you have thoughts on the recommendations by Supervisor Missal for OR? I would be in favor of increasing the funding for OR. I've heard from a constituent a really amazing story of how helpful it was, and so I would be in support of that.

[02:33:10] Supervisor Malik, did you say, just in one of the comments, for Foothills, did you throw a number out or just? They are only short 37. That was their full request was for the 130. And so I think the difference is what would help them. Or up to, up to full fund.

[02:33:27] There's, without the number being firm, there's clear support for increasing for ore. I don't have the same track for the Mahogany Friends and Foothills. So I'd like to do a pass on those.

[02:33:46] Well, let me throw out this idea first. Mahogany and Friends isn't on this list. Is it on another list? We recommended that Mahogany and Friends be considered by the Economic Development Authority for potential funding related to financial literacy through them.

[02:34:07] And that's probably on another list as well. I think so. Also, there was a recommendation for New Hill and a recommendation for the CIC to be considered through economic development office and not through the human services funding process because they don't have direct service, basic services impacts on the most vulnerable, so they will never rise to even tier five.

[02:34:36] All right, so let's cordon that off because that's outside of what the other two are. But we're not going to drop it. We'll have to address it. So the ore in the foothills piece, here's my thought. just for the supervisors it sounds like the recommendation would be if increases go here whatever that dollar is it would come from the technical adjustment pot of money um there's a couple ways to go we can take votes now or if it's interesting to you to see how it impacts other

[02:35:10] things then we worst case it by that like let's say the seven the 37 for foothills gets taken out of the technical adjustments and gets parked in the foothills place, not for final call yet, but it starts to adjust out the other number, our bucket that we're playing in, for consideration as the other issues that are impacted, the wiggle that we talked about earlier, happens.

[02:35:38] So I'm happy to do it that way if that doesn't frustrate staff. At some point, staff's going to want us to make hard decisions, but I think with this one, flexibility is still there for us especially since we're still have town halls to go through and public hearings etc um andy do you have a is that going to frustrate staff if we do it that way so i'll ask a question would it assist the board if we gave me the highest cost scenario if the board wanted to fully fund that's what i'm asking foothills and therapeutic yeah yeah we could uh in just a moment we could share with an updated reserve contingencies would be if the board were to fully fund both right i'm not feeling the pressure to make the final call

[02:36:17] on those yet I think sometimes these technical adjustment dollars whether we do this or not what's left over might be unsatisfactory for other areas and that's the piece we don't know yet so we can't make that call so I don't want to make hard votes on this because then it's gonna lock it in and sometimes that works to your disadvantage none of it's locked in until we say yes to the budget but that's how I'd like to approach it yes this is of your budget of course and and your technical adjustments are yours to make.

[02:36:50] I think I would feel guilty if I didn't share with you that there are other agencies listed on this list who meet the same criteria that you all are identifying for the therapeutic docket and for Foothills in terms of their contractual or policy relationships to systems of care or to Albemarle County-specific services.

[02:37:12] We're aware. Okay. Appreciate that. We're aware. The politics of this is what we're going to have to own. So if we make decisions that change related to that, we can't say, well, staff, this is on the board. All right, what I'd like to do, because we're past our time, we should have taken a recess.

[02:37:29] I'd like to take the recess now, and then we'll come back, get into the bigger tax rate pieces, and then we'll be able to continue with what we need to do today from that standpoint. May I ask my question that I forgot? Yeah. Yeah, I just wanted to know if administrative costs, if those are part of all these proposals and are not counted or if there are administrative costs.

[02:37:55] In other words, instead of going to help people, individuals and such in the county, some of them are going for, you know, make a living administrative costs. Administrative costs below a certain number is an eligibility requirement to consideration in the project, just like being a formal 501c3, and I can't remember if that's 10% or 20% at the moment.

[02:38:21] It's less than what the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services requires, but we can get that number for you. But you cannot apply for consideration if your admin is above either 10% or 20%, and I can check and verify what that number is for you. Thank you. That does it. Thank you.

[02:38:38] All right, we're on we're not on recess. I really don't want to disrupt a break Before we get to I get some of the bigger fish in the bond There are agencies on six and seven for the arts and cultural and there But it's to the board's discretion when they would like that Yeah, I understand sometimes we push past these breaks at least for me I get a little mentally tired and could use the break. So if we could take the recess. We'll pick up where we left off

[02:39:04] Thank you. All right. Thank you everyone call us back from recess. Sorry, mr. Bowman sometimes I Can I interrupt the flow?

[02:39:22] Sometimes I need a break, too. Sorry, that was an attempt at humor. So to answer the last board's question, if the board were to fully fund the request for the OAR therapeutic docket and the Foothills program, that would take the ongoing reserve down from about \$663,000 to about \$554,000.

[02:39:44] So the board would still have room to work with. And on top of that, they would still have the \$510,000 in one-time reserve if they were to do something. Say that number one more time. I'm sorry. Sorry. If those two agencies' requests were funded at the requested amounts, the ongoing reserve contingency would be \$555,000.

[02:40:06] Thank you. So the next, I'll look to the chair because I know the board has a full evening agenda. And we could continue the conversation with the arts and culture, which are smaller. But we could also move to the affordable housing and school operating as those are larger It's really trying to support the board and their best work because they will be asked to take action on a proposed budget And a proposed tax rate for advertisement today board I'm happy to go either way if we continue because it's coming from the same pot of money It stays in the theme the other one is a little bit more urgent to be addressed today the tax rate ones would be

[02:40:44] three and four and eight Is there a preference? Can we see the arts and cultural list like service bathroom if you could go to that slide? I mean a lot of these are going to be the same Why don't we just go ahead and continue with our line of thinking here? Yeah Perspective it frames it for those identified by the board the total difference. There's about a hundred sixty thousand dollars of that 160,000 and unfunded

request 103 of that is from the Charlottesville ballet, so we'll just go through here Supervisor Malik, I think you raised some that were on this list.

[02:41:23] I did, but could you please repeat what you just said? The change is \$160,000, and of that, something came out of the way. So the math, comparing the total request and the total recommendation columns, that number is about a \$160,000 difference between \$212,000 requested and \$52,000 recommended for these agencies who are shown on the slide, which is not everyone in the process.

[02:41:45] Of that unfunded request, Charlottesville Ballet, the very top line, is \$103,000 that is requested but not recommended. So they are a disproportionate share of the total unfunded amount. Just trying to give perspective to the board on where the differences are mostly.

[02:42:02] Yeah, that was the Charlottesville Ballet word that I missed, so I didn't know where I was going. Yeah. Okay, very good. And it did not dawn on me before that their request was so, so, so high. I know the programs are wonderful. but someone else had mentioned the front porch.

[02:42:20] That is one that the funding is directed to an all-county program, so I am supportive of keeping that. The Jefferson School, the data beneficiaries in the county, 65%. I would like some information because I know there are programs there that county people attend, but the space is rented by agencies, so I don't know quite how that comes real.

[02:42:48] That is one that I've just been concerned. It's a county-funded department renovation of a building, and so I don't know why it has jumped up in two years from \$0 to \$10,000, and other county things have been cut.

[02:43:06] So do I need to go through all the things I mentioned the other day? I'd hold, because that's a question, it sounds like. I would ask, in the interest of time, we could prepare more thorough write-ups specifically about Jefferson School. And the board, if they would desire a change in the recommendation, would have an opportunity either on April 1st, April 15th, or April 2nd.

[02:43:26] That sounds right. We're not taking anything away from this bucket yet. So the further explanation would be useful before we could probably do that. Okay. And then you can, I'm sorry, you can go ahead. All right. So in addition to the things I was concerned about because they're city agencies, I definitely wear the band.

[02:43:46] we're increasing an amount to give them either full funding or returning where they've been for the last 15 years, then that is certainly one where we've heard lots of information in support of their activities. I guess I'll highlight that one and then go on from there. Now, I know that the recommendation, the REC, is from five to eight, so that's three. When you say historically? It's from eight to five, and they were eight for 15 years, and then they requested 11, but they were

[02:44:20] cut from eight to five so restoring where they've been would be helpful oh so i've got the number right five to eight i just did them looked at the okay so three grand is the difference that's right for their request oh their request was five but okay um all right supervisor pruit yeah on this one uh similar to previously i'm hugely sympathetic to the charlottesville band um i have friends and neighbors who are active in the band who attend their shows i am very sympathetic to the impact

[02:44:56] it can have on a smaller organization of consistent level funding followed by what to us is a really de minimis drop um so i get it i have to adopt a consistent and coherent rule which is i'm not going

to weigh in on individual funding on this one um and this one because it's such a easy amount it I really have to grit my teeth on it but it is I would not be in favor of a board-directed change on this because it would it would open up a it would eliminate our justification to not entertain literally discretion over

[02:45:34] every single discrete one of these applications which I don't think is a position we want to find ourselves in and I would also just offer for a correction and I'm open to being corrected on this correction but the Front Porch, Supervisor Malik, you mentioned that this is going toward a specific county program.

[02:45:52] And I don't think that's true in this context. They've applied under both the arts and cultural and festival process, and they applied through the nonprofit agency process. The nonprofit agency process is going to the Roots and Wings preschool program, which is a county program.

[02:46:12] That's not what's on the screen. What's on the screen is their funding for their operating costs as an arts-focused agency, which we are not the plurality of their beneficiaries. That's no problem at all. That would be like if I wanted to get my claw hammer lessons, that's where I would go.

[02:46:30] That was an error on my part because of things showing up in so many different places. I absolutely got confused. Thank you. Good clarification. Supervisor Lopisto-Curley? Yes, I would like to see for Charlottesville Ballet, which I've attended a number of their presentations, and it is actually in Charlotte, excuse me, in Avamorla County, and they serve residents of both.

[02:46:53] They also give scholarships for students to be able to learn dance, learn ballets. They also have a program for seniors. But the reason why I'm bringing this up is that the numbers that we've received, I know you received the same numbers I have.

[02:47:12] Those are different from the numbers that we see on the screen. And I would just ask, since we're looking at staff, to maybe look at some things, if they could just please check those numbers out and see if there's a, maybe it's a process of not being updated.

[02:47:30] Those numbers are directly from the application the agency submitted last fall. Correct. So I would presume that agencies may have updated numbers since then, but we're basing this off the data that we received from them and involved during the application process. Okay. Do you have a dollar amount associated with this interest?

[02:47:50] Well, they are, yeah, Charles Hill Ballet, is that what you're saying? Yeah, they're asking for \$103. I would say I would go back, frankly, to the \$2,500 that they've asked for before. All right.

[02:48:06] Anything else? No, thank you. Supervisor Missal? Only just to say that I, too, am a huge supporter of the arts, and I think it's really challenging to try to pick one out of the rest that is more eligible. I think the Charlottesville Ballet number was skewed because in the past they've only applied for the CB moves, which I think is Charlottesville Ballet moves, and this time they're actually applying for operating funds as well.

[02:48:31] So that's what skewed it high. So I don't have any particular – I mean, I'm an advocate of all of these, so I don't have any particular recommendations. All right. Supervisor Duncan. Ms. Demick's point about there being a lot more agencies than what's listed on screen was well taken. I am retracting my comment about the OAR funding because on principle, same with these, I'm going to, you know, follow the recommendations of staff in the committee and not get in the weeds on any of the numbers.

[02:49:10] Okay, the Charlottesville band speaker today, was it in, and I didn't, because I haven't looked at the application since then, but his point about, and this could open up a whole other can of worms, but the 250th, he was talking about his inflationary cost increases, but also be given that the fact that this is the 200, I am not going to attempt to say the word that 250th anniversary is semi, semi sesquicentennial.

[02:49:43] holy crap so um but that that was a persuasive or compelling reason because it makes this particular year something of interest that something like a band could be there so that's just a justification that i'm using in my brain um i must but but my question is was that illuminated in the application do we know that i had a recent email for everybody within the last yeah staff is shaking their head no um i always share generally there's been uh from many agencies information that has been uh emailed to the board and staff that was not part of the applications

[02:50:23] so i think this is going to be part of our education in the future the importance of them to share their data in the application itself because that is what we are using to make our recommendations yeah um all right thank you um in just scanning the rest of these i don't know if there are others are doing things in relation to that or not, but that's an interesting, I'm going to ponder on that for a little bit. All right, in terms of the Seville Band and the Seville Ballet with the number of the level funding back, I hear two just knows for anything to stay with the

[02:51:02] process. Obviously, the two that have raised the issue have come up, so there's two, so that leaves me and you i would support that which the raising the charlottesville ballet and the band to their original levels uh both you said both organizations and supervisor malik on the ballet yes the same as net i mean to put it back to where they were last year would be or this current year would be all right yeah who am i missing on the band

[02:51:40] Supervisor Lepisto currently on the band? Yes. All right. For the sake of a final, like what we did with the other piece, I will say yes to those to put them in the category of the worst case scenario like we did with the other.

[02:51:59] Yeah, so for one agency being \$2,500, the other being \$3,000, that would leave roughly \$550,000 if those two agencies and the two human services were all funded by the board. So the board would still be in a place of flexibility. As I'm the person carrying that to four, I want to make it clear that that's not my complete final decision in support for that move.

[02:52:20] But I think we can look at it in the bigger scheme of what else we're considering. We can do that. All right. So the last agency today was just the identified in the capital process for the Dogwood Vietnam Memorial.

[02:52:37] Ms. Malcolm has gone through the details before, so I'll turn it back over to the board for direction on this item. All right. Dogwood Vietnam Memorial, remind me who raised this item. I did. All right, Supervisor Malek, you want to start us off? As I mentioned before, their original request years ago to the city and the county was \$600, and Cree Deeds put in another \$600 from the legislature in a budget thing two years ago.

[02:53:02] So any extra money we can put in beyond \$250, I would appreciate that because this is a constituency who is important and does a lot of work for our county and fought for us, and I would really like to support them as much more as we can get.

[02:53:21] And Andy, help me here. This should, if it were to come from one of our technical adjustments, should come from the one-time funding bucket. It could, and there also is, Ms. Malcolm, if you don't mind hopping back to the slide on the different buckets available to the board.

[02:53:38] In the CIP is \$394,000 and the Advancing Strategic Priorities Reserve that's undesignated. So that would be one if the board wanted to apply some funding from that and or the one-time reserve of contingencies. Both of those would be appropriate if the board would like to go down that path.

[02:53:57] So you have two different pots that you could potentially pull from there. Supervisor Pruitt, thoughts? This is yet another one where I'm not sure I see the value in us weighing in on as a discreet item. Supervisor LaPista Kirtley?

[02:54:15] I'm supportive of the Dogwood Memorial, but if we give extra monies, I'd actually like to see whether or not Charlottesville will match that, since it is in the city of Charlottesville. I'd like to, you know, if we can do that with them.

[02:54:32] They're also building a bridge, and we know how expensive that is. I'm just, I mean, I can't tell them which, where, where to go, which direction to go. But, you know, they're putting, they want to put a bridge across the John Warner Parkway, which is extremely expensive.

[02:54:52] It's not also building a bridge, right? That's the whole thing. That's what the whole thing is. This is what this project is. The parking lot also. The parking lot is separate from the bridge. That's part of it. Yeah. Go ahead. But I would like to see if Charlottesville is willing to. Clear us up on what the project is, please.

[02:55:09] Yeah, so according to their application, they're requesting funding that would support both the bridge and the parking lot. The total project cost is estimated to be \$2.4 million, and they were requesting \$600,000 of that from the county. For both projects. And the city did \$250,000.

[02:55:25] We were doing \$250,000. Correct. All right. Supervisor Duncan? Missile. Starting to wonder, Chair. No, I'd just throw out also supportive of this initiative, and I'll also just throw this in there because Supervisor Pruitt also kind of sometimes riffs on more theoretical things.

[02:55:49] And so what I'll say is I'm starting to get my head wrapped around this discussion, which initially felt very uncomfortable to me. I feel more confident that we're here as advocates, and if we're here as advocates for certain things, that's okay. I mean, that's why we're in this position.

[02:56:05] So I don't have a problem with that. I'm not saying I'm not an advocate for something else, and we're not pulling from funds that are going to hurt other organizations. As, you know, we're either being reached out to by our constituents in support of things, so we're supportive of those. I think it's okay for us to be advocating for these things.

[02:56:24] And so I do advocate for this as well as the others that I've mentioned. All right. Thank you. Supervisor Duncan? My understanding is that they are fundraising for this bridge because the city did not want to take it on as their own bridge and pay for the whole thing. So I would doubt how much more willing they'd be willing to put in.

[02:56:46] The other thing is if we did add more to this, theoretically to the prior discussion about ACERP, is that I think the hope would be that some of this extra money could go into there. And so if we're putting it towards the bridge, that's something that's not being used for probably better purposes so I'm in favor of

how it is in the budget but I'm not in favor of adding any more to it all right and my question that I would be of interest to me is that if the county were willing to increase

[02:57:23] if the city would go along I don't think the decision should be contingent on that but I think it would weigh heavily on how i would decide on it um because that's a that's a twofer if they were willing to do that i don't necessarily agree with the with the rationale that they wouldn't based on what was just said but um we've we've been down this road before and i think one has somebody has to be the grown-up and go first and i think there's a much higher likelihood that the council would increase if the board made an affirmative choice to increase if the council

[02:57:58] did too because the reason it's taken three years to get anywhere is because there was nobody would go first so i propose that we go first and i'm sorry where were you on this supervisor lepesto currently that we asked the city of charlottesville to also the same amount whether it's um 25 000 50 000 all right i think we can worst case this one like we did with the other agencies with four interested in some level to move it forward with that and is that a reasonable thing jeff that could maybe at least take a temperature yes sir on a match yes sir all right thank you all right

[02:58:37] i think we're andy and just you stop me and say i need more if you feel like you need more info from no that's helpful with the 394 000 in the advancing strategic priorities reserve the difference in this is 350 000 so that could be the board has an option to address this without impacting anything else in the budget yeah all right then the next one is the yeah it gets into to tax rates, and so I would suggest we actually jump back to the last two items, which are affordable housing and the schools, which we can take in either direction the board would like.

[02:59:09] Housing happens to be the first up in the deck. Well, let's, I guess, housing's up. What was the second? Well, I'm sorry, the tax rate was the other? The, yeah, the affordable housing, the tax rate, and then if the board is desiring a change to the public school's transfers.

[02:59:29] I was thinking of the eighth one, which is the tax rate. Yes. All right, so you can't, why don't you go ahead and drop that back to the housing? We'll go there first. Supervisor Malik, thoughts on the Affordable Housing Investment Fund? Increasing, getting ideas of how, if we wanted to.

[02:59:49] So a question that occurred to me when I was out on the tractor yesterday was the original four cents that the tax rate increased last year. 3.2 went to the schools. No, 3.2 is dedicated for several years well into the future for public safety.

[03:00:11] And so I would propose that we would take that 0.8 that was in discussion last year and put it all into the AHIF instead of half as we did last year because that was a one-year thing to the schools last year.

[03:00:27] They're getting amply supported already, and so I would propose that for discussion. So, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, and so can staff, we pulled ahead the 3.2 for public safety.

[03:00:42] We pulled ahead the .4 for the affordable housing. The remaining .4 did not remain dedicated to schools this year, went to the general fund and to the other split conversation. If you wanted to now dedicate that 0.4, it seems to me the two options, or maybe three, would be raise the tax rate by the 0.4, dedicate it totally, and that's a tax rate increase.

[03:01:08] If we don't do the tax rate increase, then the 0.4 has to be deducted from what is we've already sent to the school, so we would be pulling some back to match the 0.4 amount, or somewhere else on our own side. Do I have those three options right?

[03:01:25] The value of 0.4 is about \$1.3 million, and so that 0.4 is built into the school's base. The growth of that 0.4 is shared in the formula. And so to add the \$1.3 million to the housing fund, it would need to be taken from the \$218 million general fund transfer.

[03:01:45] Oh, so it would hit all three categories based on the split, technically. It would be, so I think there's probably the mechanics of it, and then there's kind of what the board's intent would be. We could approach that from two different conversations. So in the county executive's recommended budget, we claw back that 1.3, which isn't all in the school side.

[03:02:09] So you would have to do some clawbacks, in other words, based on what the county executive's recommended to be able to dedicate that .4. Right. However, the 0.4 last year to the schools, why did that go into the base when that was told?

[03:02:25] We're told it was one year, and that was all. I mean I've tried to raise this last year also but didn't yeah so past tax rates and adjustments have gone into the base whichever that may be there was a one-time transfer that was provided to the schools for the health fund that was not part of the base the distinction the board made back on November 19th when they updated their financial management policies is the growth in the pennies for public safety and affordable housing the growth of those pennies would not be split but the growth in the point four for schools would be split and so the value of a change in four-tenths of a penny is about 90-some thousand dollars and so schools

[03:03:03] are receiving 54 percent of that than the hundred thousand it's about a forty-some thousand dollar impact i answered this question recently which is why how can rattle these numbers off my head well i may have made a suggestion that is worth more causing more difficulty than it's solving so maybe it's simpler to leave it alone and go get the money somewhere else right because the point four if it would have remained dedicated wouldn't have been in the split this year and they would have just got that full shot and that was where i thought i was operating from so thank you for that clarification sorry to take the time any other items so you're uh in terms of the fund interested in getting some more money there we just still are figuring out from where

[03:03:39] um yes and i actually have one question about this slide the 22 million invested in the bottom um that includes state grants correct that are just pass-throughs many many millions just so we're clear that it's not \$22 million in taxpayer money.

[03:03:57] I want to look to the group behind me. I know a lot of that is a combination of one-time funding. It is the dedicated tax rates for the last two years. I'll double check to see if there's any of the state funding that was in that. CDBG grants and things were added in as local money over and over again. I want to clarify if that's included in this too.

[03:04:18] We can just take that as a follow-up and give it an answer. CDBG funds are accounted for separately from this fund, But we can do a quick check to make sure there's nothing else mixed in. It may be separate already. Thank you. Go ahead. Or did you have more? No, I don't. I'm just confused. Supervisor Pruitt.

[03:04:35] To first just speak to the previous issue, I would just note that if we're talking about for out years, as in not the current half year, well, obviously not the current half year, but not also the fiscal year that we're budgeting for, But if we're looking at fiscal year 28, I actually could express some interest in Supervisor Malik's proposal of going back and rededicating that .4, which we're really actually only taking .2, a fifth of a cent that we're moving.

[03:05:10] I could see some interest and value in moving that in a future planning year, but not one where we've already transmitted a notional budget to our partners in the schools, and now we're clawing it back, and we've already built around our own budget assumptions of how the roughly two-tenths of a cent are going into our own general fund.

[03:05:33] It introduces a lot of problems in the proposed budget, but I could see the value in exploring that in the next budget cycle. So I would just voice that now. And that being said, this is a seven-figure question mark, And even I, in my appetite for digging around, I don't think I can meet the size of the ask without getting to question number eight.

[03:06:00] And so this, while I appreciate that this is set out as a separate discussion point, I feel like this discussion is entirely the tax rate advertising discussion. And so I will hold my powder until then. Or you can jump in. Or I can jump. You know what? I'll jump in.

[03:06:17] To try to keep these next three items clean and separate containers is probably not going to be possible. So we might as well just get in there. Yeah. So, um, Andy, is that all right? You just gave a side eye. I was making it is actually okay. Sure. With Ms. Malcolm to be clear and she gave me the thumbs up. No, but I can also, while I'm here, answer Supervisor Malik's question. Of that \$22 million, about \$700,000 of that was pandemic relief funding. The rest of that were to come from one time money the board is dedicated or the tax rate. So thank you to Mr. Unsworth.

[03:06:47] the quick assistance. Thank you. Alright supervisor Pritt. I think goals are valuable and as I've already indicated in our agency funding thing and so I think that's also true as far as political goals and policy goals and so I'm not going to sit here and debate 10 million but 10 million is the goal I'm striving for. We have had members of the public talk about suggest the idea of dedicating a cent on real estate property tax in the future toward toward affordable housing that alone for this year gets us exactly to 10 million because it's 3.3 for the

[03:07:27] upcoming fiscal year and for the remainder of this year it would be um what is it 1.66 something like that which is almost exactly 10 million for this fiscal year i'm looking to see that i haven't made something so that that would get us there alone um i also don't think it's helpful to paint ourselves into corners and to assume that that is necessarily just because it's the one that's been broached by the public is the smartest way to get there. I want to keep multiple avenues open for us and potentially invite the possibility for a blended revenue stream on

[03:08:06] this. So I think it would also be prudent to advertise an additional one cent real estate tax and an additional \$0.29 personal property tax, which is the approximate equivalent. That gives us the ability to chop and screw our goal from different, maybe we do \$0.4 and \$0.17, something like that.

[03:08:32] Maybe we do all personal property and no. But that would give us the opportunity to have those more thorough policy discussions in how we might want to hit that goal, if that is a goal that the rest of the board agrees that we could strive toward using tax revenues as a mechanism. It would also, I think,

make very acute, like, hey, if we agree on this goal and both of these revenue options are not palatable, I think it is a, it also is a helpful forcing function to say, okay, well, where are we going to find the rest of the money? But it sets

[03:09:07] that clear goal. It presents two options and invites us to look for others. And could you just, I wrote down the totals, the 0.1 to real estate and 29 to personal property. Then you said another set. What was that? Oh, I, those were just, I was giving the example of maybe we could do 0.4 to real estate. And then I was trying to estimate it in my head, but whatever the, whatever the resultant proportion and personal point being, we could do half and half, 60 40 that kind of thing but right now you're recommending the one cent sales tax on prop real

[03:09:43] estate and 29 29 cents on personal property that is correct fully dedicated to housing let's clarify you meant property tax personal property you said sales tax i just want to make sure you correct it personal property and real estate one percent property tax okay just to clarify if it assists the board in the discussion because this is dedicated would it be the board's intent, or I guess the supervisor's intent to have the one-time money in 26, I'll be dedicated to the housing fund as well.

[03:10:15] Could you say that again? Sorry. Oh, the current year. Yeah, the current year. That would go into the housing fund as well. Okay. Thank you. Because that's how you mathed it to 10, right? That is how I mathed it to 10. Thank you. Otherwise, it would be a both and instead of an either or.

[03:10:30] Yep. All right. Supervisor Duncan? Who am I? I'm just going to you all day. Supervisor Lopisto Kirtley. He really wants to call Supervisor Duncan. Go down the line. I'm glad to be last. I'm not going to say that comment. All right, go ahead.

[03:10:46] Okay, so my feeling on this is what we have proposed. I'm in favor of the \$5 million for affordable housing. I think because of the whole split for this year, I think we should leave it, frankly, as is the .4 to affordable housing of the tax bill and then the .4 for schools and other things.

[03:11:12] I'm vehemently against advertising for a one-cent tax rate. I don't mind if we slowly get to the \$10 million, maybe \$1 million a year for the next few years, see where we're going, see what's happening with our commercial, AstraZeneca, other places coming in.

[03:11:37] So I think we can eventually get there. I'm not in favor of doing it next year. I'm not in favor of raising the one cent, even proposing the one cent sales, I keep saying sales tax, real estate property tax.

[03:11:52] And I'll tell you why. Because I think it's, for me, it's disingenuous to have that advertised, knowing we may do it, we may not do it, depending on how the board votes. And I don't want to cause that anxiety, frankly, amongst our citizens.

[03:12:13] I don't think we need to do it. So I would not be in favor of doing that, and I would not be in favor of saying, yes, we're going to advertise this. That's going to give us a ton of negative support, which that's fine.

[03:12:31] You know, we can all take that. But why cause that? We've been getting letters regarding assessments. We don't know what the future may bring on a federal level. I mean, things are going, frankly, bonkers, and I just am taking a different approach, and I'd just rather kind of calm the waters, so to speak.

[03:12:55] Thank you. Okay. Did you say I'm next? Good job. Supervisor Missal. Thank you, Chair. So I'll throw out a couple of ideas. One is we have to make material differences in the Affordable Housing Fund, bottom line.

[03:13:17] I mean, that is unquestionable. The other thing that's apparent is costs are increasing for everyone all across the board, right? It costs more to build homes. It costs more to live in homes and to afford homes. Construction costs, same thing.

[03:13:36] So what I would be in favor of is to revisit the .4 cents that we talked about next year. And I think that was Supervisor Malek that initially brought that up. I would also not be in favor of raising real estate taxes this year to cover an additional amount because of the pressures that are being felt by assessments that have gone up, et cetera, et cetera.

[03:14:10] I think we, bottom line for me is we need a roadmap. And you've heard me say this before. We need to figure out how to get from here to success. And I don't think a million dollars a year is enough to do that. I think we need to think more aggressively about that.

[03:14:27] But we need to plan for it. We need to get to a place where it's predictable because then the community will be able to anticipate that's where we're headed. The community of developers of affordable housing will be able to anticipate that. Others will be able to anticipate if there are increases in taxes in the future.

[03:14:46] They'll know that's coming. It's a roadmap to success for us to achieve where we need to be with affordable housing. So that's where I stand. All right. And I'm just going to repeat so that I got it, but no change to the recommended tax rate for the current year.

[03:15:05] Correct. One question I do have, the one-cent sales tax increase is one, was it 3.3? Yes. Million? And the personal property tax? One penny would be \$113,000. Thank you, \$113,000, that's right. Just one correction, I believe he said sales tax, and it's real, and it's personal, and I don't, houses.

[03:15:26] No, my bad. I knew you knew what you were saying, but it's really just correcting it for the record, because we have citizens that sometimes let us know. And continue to do that, please, because we, what I will say, though, while I've still got the, if I still have the mic, is I think there are opportunities, you know, if you do the math, and you think about, you know, we've been talking about the funds that the, the technical adjustment funds.

[03:15:52] My math is really very rough. We're at about a million dollars left in that. And I think in the end, if those funds are available, that should be allocated to affordable housing. And I'm sorry, where is that million at? That's the technical adjustments.

[03:16:08] Ongoing and? It was both combined, ongoing and one time. Well, let's see, the 814, 660 minus the worst case scenarios. Yeah, if we go to the next slide, actually, with the option C where we started. Yeah, so those were where we were after technical adjustments if the four agencies to arts and cultural and to Human services were funded that would take that number down to about 550,000 so between the two there would be about a million in total The board is free to spend that entire amount But I would encourage them that over the last few years is typical to a minimum spend about

[03:16:48] 250,000 ongoing for things that come up So the board does not required to but that is just something that based on experience There's been some need or in recent years to tap into that for a few

hundred thousand dollars. I would just express a Respectful caution if the board were to consider using all that. Thanks for the reminder. Yep. All right now it's Supervisor Duncan Yes, Supervisor Duncan One I am a history teacher and not math so it's really hard for me to do numbers without it like in front of me to study Um, I am, so in principle, I'm uncomfortable with taking the 0.4 cents from schools and putting it

[03:17:25] towards anything else, but I understand there's a split and like looking at what that actually looks like would be helpful. Um, the city has a much smaller budget than we do. They give a lot more money to affordable housing than we do. They also have higher taxes than we do. Um, so I am in favor of the one cent real estate tax, um, slowly getting to \$10 million over a period of years when we've already had a discussion tonight about clearly there's a desperate need um it feels to me like the argument over the fight for a 15 minimum wage when people started fighting for it

[03:18:03] they said by the time we get it it's going to need to be higher and so like you know if we get to 10 million in five years we're going to need more than 10 million in five years um but i agree we need we need a plan we need a roadmap we need a way to create the money for this if we really don't have it in our budget, how are we going to get the money for this? So yeah, so I'm in favor of everything Supervisor Pruitt said. As a slight alternative, the city's personal property taxes is \$4.40. Ours is \$4.28. So even if we didn't do \$0.29, if we raised it to at least meet what

[03:18:41] the city's is, that would give us some more. But yeah, housing is a problem in this area. We get emails about it. I think we need to increase our elderly tax relief. The base amount needs to raise because as people's houses are going up, they're being cut out from the relief. We have to come up with the money somewhere. So what are we going to do? All right. Give me, and I just want to load this question in there because I think it's a formula thing that we're going to have to think about. The shared revenues has come up obviously as a conversation and there seemed to be the talk

[03:19:19] of last year you know we dedicated and that hits the shared revenues just like the i'm not even talking about the the cip reserve piece but can unless you already have it locked in your brain we probably need to be thinking about how it changes the split if you would in the following year if we did some of these maneuvers yes i would say the way the board's policy is written and i'll double check this when i get back to my seat it does not specify a 0.4 cents for housing, it just is the dedicated transfer to affordable housing.

[03:19:55] So whether that amount is .4 or .1 or .2 or whatever it is, the board's intent is for that to be dedicated to that, until which time the board changes that. Because it's the board's formula, not anyone else's. I guess what I'm asking is that current year, now this was both the CIP and what we dedicated last year for whatever purposes, if next year we're going to do it again the 6.4 if we decide to go that way and then if what supervisor Pruitt and Duncan are advocating for that both that new cent and that 29 cents on the other one would be

[03:20:33] locked away and not split that changes the percentage I'm looking to see what dynamic does it take to maybe move the split from 52 to 51 I'm not saying that's a good or bad thing but I want it to be a known thing yeah that's one I think we would need a moment to do that to Calculate that one Buell this evening.

[03:20:51] Get it in the gears and moving around. I'm just going to come to Supervisor Malik to weigh in on what Supervisor Pruitt brought up. And then we'll, because I don't want. I did not respond to the

increase. Okay. Well, thank you very much for that. And I know at the last board meeting or the work session, someone raised about changing the split.

[03:21:12] And if there is a certainty that's needed, make it 45%. And then they know that that much is coming and maybe they'll get more. But to have this arguing about a tiny little percentage makes it increase this sort of let's spend it all now.

[03:21:31] So anyway, I'm not supportive of the increase in the tax rate. The burden on the residents and the renters, because everybody's rent went up last year after the four-cent tax increase happened, has just been a real burden for this year for basically everybody.

[03:21:51] I want to save as much as we can in general, knowing that chaos is in our future, then I'm always going to save it in a reserve somewhere for these large amounts. The A-HIF, I think the evolution of the process over the last 12 months means that the next 12 months we're going to get a far better process and more questions answered and more clarity ahead of time and the timetables better, which will make of its own self the more efficient use of the funding we have.

[03:22:24] And I'm very glad to work on that. Planning for attaining the housing we really need, which is that 60% and below, not just more market rate houses everywhere, is to me the core discussion that the board needs to face.

[03:22:41] Because just more houses in Albemarle County's market, as described in the recent national article in the Washington Post, supply and demand does not work everywhere. And this is one of those places where it does not work. Because in addition to the 6,000 future residents we graduate every single June, they all want to come back here when they retire.

[03:23:00] There is incredible pressure that has nothing to do with any board process or zoning rules or permit time or anything else. It is just that there is an insatiable demand of people who want to come here. So we need to figure out how to deliver the controlled, predicted, affordable, attainable housing that we really, that our residents, especially our long-term residents who have been here forever and worked here for their whole lives. I do not want to be throwing them out.

[03:23:33] Thank you. So I'll weigh in here. I think the decision today is for advertisement. It's not the final decision. I think that's important. I don't think, I've been doing this for eight years and four years prior on the school board. What I have learned is whatever happens to the tax rate and whatever happens to no tax rate increase, but if a tax bill goes up, we hear negative stuff.

[03:24:05] Because it's already gone up. What I have also seen, though, over the last eight years on this board, is that when either of those happen or both happen, most while they're, I said this at the day the county executive made his recommendation, there's always 10% that says too much, spend less, And there's always 10% roughly that's going to say, not enough, spend more.

[03:24:29] And then in between becomes, well, what are you going to use it for? Not that it's not tough, not that they're happy about it, but there's another layer of conversation that happens. So the fact that we're getting today is about setting a tax rate, and then each of us are going to walk into town halls, have further discussion, further public hearings.

[03:24:50] I'm not going to be presumptive about what that feedback is going to be yet until I hear it. And I certainly have seen affordable housing be just I said it the other day to someone that it just seems to be

taking up a lot of oxygen on a lot of issues across a lot of different silos.

[03:25:11] So I think it's important enough that from a tax or from an advertised tax rate that I would join Supervisor Pruitt and Duncan in supportive of it to hear what the community would have to say about it and get that feedback. Now, this isn't going to be great for my tracking purposes here, but this is also one, since it's relative to the tax rate, that we'll probably have to start taking some votes on.

[03:25:37] But before we go to that, from an understanding of positions, right, I think I'm clear on where everybody stands and why, but is there any additional information before we take some sort of vote? I'd like to make my closing arguments, counsel.

[03:25:56] So I want to make two different points, and first is this board thinks about real estate property tax a lot. We talk about personal property tax a little bit less, and so I just want to make a brief argument for if you feel one is too toxic, maybe we can have a breakout.

[03:26:16] I would say I'm going to give you a list of counties. Cumberland, Dinwiddie, Greensville, Isle of Wight, Southampton, Stafford, and Pittsylvania. Those are all counties that have a higher tax rate than what I'm suggesting on personal property.

[03:26:33] And that is an eclectic bunch, and it is not ones you would think of as more tax and spend types than us. I'll actually point out that Pittsylvania, which in a lot of ways is quite similar to us, they are also the populous exurb of an enclave city in the south side, right?

[03:26:51] We have a lot of similarities. Their personal property tax is nine cents. Sorry, it is nine. It is more than twice ours. It is extraordinarily high. So this is something that's all over the map. It is also something that, while there's general discontent about it existing, I have found in my limited experience on this board that we have a less intense reaction from the public on it.

[03:27:18] It is also one that has certain, we've discussed this in the previous year, there are progressive exclusions for lower-valued properties, which I think is also important to keep in mind. So the person who is struggling to make their two jobs on a beater is paying significantly less, if any, personal property than the person who has two benzos in the yard, right?

[03:27:46] The final, the second point I wanted to make, that was arguing a justification specifically for personal property, which we don't talk about as much. um the broader point i want to make i i said this once in like a town hall and i've since been like hell yeah mike that was great you coined that um how we approach housing is not act does not need to be that complicated but it is going to be hard it is not complicated but it is hard and i say that in in my apologies in direct response to supervisor missal's uh suggestion which is

[03:28:25] Yes, we could plan for how to climb to \$10 million in out years, and I don't want to speak for our county executive, but I would not be surprised if I turned to Mr. Richardson and said, I want to see the plan for fiscal year 2030 to have \$10 million every year following that in AHIF, that he would say, okay, well, here's the year you're going to have to implement a cent on the tax rate.

[03:28:54] We can do all the planning we want, but eventually we have to do the hard thing. I am not pretending that what I've proposed isn't hard. I certainly don't want to have to assess these taxes, but I think some combination of the two of these is necessary if we're going to meet this need.

[03:29:12] And at some point, we have to skin the cat. We have to nut up and actually do the hard vote. And so that is why I'm supporting this. I'm just going to go back through the round. for everybody. So Supervisor Duncan. Supervisor Duncan, you're next. But just to remind everyone, this is to set a tax rate at the max limit. So keep that in mind as we move forward, that there is still other decisions that have to be made. But I think it is wise before we

[03:29:51] start negotiating down that we have to start, since this is both an important topic and it has to do with the tax rate itself is one that we have to just start making some some calls on before i do the next round though uh mr richardson in terms of you've heard the discussion we've never really in my memory dedicated the personal property tax so i guess before we make final calls decisions comments is there anything staff would want to weigh in on that as a

[03:30:24] Dedicated rate that you feel likes information. We don't have that's pertinent to where we're about to go or staff I could have directed that at Andy. I suppose by trying to read phases one moment. Yeah

[03:30:55] Mechanically any revenue and how it's dedicated It's all in one could be could be dedicated it's all general done revenue. So to me That's one where if the board's intent is clear if there's an administrative hurdle We could figure out a way to to make that work. Yep. I Great. Thank you.

[03:31:11] All right. Supervisor Malek? Thank you. One clarification. I was interested in your comments about Pennsylvania. Their tax rate is \$0.62, and their median real estate value is \$212,000.

[03:31:27] So they may be able to support a \$9 value in their personal property tax for a \$30,000 car, but with our assessments here and our median end price here and the difference, I just, I can't compare those two successfully.

[03:31:47] So I do not have any extra changes beyond what I said already. Thank you. All right. Supervisor Lapisto-Kirtley. Are you sure you're calling on me? Yeah. Okay. I'm still, I'm not in favor of raising or advertising a tax rate hike because I just, I'm not sure where we're going to go with all this.

[03:32:10] I would say if you are dead or if you are sure, completely sure that you want to raise the tax, right, one cent, okay, I can understand that. But if you're not sure or if you don't want to, I would just not, I would not advertise it.

[03:32:27] I think that's disingenuous on our part, frankly. I would not be in favor of raising the personal property tax. However, I did want to ask, Supervisor Malek, did you say that brings in \$1 million? The personal property tax, one penny, would be \$113,000.

[03:32:48] I was just multiplying it times \$4. I'm sorry, \$428. I don't have any money. She was just trying to do an apples-to-apples comparison. Okay, okay. So if we did an increase in the personal property tax, how much would that, is that \$113,000?

[03:33:04] One penny would be \$113,000. The recommendation was \$0.29, so you'd have to math that up. It's approximately equivalent to, it's \$3.27 million. It's approximately equal to one cent on the real estate tax.

[03:33:21] That's why that number was thrown out. I mean, we heard last year, and we're hearing this year from all of our constituents. I just don't think this is the year to do it. And I don't think it's going to take five years to get to \$10 million to assist with affordable housing.

[03:33:42] I think we can do it a lot faster. In my mind, I'm thinking probably in three years that we'll be able to do a lot more within three years. And then we can add to it as we're going there to get to that. But once again, I'm just not in favor of raising the...

[03:33:59] Got it. Okay, you got it? Yep. Both of them. Yeah, I'm going to start speeding us along here because we don't need to repeat what we've said. And that's not a pick on you because I've got to make sure I don't do it either. Supervisor Missal? Thank you. I'm going to pivot just a little bit. I am leaning towards the increase in the personal property tax.

[03:34:18] I'm not necessarily leaning towards it at the level that you're suggesting. I don't have a number in mind. I mean, I kind of do. \$0.17, \$0.18, which is \$2 million, I think, roughly, would be something I would be more comfortable with.

[03:34:35] I'm not comfortable with raising real estate taxes, et cetera, et cetera. And then just one other thing, in response to the roadmap piece, I completely understand. My point is, if we have that roadmap and we are talking about raising taxes and it's three or four years from now, people can anticipate that, we can anticipate that, and try to adjust if we need to.

[03:34:59] That's all. Supervisor Duncan? Yeah, I think also with the roadmap idea, people are going to be mad whenever we raise taxes whether they're prepared or not um so yeah i'm still in favor of it i also think personal property tax is a more equitable way of taxing because if you have an expensive car you can sell it and get a cheaper car and then pay less taxes um but i'm still in favor of both of them all right so we are at a point where uh i think everybody has the information they need to be able to take a vote so i'm looking to supervisor pruitt if you would like to offer a motion yeah i i will offer

[03:35:38] them as discrete motions um hold on oh oh so we do have a motion for uh the board which they can modify this is voting on the issue of whether we want to raise the tax rate or not do we have to say that specifically so well i think it depends in terms of whether the board would like to kind of do a straw poll where there's the actual motion later i think we're taking a vote on whether or not we want to do what we want to do with this one penny and 29 cents on the personal property tax I don't I see that separately as a vote from the final

[03:36:11] advertised tax rate all right thank you it's almost like a it's a formalized straw I'm putting this on the record yeah I don't I'm not a huge fan of the straw polls. So, Supervisor Pruitt? I would like to move that this board consider adopting an additional one-cent real estate, advertising an additional one cent to the real estate property tax rate dedicated to the Affordable Housing Investment Fund. And just that one? You want to do this other one? I want to do them as separate. All right. Is there a second? I second. All right.

[03:36:49] Is there any further discussion? All right. If the clerk would please call the roll. Ms. Lapisto-Kirtley? Nay. Ms. Malik? No. Mr. Missal? No. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan?

[03:37:05] Yes. Mr. Galloway? Yes. All right. The motion's 3-3, so it doesn't get approved or denied, but it fails since it doesn't receive a majority vote. Supervisor Pruitt? I would like to move this board consider adopting an additional 29 cents on the personal property tax rate dedicated to the Affordable Housing Investment Fund.

[03:37:28] Is there a second? Second. Any further discussion? All right, if the clerk would please call the roll. Ms. Lapisto-Curtley? Nay. Ms. Malik? No. Mr. Missal? No.

[03:37:44] Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway? Yes. All right, 3-3, that motion fails as well. All right, board, so we've got that off the table. So now it's a, if supervisors, I'm going to come back around, do you have a modification?

[03:38:03] I'm going to actually go to Mr. Pruitt since it was his first two motions and see if there's another piece here you would like to do and see where it goes, if that's all right with the rest of the board members. I mean, we could just play the game where I keep throwing out new numbers until I get a bite. You want to hear what others have to say?

[03:38:21] I heard this is, you know, I'm imagining the process by which you do settlement negotiations, which I did a few of before I took my hiatus. you just throw numbers at each other back and forth through an intermediary and you're not allowed to talk to each other and honestly you get to a number eventually it might not but you are looking like you might not think that's a good use of our time well i mean if you're going to penny us down and do a vote for per penny on each on the personal property no i'm gonna jump down to 21 cents on the personal property tax rate well since that has gone forward let's see

[03:38:59] if we got other new ideas on how to move between what was recommended and somewhere above it i'll just go through our order supervisor malik any other i mean you're at the recommended rate i'm happy where i am thank you no change and uh i i guess a fair question as i go through this round and i'm putting supervisor malik on the spot is any inclination to go beyond what has been recommended tax rate because if there's not then we don't need to go through the iterations for the ppt only for either either uh no i consider both of them to be maxing out people's

[03:39:38] ability to pay as it is. So the 428 on the PPT is high enough for that. Okay. Because that'll, I think, help us along here. Supervisor Lapiso currently? Yeah. I have no desire whatsoever to look at that. Okay. Supervisor Missal? I would be in favor of looking at a 15 cent increase in the personal property tax. And did you do some quick math to see what that would yield? I did.

[03:40:10] it's just under, it's 1.15 cents, 1.695 million. And again, this is for advertisement. All right.

[03:40:26] And that would take it to 38, 443. I'm on the right one, right? Looking to Andy. Did I just do that right? Is that right? 443. Yes. Roughly 1.695 million. I'm going to ask that, yes, we're giving the thumbs up on the math. And that would generate about half that in the current fiscal year that i would presume the board would direct into that fund as well right and it's for advertisement supervisor uh duncan 17 cents is like 1.9 would you be it is close to two

[03:41:04] we're at 15 well one's saying 15 one's saying 17 so uh i i closer to 2 million sounds better and it's only two extra cents all right well well i got it i'm just looking i'm just trying to pick I mean, I think 15 seems reasonable in that it does increase and it does put more of a burden, but it's also balancing the fact that affordable housing has to make progress forward.

[03:41:37] So to me, that just feels like a good compromise. All right. I am going to, just given how the last vote went, ask Supervisor Missal to make a motion, and then we'll see how this goes on that number. Sure. I'd like to move that we increase.

[03:41:54] Check me on my motion here. So I believe it probably should be at this stage. I move that the board consider an increase in the personal property tax rate to the desired rate I move that the board consider an additional 15 cent on the personal property tax rate Entirely dedicated to affordable housing

seconded. All right. Is there any further discussion? All right If the clerk would please call the roll miss Lapista currently nay miss Malik. No. Mr. Missile. All right. Mr. Pruitt

[03:42:28] aye. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway? Yes. All right. We have that settled. Again, all for advertisement, right? Okay. Andy, we're at, I feel like we've got some honing in. It's dedicated. Yes. There's one more item in the parking lot before we get to the motions for the budget and the tax rates, and that was any direction the board would have related to the transfers to school operations and the CIP. While we're having this conversation, I'm imagining some scurry i mean we'll have to get other motions ready i don't think you have the

[03:43:06] percentage piece that i asked earlier that'll probably be another day you have the 54 versus 52 we need to have that one as a follow-up i think before we take the final vote obviously as we consider the new advertised rate that that has to we have to have that understanding of what yes we will take that as a follow-up what that'll be all right board we're at the uh operating cip transfers this one is honing in on what we're doing versus what the superintendent requested there's other things that could be open here too for consideration but since we just advertised a

[03:43:39] little higher tax rate in one area fully dedicated it doesn't change the math here so who who asked for this one or was driving or this was just one what we were all going to deal with so i'll just go through the order supervisor malik any interest in changing anything here i support option a one time transfer county executives proposal so no change from the county what the county executive recommended all right supervisor Pruitt um I I kind of pithily after saying quite a lot then very pithily disposed of this issue during our work session so I want to just put a little bit more

[03:44:16] stank on that real quick um I I I don't have a strong preference between options one and two retaining entirely in our CIP versus giving it to them to control the CIP and 2.3 million of that for operating funds because of how I'm viewing the nature of the board's role in this right our role is to determine a total amount set aside for school and to plan for their capital expenses right that I don't think of myself as having a role in their operating decisions but we do have a role in their capital decisions. I see both of these as, and I look to Andy to correct me if he

[03:44:55] thinks I'm incorrect on this, I see both of these as being a, if carried out two years, sufficient to meet the saving need for the school's proposed big dollar capital programs. I think that's correct, right? Even at 4.2, if it's carried out two years and held, that would be sufficient for their school ask? For the high school? No, that amount of funding. So if the high school is going to be a \$200 million project of cash and bonds, the placeholder, whether that's a total of \$8.2

[03:45:32] million or \$12 million, there would still need to be support for a 1% sales tax, bond revenue, all the other things. Again, with the art of the possible, we had the first three elements. It was It was the sales tax. It was this new growth allocation.

[03:45:51] It was a third thing that I'm forgetting. I think reprioritized. Yeah, there's an eight million place over half. Does the school's recommendation, if carried out next year also, does that satisfy the criteria for step two in that process? Does that question make sense?

[03:46:07] I'm going to clarify on this one. I don't mean to butt in, but they did not have a step two plan. That's fair. That was asked and answered. Now, to be fair, they also haven't thought about it. That's also true.

[03:46:23] I guess what I'm suggesting is there probably is a balance that could be struck here of if the 4.2, if iterated for a second year, would be sufficient to do that capital-saving component of the new growth that we had suggested, that we could make that decision into year two but still give them that percentage of operating.

[03:46:47] I see that as kind of a Solomon splitting the baby. Is everyone following on what I'm suggesting? And, again, I'm not heavily wedded to either way, but I think that would potentially be a way of making both sides happy if we're saying that would meet the capital demand on year two.

[03:47:06] But I'm not sure if that meets the capital demand on year two because I haven't done the math. It's \$100 million short. So I think that with year two, it's just a plan. Year two is not appropriated, and so I think that'll be a distinction as well, is that whatever amount is in year two, the board will have an opportunity to adjust that.

[03:47:26] The board of supervisors will have an opportunity to adjust that in next year's budget process. Yeah, I am comparing it to what our original discussed proposal was of taking 10% of new growth and allocating that to the CIP for, I think, five years, which would have been 1.9 over five years, which would have been 9.5 at the end of that saving period as part of that step.

[03:47:53] This would be instead, what, eight and a half? So I guess it is less than that. Yeah, it would be less. I would clarify that 1.9 was just kind of put something on paper to give the board to respond to, just to see what that could look like. It was prior to revenues being finalized.

[03:48:08] It was prior to knowing the full LCI, the VRS, everything else we've learned since really late November when that scenario was put together. This board knows how I feel about setting things aside for savings. So I want to, when I'm setting things aside for savings, know I'm tacking to the goal.

[03:48:25] And so I'm trying to get a sense of if just 4.2, what they're suggesting, is sufficient to tack to the goal, then I'm fine with giving them the rest of that operating fund, so long as we are the ones who are enforcing that savings mechanism, going back to your might point.

[03:48:43] Got it. And I'll speak to that. Supervisor Lopisto-Kirtley? Thank you. No, I'm in favor of A and A, 1 and 2. I'm in favor of as is with a recommendation for A.

[03:49:00] All right, Supervisor Missal? I think I'm agreeing with Supervisor Pruitt here, and that is the \$6.4 million is made up essentially of \$2.3 and \$4.1.

[03:49:15] So correct me if this is not really a feasible option, but my thought is to take the \$2.3 and put it as we're seeing in B, balancing the operations of \$3.07.2, by taking the \$4.1 million and using option A, which is to send it directly from the general fund to the CIP.

[03:49:38] Okay. Supervisor Duncan? Yeah, I'm also in favor of that, but also making sure that we earmark the \$4.1 million for schools. I don't think it should just be a general board of supervisors can do what they want with it in five years. I also did have a question in the second half Monday night on the chart.

[03:49:57] There was a slide that said there was \$8 million school placeholder by reallocating school renovations. Is there a way that that could also get moved into the CIP? Yes, that placeholder is in the CIP, and so there's two placeholders in the CIP.

[03:50:18] There's, in the county, you get executives' recommended budget. The renovation funding in year three and four was moved to year five based on the school's stated priority that the high school was a

priority. Then in the, I'll call the other category of the CIP, there's \$12.8 million separately. It's to the board's discretion.

[03:50:35] So this would put, if we did the \$4.1, we'd have \$12.1 million in the CIP for schools. No. If we did, either way in this discussion, there's an \$8 million placeholder for the schools from the renovation funding. What the placeholder would be in the CIP is that \$12.8 million, is that \$8.2 million if we're taking the two-year approach.

[03:50:58] But, yes, I'm in favor of B. I think we should give the \$2.3 million to the schools operating, especially with everybody's rising assessments and taxes that we've talked about. I can't ask the schools to make \$2.3 million worth of cuts. Good. I'm firmly in favor of the county executive's recommendation for the reasons I outlined at the joint meeting the other night.

[03:51:20] From the way that we are doing multi-year budgeting and the rationale behind it, I'm wholly invested in. At the end of the day, the 6.8 this year, the 6.8 next year, does what the CIP does, but it also guards \$6.8 million in operating funds for the schools in year three.

[03:51:43] If we, you know, I understand when we say cuts, this gets us into trouble, especially when we answer campaign questions. But what we would be cutting into would be new initiatives, not operations, because there are \$7 million in initiatives, which the 4.1 is.

[03:52:00] So if you remove the 4.1 out, that relieves them the 2.4 in initiatives that they would have to reduce, new spending, new things. Now, I'm assuming your point was that you want them to be able to do those add-ons and those extras, not make cuts.

[03:52:17] The thing that I would say, though, is that from a fiscal responsibility piece, and I wasn't real clean on this the other night, but when I go in front of the taxpayers tomorrow night and for the rest of this, they're looking to me and us to be the fiscal agents who say, how are you borrowing, how are you planning for future debt, how are you going to deliver on these things?

[03:52:40] The fact is, is the 6.8 per year is the step in the right direction, not just for the cash piece for the CIP, but to guard against a whiplash in year three that if it doesn't come to fruition, I'll feel more comfortable handing over to the schools in the split. But how you could say I'm not going to worry about that, I think is we've been burned on not worrying about that. And we started budgeting differently about three or four years ago and yeah it has meant that we have had some limitations on what we can do on both sides but it also has meant that we've been i think

[03:53:19] very responsible fiscal stewards of the county budget so i just say that in full on this is what i meant by if we do year one our approach it's all to the good why do i not want to earmark it anywhere because i don't know what unknowns exist next year year two or year three and since we're responsible, I don't want to give up the retention of that responsibility. I want to retain it for myself. And I'm happy I started saying that the other night. You can bet I'll be speaking this way as I move forward, but that's where I'm at as a supervisor. I'm going to go back through just so

[03:53:59] if there's other comments. Supervisor Malik? Thank you. Goals were mentioned. To me, the most important goal right now is to avoid financial collapse and instability due to national and international chaos. And when I see that the transfer to schools for operating in this kind of high-risk environment, when they just got \$20 million extra last year, and in past years when there's been an extra

LCI to their benefit, they have spent it all. So I'm not, we have to be, I personally feel the responsibility to try to be the grown-up here and say we need to save this.

[03:54:38] put it away in a safe place, not allocate it, and we'll see how it looks in a couple of years. It also gives the opportunity to make step one in carrying out what the school board said they wanted, which was a shift in the capital focus. So we're being told this is what we want, and then when we try to help with that, we get yelled at. So I am very much in support of AA. I talked about that. Hold on. This is not a cut. And I will remember that in the past, \$500,000 or more

[03:55:18] was the school board responsibility for CSA. Now that all sits in local government. They pay 50. And school buses used to be a million dollars a year in the school budget. Now it is six or eight million dollars a year in the local government budget. Technology was totally paid for by the state. Now it is \$5 million a year in the local government budget, in the CIP. So as people sometimes say i gave it the office and i think we already did thank you supervisor pruit um i i don't know that i have anything to add here other than i i i appreciate the point you're making right

[03:55:58] the especially to supervisor malik's point 13 million i think in federal revenues that the schools get per year um looking at what i have in front of me right now um which the schools have policies that are contrary to what federal policy currently directs them as complying with in order to continue to receive funding, that can drop and change the moment someone at DOE gets to be in their bonnet.

[03:56:27] So I take your point, and I think I'd be willing to support that motion. And by that motion, A and A? A and A, as in the 6.4 to CIP. Yes. Supervisor, where am I at?

[03:56:43] Lepesto Kirtley. Thank you. Yes, what worried me about B is \$4.1 million sent to the general fund to the public school school's, excuse me, operating fund, then I assume if anything's left over, go to the CIP.

[03:56:59] It says then to CIP. Well, the, the, well, I'll let that, let them clarify, because now I'm not sure that what I was about to say was right. Is that correct? Can you just explain then to CIP?

[03:57:15] The distinction is the school board has requested that they receive the money first in their transfer and then that they send it to the CIP versus the supervisors withholding it and sending it to the cip so they want to send from the general fund to the operating fund then they'll make a one-time contribution to the cip of 4.1 okay yes i'm i'm in favor of us uh the board keep or the board of supervisors that the county we keep the money um because i'm not sure what's coming in from the

[03:57:50] state i think there will be additional monies for schools i'm i'm at very high hopes that there'll be additional monies for schools i think the eight million dollars that they've allocated for renovations are very much needed um and the cip would just start building up slowly to toward their con toward our contribution for a new high school which is the number one priority um i think this is a very good uh budget i once again approve a and a and um that's what i'm

[03:58:28] sticking to. Supervisor Missal? Thanks. I'll just clarify maybe my previous opinion. This is a quick question. I think we're talking about 6.4 times two years, right? It's 12.8. So my initial thought was 2.3 would go to operating, then we'd have 10.5 that would stay in the county's coffers that would be for the things that we're talking about. Smoothing out the unknowns with the LCI, et cetera, et cetera, but that that would be a way for us to, at least this year, fully support the kids and the schools in their operating budget while also providing some predictability for them in the future

[03:59:07] that next year is not going to be 2.3 off of the 6.4. It's going to be 6.4, and that total, that 10.5, would go towards the CIP. Yes, to clarify. Understood. Supervisor Duncan? Yeah, I would also be supportive of that.

[03:59:24] I hear your point. I think part of it, too, is that, like, if the county sort of changed its planning, that the schools didn't change their planning alongside us, and so I can see how it feels like a shift to them that they were not prepared for.

[03:59:39] So I do, I would be supportive of doing it the way Supervisor Missile says. Yeah. And still with earmarking at CIP that it's for the schools and not for the Board of Supervisors. That's where we differ. All right, understood. I have not changed my mind.

[03:59:56] I will, well, I lost the point, the additional thing I was going to say, but I haven't changed my mind. So we will need a motion to, at this point, I could invite either.

[04:00:12] You have two different thoughts of how you would like to approach it. You're both welcome to introduce a motion, then we can vote. And this, again, is to consider not doing it. So I would start with the most onerous first, which sounds like Supervisor Duncan's.

[04:00:31] I'm happy to go with Supervisor Missiles because I doubt. We can try that motion on for size. All right, I move that we consider operationally balancing the school board's request at \$307.2 million dollars while contributing \$10.4 million over two years to the general fund directly into the

[04:01:06] county's CIP. We can clean it up in discussion. All right, there's a second. Second. All right, discussion. Are folks clear what Supervisor Missile's asking? The \$10.4 million to the CIP, I believe I heard earlier it would be \$4.1 this year and \$6.4 the next. Would that be \$10.5?

[04:01:28] That's correct. Okay. Over two years. Yeah, \$10.4 is what I heard, but maybe I misheard. You did. hear that because I combined both years this this year sorry this year be 4.1 mm-hmm and then 6.4 in the following year correct for a total of 10.5 that's exactly right yep and not allocated to schools all right it's it's so no he's

[04:01:57] doing a mixture B and C so he is basically stating that we would we would send them their ask operational ask and then next year hold the full 6.8 which we can only vote on the 6.4 we can only make the motion for this year's budget but that's the rationale it also can serve as a policy direction that's a staff in forging future projects okay before i call for

[04:02:35] the vote though we need to make sure we're clear what we're voting on so ask questions if you're not. Yeah. I would have a comment. Oh, you can make comments, but let me get clear first. Is everybody clear what the ask is? All right. Supervisor Mitchell, you want to take another swing? So the school board is requesting \$307 million to go towards operations. That will balance their fund. They're also asking for 4.1 to be sent from the general fund to the public schools operating fund, which they will then transfer an earmark for their use. I'm suggesting

[04:03:08] that the full 307 be balanced so we give them 307.2 right got that that instead of 6.4 this year we hold back 4.1 which is the difference between 6.4 and 3.2 right and 2.3 i'm sorry and then in future years the full 6.4 be transferred to the general fund and as as is originally planned for So we're not transferring 6.4 into the general fund.

[04:03:40] We're transferring 4.1. 4.1 will go to the general fund. 2.3 will go towards balancing their operational budget. That makes up 6.4 million. No, no, I got that. I got that part. So it changes what the county executive has recommended, basically to the tune of that change in the operational request, everything else remaining, because it would stay basically on the supervisor's side.

[04:04:10] I will direct you to left column A, increase of \$20 million already this year, on top of \$22 million extra last year, \$100 million over the last five years.

[04:04:28] They have plenty to manage, and if we have to manage for them by saying, you are going to put this in the piggy bank, and we'll see what all chaos happens, that's what I support. I really hope we will stick with A and A. All right, any other discussion?

[04:04:46] All right, if the clerk would please call the roll. Ms. Lepisto-Kirtley? Nay. Ms. Malik? No. Mr. Missel? Aye. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway? No.

[04:05:01] All right, the motion does not carry. So we can either do an iteration or we're to A and A, which gets lumped into the bigger tax rate increase. I'm glad to move the A and A if you'd like one.

[04:05:19] Go ahead. I move that we adopt option A on screen, county executive recommended, for the operating fund for schools and the one-time transfer to CIP. Second. All right. Is there any further discussion? All right.

[04:05:36] If the clerk would please call the roll. Ms. Lapisto-Kirtley? Aye. Ms. Malik? Yes. Mr. Missel? Aye. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? No. Mr. Galloway? Yes. All right. That motion carries five to one.

[04:05:52] All right, board. It's not easy stuff to work through. It's not. But we got through that. Now, Andy, remind me where we are. We've got to do the tax rate eventually. We'll go to the motions. And maybe just to recap everything really quickly.

[04:06:07] If there are any other, yes. Let's go back to the parking lot list of 1 through 8. Where, number 1, we'll kind of just walk through these again. Ms. Malcolm, if you don't mind, go to the next slide. The board gave direction on option C, which is an ongoing reserve until it's adjusted of 663, One time, \$510,000, and the transit contingency of \$151,000.

[04:06:31] That was the board's direction. On the next item, item two, the ACERP, there was no further discussion at this time, but the board has an ability to adjust that further as they work through the budget process, either on April 1st, 15th, or 22nd.

[04:06:49] Option three, this is really related to the affordable housing fund would be increased by, If adopted, the proposed tax rate on personal property, assuming that's what the board follows through in their motions in a moment, that would include both the 27 impact and the 26 one-time money.

[04:07:08] That rate, which we'll get to, would be the 15 cents on personal property and machinery and tools. To number four, A&A is where the board just landed, so that is not a change that the county executive's recommended budget. And on the next item, these weren't discussed, but that's also okay, because the board doesn't have to decide that now.

[04:07:29] And by maintaining the county executive's recommendation, they're also both maintaining points A and A. All right, so then on these slides, the board has not finalized direction, but they know they have the ability, if they would like to fund their requested amounts for Foothills and OAR therapeutic docket, they have the ability to do that in their reserve.

[04:07:50] And on the next slide, for their agencies, the same would be true for the Charles Ballet and the band, and that will leave them an ongoing reserve of about \$550,000, ongoing \$500,000 one time. Then the community capital request process, if the board desires to fund that at the full amount, they have enough reserve in the CIP Advancing Strategic Priority Reserve to do that, and we have a follow-up with staff at the county executive's office to talk to the city manager about their willingness to do something in additional.

[04:08:19] And then on item 8, that continues the conversation on the tax rate. So before we move to motions and a recap, is there anything that the board would correct that I have said? Sounded right to me. And I know you guys need a break.

[04:08:35] On the 394 that's in your strategic reserve, you've got 250 right now that's allocated for the Dogwood Memorial. Remind me, when I talked to the city manager, did you earmark or at least consider earmarking up to 394 to add to 250?

[04:08:53] Is that where the board was? We'd be up to \$350,000, which was their request. Sorry, I spoke for the chair. If we got to the \$600, you mean? Yes. I mean, we didn't name it, but that was the target. \$350,000? So we hadn't, but we did not land on a specific amount.

[04:09:10] That's the worst casing it based on the other approaches that we did for the other items as well. Yes, correct. I apologize for jumping in for the chair. So, yes, we should go there to the request since that's the ceiling, but the board did not land on a number. Thank you. All right.

[04:09:27] So now we will... Yeah, so a few, sorry, a few recaps just to set up the board for what happens next. The first is really setting the rate for advertisement, and I'll go through these pretty quickly. These are the rates that are included in the recommended budget, and the board has indicated to maintain these with the exception of personal property, which would be 15 cents higher, without money going to affordable housing.

[04:09:52] On the next slide, we have just information on real estate tax revenue. This information has been reviewed with the board before. And it would not change based on the board's discussion at this time. And again, the lowered rate, I'll point out as part of the ad, that's the rate that would really offset any increase in assessments.

[04:10:11] So on the next slide, we get to just the value of penny. We talked before. We can go into the next slide on personal property. Primarily comes from vehicles, and there's the other categories. In the board's discussion, that increased rate of \$4.43 would be applied to all of these categories. Rates for machinery and tools and other categories cannot be a set above the personal property rate. And as was noted by the board earlier there is some relief that is provided for personal property based on the first \$1,000 or \$20,000 of your vehicle. So in the next slide is again we can

[04:10:49] skip this one we've talked about it the the values of the penny. So there are a couple motions I'll look at together. The first is to advertise rate at the rate the county executives recommended. The next motion is on the personal property which is only if needed if the board were to increase it and so the board would just need to fill in in this motion the 443 in this statement and then if we don't mind I'll just go to the budget because we can make all these motions at once. Just to really recap where we've been here's a total budget of 724 million that would increase if the board were again assuming they approved the housing that

[04:11:25] would increase by that amount. On the next slide, we talked about the general fund. That amount will increase by the portion of the \$0.15 on personal property going into the housing fund. So on slide 30, we've seen the general fund expenditures, and we would see the health and welfare. It may not be very visible, but that would increase. And on slide 31, this is just for the board's awareness in the fiscal year 27 proposed budget. These are the projects that the board is appropriating and the contractual work will begin moving on all of these. Includes the Ravanna Futures, or I should

[04:12:02] say the Boulders Road project, the design of the Northern High School, and the other projects we discussed Monday night. And then slide 32 shows the CIP by goal there, which again will be reviewed. And I'll hit in this very quickly for the public who are tuning in. We've spent 10 hours reviewing these few slides. So if you're tuning in, I assure you the board has had a very thorough and robust discussion on these items. And then with that, on slide 33, just to confirm when they make the motion, it would incorporate the county executive's recommended technical adjustments and then the board's adjustments. The only board adjustment they have made tonight is, assuming they approve

[04:12:41] they're consistent with their earlier motions, is \$0.15 in the affordable housing and the other items would be refined in future meetings. So I think with that, I will, unless there's something on slide 34, I'm forgetting. Okay, that'll be the motion for the board, which is a little more general just to state that intent. And we have a very brief recap, but I will turn it back over to the chair if we can go back to the real estate motion slide. So I just want to remind supervisors and the public, this is basically outlining the constraints that we will now work on for the rest

[04:13:19] of the budget the only real item that got changed there obviously was under will be coming with the personal property for affordable housing the school item we just talked about we still have public hearings and town halls to go through so it's not that that item it's certainly we have staked out our positions uh but it's but that still can work within the constraints because nobody changed the tax rate to to suggest how to do that so i just want to remind everybody that this is still an active changing budget. So, all right, we need a motion to, if somebody would offer the motion that's on the screen. I move the board advertise the following rate for public hearing for the

[04:13:59] 2026 tax year, \$0.894 per \$100 of assessed value for real estate public service property and manufactured homes. Second. Any further discussion? The clerk would please call the roll.

[04:14:18] Ms. Lapisto-Kirtley? Aye. Ms. Malik? Yes. Mr. Missel? Aye. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway? Yes. Thank you, board. So now this one will need to read, but put 4.43 in the blank. Correct. Yes, that is correct. And I believe it's the county attorney's wish that the board read the entire motion.

[04:14:46] It is only necessary to read the tax rates that the board wishes to increase. So if the board is not wishing to increase either the second or third categories, the board can simply stop with the first. Thank you. I've heard the board's intent is all of them to generate the money they desire for the Affordable Housing Fund.

[04:15:05] But I would ask the board to correct me if I'm wrong. We don't want to go through those iterations. Unless the board doesn't want to read as much. We can do that later. I mean, we can go down, remember? This is not locking us in. We can still go down on this one if we want.

[04:15:20] And, Mr. Bowman, could I just verify the rates that the board would be inserting into the blanks here? \$4.43, which is \$0.15 higher than the current rate of \$4.28. For each of the three blanks? For

each of the three blanks.

[04:15:37] So if a supervisor could read the motion that's there, and you're adding in the 4.43. I'll do it. I'd like to move that the board advertise the following rates for the public hearing for the 2026 tax year. First, \$4.43 per 100 of assessed value for tangible personal property.

[04:15:57] Second, \$4.43 per 100 of assessed value for miscellaneous and incidental tangible personal property employed in a business or trade that is not otherwise classified as mischievous rituals, merchant's capital, or short-term rental property, and that has an original cost of less than \$500. and third, \$4.43 per 100 of assessed value for machinery and tools.

[04:16:17] Second. Is there any further discussion? The clerk would please call the roll. Ms. Lapista-Kirtley? Nay. Ms. Malik? Yes. Mr. Missel? Yes. Mr. Pruitt? Yes. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway?

[04:16:33] Yes. All right, that motion carries five to one. And now we have the motion to advertise the proposed fiscal year 27 budget.

[04:16:51] I can do that. I move that the board authorize staff to advertise for public hearing the FY27 proposed budget, which is the same as the county executive's recommended budget, including any staff recommended changes and any additional amendments made by the Board of Supervisors.

[04:17:10] Second. Any further discussion? All right, if the clerk would please call the roll. Ms. LaPista-Kirtley? Aye. Ms. Mallett? Yes. Mr. Missel? Aye. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? yes mr. Galloway yes great one final item for board direction on April 1st there's a work session if needed that is during the board's regular meeting the board can continue topics on agencies or they could also yield that time to all non-budget items the board have because the board could still continue to discuss the budget on April 15th and April 22nd so if there's a indication from the

[04:17:49] board that would be helpful just to assist the clerk in agenda planning all All right. Okay. Yes. I propose we keep the work session. All right. Do it there. I mean, yeah, I mean, yeah, I agree with that. Any objection to that?

[04:18:09] Okay. Then we're done with everything on that agenda item? Say that again? Are we abandoning the bond stuff? Well, I mean, I'm just asking for the, if we're done with that topic.

[04:18:25] Yes, we are complete. The bond item is at 6 o'clock. Oh, I thought it was now. Okay. Very good. Thank you. Oh, you asked about the bond. Oh, yeah, I'm sorry. We're getting ready for a closed meeting. No closed meeting this evening. Oh, yeah, we're getting ready for a 30-minute recess. And we'll start back up at 6 o'clock.

[04:18:48] I don't usually gavel. All right, good evening. We're going to come back to order. Board, I'm used to calling for the closed meeting certification. We did not have a closed meeting today, so we are going to move right to item number 13.

[04:19:04] From the county executive, report on matters not listed on the agenda. Mr. Richardson, do we have a report this evening? Yes, sir, Mr. Chair, members of the board, we do. We have a brief presentation tonight, and as always, from Abby Stump, Community and Public Engagement Director.

[04:19:22] She has helped with all of our departments put some information together, not just for our board, but for our community as well. So as always, board, it's always a pleasure to be before you and talk

just a little bit about the stuff that we're doing on a month-to-month basis that ties back directly to our strategic plan.

[04:19:39] A lot of it is data-driven, but it's not going to rise to the level of press release. It's not going to be in our local newspaper. It's really just stuff that's a lot of operational impact, but it also has community impact. And so we'll walk you through some of this tonight.

[04:19:56] Thank you.

[04:20:06] Evie, thank you very much. So, Board, this evening I'm going to be highlighting some of the data points from recent annual reports that we have released.

[04:20:25] earlier today it was commented i think during public comment about how one community member especially leaned in hard on our spear report that's the data that we are now collecting in year three that is tied to your strategic goals and you'll see some of this and as in addition to that we have some of our departments that release annual reports that will dig in a little more uh in detail about some of the work that's going on in some of the key areas and so we want we're going to take a little bit of time tonight and look at what some of that looks like. Our Department of Social

[04:20:59] Services welcomed 17,120 lobby visitors over the past year and answered 41,881 calls to the front desk in 2025. The three people here pictured left to right, work our social services front desk, Bethany Hall, Kaylee Shiflett and Kayla Toms. Now I want to take a second and talk that our DSS serves front door to some of the community's most pressing needs from benefits enrollment,

[04:21:38] food assistance, to adult protection, to child welfare services, as well our human services navigators always play a key role in this work. They guide residents through complex systems helping to ensure they access the right services at the right time. The volume of these touch points reflect both the demand for service at social services and the dedication of dss staff in meeting the demand with care and professionalism and i did the math so 17 120 lobby visitors

[04:22:11] are approximately 70 per day for every day we're open in the year and 43 000 calls equate to 170 calls per day for every day that we're open. And so that is a steady flow of work that our social services folks handle quite well. County inspectors completed 41,551 building permit inspections in 2025, roughly 3,000 more than the prior year. So here's another performance metrics

[04:22:50] board, performance metric on service demand, and this is in the area building inspections, The increase reflects continued growth and development activity across Albemarle County. Each inspection is a critical safeguard, ensuring that the construction meets safety codes that protect residents, workers, and future occupants.

[04:23:10] The uptick in volume speaks to the commitment of our inspections team to keep pace with a growing community without compromising quality or safety. And again, Board, I did the math. 41,551 building permit inspections equate to 168 for every day we're open.

[04:23:33] Almar County's IT department resolved 10,091 support tickets in 2025. They are an internal service department primarily. They do interface with the public, and many of the systems that are public access is supported by IT. But keeping every department running day and night, as we are a 24-7, 365-day operation, And a lot of our folks, maybe as many as 20%, are working nights and weekends.

[04:24:01] Over 10,000 tickets represent a significant volume of the behind-the-scenes work that spans every department in our organization. Parks and Recreation, over the past year, has served 10,218 program participants.

[04:24:21] An increase of more than 3,000 people over the last year, that's approaching a 40% increase. The growth reflects the quality of programming and the demand residents have for parks and recreation opportunities. It's an exciting time in our Parks and Recreation Department.

[04:24:40] Youth athletics to senior programming to the beloved roller skating nights, the Parks and Rec team creates inclusive opportunities that both strengthen community connection and personal well-being and activity. Parks and Recreation has been focusing on scaling up program to meet demand while maintaining the high quality that keeps residents coming back.

[04:25:06] Within CAPE, our community and public outreach team, the Let's Talk Albemarle Band logged 2,458 engagements over the past year, bringing county government directly to residents in their communities. board you'll recall that this program was really started back in the pandemic when we were closed or at least hampered from people coming in and so we went out into the communities and had a lot of activity out in the open space and this has continued the van goes where residents are including neighborhoods community events to ensure access to information and engagement opportunities

[04:25:43] our own fire and rescue firefighting team they installed 199 car seats in 2029 and i've done one of those recently and uh i wish those two folks would have been around it's a free service that surprises many residents in our community who do not know that the service exists many families don't realize that you can bring a car seat to any one of our acfr fire stations and have it inspected and properly installed by a firefighter who is also a certified car seat technician.

[04:26:17] Car seat misuse is the leading contributor to child injury while in vehicle crashes, making this a simple free intervention and it has a real safety impact. I got this picture the other day and while I wasn't happy to know that our emergency ambulance system was completely taxed out. This is every bay at the UVA hospital, and every bay was completely packed with our ambulances transporting patients to the University of Virginia Medical Center. It was just coined by

[04:26:54] the text I got as a very, very busy day in our system. The Career and Volunteer Network traveled 82,818 miles transporting patients in 2025, the equivalent of circling the earth more than three times, 30 trips across the U.S. coast to coast. Every one of those miles represents a patient who is in need, a crew of dedicated career and volunteer professionals committed to getting the care that the patient needs. The stat highlights both the volume of emergency medical services that we provide in our community and also the large footprint geography-wise that

[04:27:33] our county represents. I believe it's about 726 square miles. The police department animal protection unit responded to 1832 animal related calls in 2025 nearly a quarter of all of the quality of life calls for service and it is included in the police department's annual report if you want to dig in a little bit more these calls span a wide range from strays injured animals concerns about animal welfare and so we're going to do the welfare check as well as loose animal situations. The unit's work really reflects the county's broader commitment to community and

[04:28:13] well-being, which includes the humane treatment of animals and the support of residents navigating animal-related issues, and our team works really hard with that volume of calls. While we're

also in the police department, let's talk about the traffic unit. There's been a focused effort including 73 targeted initiatives, 32 speeding studies, and 1,328 unit-specific traffic stops designed to address the corridors and behaviors where we have seen a higher likelihood of serious

[04:28:48] crashes. So we're spending more time using data, using analysis, positioning our people in areas where we get complaints or we have data to suggest that there are more crashes. across all acpd personnel 10 270 traffic stops were conducted last year and it reflects a department-wide commitment to road safety board you know that that's one of the most common complaints that we get is speeding and reckless driving and speed studies are a critical data tool helping the department make evidence-based decisions about where to focus resources

[04:29:25] where to do interventions to get the most result the work connects directly to the county's ongoing goals around traffic safety including the use of strategies like marked patrol vehicles and high crash locations so board that's it just some data-driven stuff as we do some year-end work in several of our departments again we'll have these i know the board is active in the community these are easy slides for you to take with you in an email from our team if you're in the community and you get the question such as where do my tax dollars go what are things the county's working

[04:30:02] on that i might have interest in these are really strong slides in that they really focus on service delivery volume data and service to our community so i'll turn it over to the board and see if there's any questions and if there's no questions again abby will do a good job of getting this information out to the board in your inbox thank you thank you mr richardson supervisor malik that would be a great intro for the budget town hall supervisor pruit i have nothing to add Thank you so much.

[04:30:32] Supervisor Lepisto-Kirtley? Thank you very much for that. Supervisor Missal? No questions. Thank you, though. Supervisor Duncan? No questions. It was great to see. I mean, you know, the phone call traffic and the desk traffic over at the Department of Social Services, when you broke that down to the daily, that's eye-opening.

[04:30:51] So I appreciate that nugget. But thank you, as always, for the March report. All right, board, that will take us to item number 14, Public comment on matters previously considered or currently pending before the board, but other than scheduled for public hearings, which we have more of this evening.

[04:31:11] We do have some sign-ups. Vice Chair Missal will read the rules and then work us through our speakers. Great. Thank you, Chair. Good evening, everyone. During the time set aside for public comment on matters previously considered or currently pending before the board, other than scheduled public hearings, individuals may address the Board of Supervisors concerning matters previously considered by the board or matters that are pending before the board other than items on the agenda for public hearing.

[04:31:35] Individuals are allowed one opportunity of up to three minutes to speak at each board meeting. A sign-up sheet is managed by the clerk's office. Timekeeping is conducted through a timer and light system at the podium. The green light will go on when you begin speaking, which begins your allotted time. The yellow light indicates you have one minute to finish speaking.

[04:31:54] The red light indicates your time has expired and you will be asked to end your comments. In order to give all speakers equal treatment and courtesy, the board requests that speakers adhere to the

following guidelines. When addressing the board, state your name, and if you live in Albemarle County, your magisterial district, address comments directly to the board as a whole.

[04:32:11] Any written statements or other supporting material may be given to the clerk. If representing a group or organization, you may ask others present to raise their hands in recognition. Speakers may not share any unused time with another speaker. Back and forth debate is not permitted.

[04:32:27] Do not speak from your seat or out of turn. And as a reminder, please speak directly into the mic and introduce yourself. With that, our first speaker is Susan McCulley. Good evening.

[04:32:54] I'm Susan McCulley, and I live in the Samuel Miller District. And we are grateful to Supervisor Missal for drawing our attention to the Board's February 18th letter to the Virginia Federal Delegation regarding your position on ICE and other federal actions in our community.

[04:33:12] Although we did speak at the February 18th meeting, we were unaware of the letter and appreciated seeing it. And we understand that the letter has been delivered to the delegation, so thank you. We're glad to see that the board has affirmed your commitment to the safety of all members of the community, your support of legislation that is constitutional, your support of legislation that prohibits officers from obscuring their faces and requires clear display of agency name officer name and unique identifier and it's good to see that you expect all community members to be treated professionally when interacting with

[04:33:52] officers of the law given the very basic nature of these statements it would be deeply shocking if the board did not support these things so thank you for that what you're asking indeed what we have been asking is not radical or extreme it's basic lawful and the lowest of bars I mean, asking agents not to conceal their identities and wear a badge.

[04:34:16] This is obviously necessary, and not just for public trust, but for public and officer safety. So we propose that you go further to strengthen your letter. We suggest that you state clearly both to the delegation and to your constituents what the county will and will not do to protect residents from the unlawful behavior of federal officers.

[04:34:39] if an agent breaks a law and impinges on the rights of a resident should they call the police and what do county police commit to doing in such circumstances if an agent uses unlawful tactics to subdue or apprehend someone in the county what should they do can they count on help from local law enforcement as we've talked about many times before the community's clear understanding of what the county plans to do in situations of federal overreach and lawlessness is essential to weathering this time of chaos, fear, and confusion. We are asking not for radical or revolutionary

[04:35:18] statements, but rather transparency that engenders trust. Thank you. Thank you. Alicia Lenihan. Good evening, board. My name is Alicia Lenihan. I am a resident of the Scottsville district. A question has planted itself in my mind over these last months. Is the current political landscape the logical progression of the objectification and acquisition of people and

[04:35:56] natural resources to satisfy the voracious greed and quest for power of rich, mostly white men? Our country's birth announcement includes this sentence. We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We have struggled to live up to that sentence ever since

it was written. Previously, when white supremacy, greed, and lust for power have asserted themselves, we were led into the Civil War and descended into the Great

[04:36:34] Depression. Those driven by profits over people were enamored of Hitler and Joseph McCarthy. They have railed against the New Deal, the Great Society, and civil rights legislation since their inceptions. When first asked to take a stand against the lawless immigration actions of this administration, one response was, and I quote, we don't want to draw attention to ourselves, and we were reminded of the supremacy of federal law. That stands in stark contrast to Virginia's role in and response to Brown v. Board of Education. State and local governments didn't

[04:37:12] hesitate to defy the federal government and to mount massive resistance. The men sitting in those chairs were resolute in their efforts to keep black children out of white classrooms. Compromise on segregation was equated with a compromise with evil, words that were uttered in this room.

[04:37:34] This administration makes it clear that cruelty and greed are the point. Whether it's someone who has lost health care coverage or family struggling to buy groceries or gas and then blaming and demonizing immigrants and refugees regardless of their status or age. Doing nothing is compromising with evil. The letter you wrote to our federal delegation is a weak response that deflects responsibility and doesn't answer the question. When ICE or their ilk show up at Southwood or the

[04:38:06] no King's Rally on 29, or at any one of the polling places on April 21st, will the county government and law enforcement respond, and who will they protect? Thank you. Thank you. Henry Parrott. I hope I pronounced that right, sir. You did. Good. Mr. Chairman, members of the board, my name is Henry Parrott, and I live in the Rivanna District. I would like to urge you to

[04:38:42] vote against the bond referendum for three reasons. First of all, it violates the golden rule of public finance, which says that borrowing should be for the purpose of funding long-term capital projects. And this proposal uses a substantial part of the money for short-term projects and operating expenses. The second reason is that this represents a sleight of hand

[04:39:19] to avoid the prohibition in Virginia against multi-year appropriations. To be sure, the documentation recites that it's not encumbering future votes on appropriations, but the fact is that it does.

[04:39:39] It puts the county in a bind. It obligates the county in future years to fund the bond issue, and if the county refused to appropriate the money, the cry would go up that no one can afford a default.

[04:39:57] The third reason is that if the residents of Albemarle County want to shoulder this enormous burden, which already amounts to some \$400 million, and by the time the plans are complete, it will be pushing a billion dollars, if they wish to shoulder this burden, they ought to have an opportunity to say so.

[04:40:23] There should be a referendum before this bond issue is adopted. Thank you. Thank you. Jennifer Winslow. Good evening. I'm Jen Winslow from the Jack Jewett District. I am currently serving as the board chair for Lighthouse Studio, and I'm here to speak tonight about the funding proposals before you for both our educational programs as well as our Vinegar Hill Theater community programs.

[04:40:59] As a bit of background of the county's past support, from the years of 2019 to 2024, we consistently received approximately \$17,000 a year to support our educational programs. Last year, we were unexpectedly placed in a tier which received zero funding.

[04:41:18] This year, we tightened the focus to include only programs and partnerships that could support adolescent mental health. We'd hope that with this limited scope, addressing one of the priorities of the county might yield a Tier 2 rating.

[04:41:34] We are again being denied any funding for our educational programs this year. I understand the county's focus on basic needs, but while Lighthouse and other arts programs are not feeding, housing, and transporting people, we are nurturing our youth in different ways.

[04:41:53] Studies consistently show that arts education is closely linked with positive academic outcomes as well as social and emotional development. We were also surprised to learn that we are not receiving funding for the Vinegar Hill Theater under the arts and culture category.

[04:42:12] For many years, we've received \$2,500 for the theater and programming. The explanation provided on pages 186 to 187 of the fiscal year 27 budget document does not make it clear why this funding was revoked.

[04:42:29] Lighthouse purchased the Vinegar Hill Theater on the downtown mall in 2015 after it sat empty for two years. In 2020, we added two teaching studios as well as a roof terrace. Not only do we teach workshops at the theater, but we screen films for the community.

[04:42:45] We also have many rental events with discounted rates to other non-profits. In 2025, we gave \$59,000 back to our community through these discounted rentals. 43% of these rentals were from county-based or county-serving partners, including Albemarle Charlottesville Historical Society, the Rivander Conservation Alliance, Region 10, the Hummingbird Fund, and the IRC, among others.

[04:43:13] These organizations would not be able to afford to host events without our discounted rates. We appreciate you reconsidering some support for our educational programming and a return to last year's awarded amount of \$2,500 for the Vinegar Hill Theater.

[04:43:29] Thank you. And last on our list is Phil Reese. Mr. Chairman, members of the board, my name is Phil Reese. I'm in the Rybana District. I want to start by saying my comments tonight are focused on the \$118 million in new debt being issued.

[04:43:51] I have no issue with refinancing \$38 million of old debt. Ten years ago, the Board of Supervisors made a very wise decision. It went directly to the voters and asked for approval on a bond referendum for \$35 million. So I have a simple question for you.

[04:44:10] What changed, and why does the public no longer get a say? Why was it appropriate to go to the voters in 2016, but not now, when the amount is more than three times larger? A proposal of this size should require voter approval, not avoid it.

[04:44:26] I also want to speak to the financial impact of this decision. When the county goes around the voters and doesn't do a bond referendum, it receives a much higher interest rate on the bonds. Last night at the EDA board meeting, county staff stated the difference would be just five basis points or about \$700,000.

[04:44:45] But those figures do not align with market reality. I hope this was simply an oversight or mistake, but it should have been corrected. And I don't think the EDA board had all the facts when making their decision last night. From what I'm seeing, the interest rate difference would be about 48 basis points, give or take.

[04:45:04] On a bond of this size, that translates to roughly \$11 million in additional interest paid by taxpayers. I understand you don't want to delay projects that are already approved in the CIP. I get that.

[04:45:20] But this is a financing decision that will cost taxpayers millions of dollars. This was poor financial planning, full stop. I urge you to start taking these bond requests to the voters. It respects voters, it saves money, and it is the most financially responsible path.

[04:45:37] Thank you. Thank you. Lose our list, Chair. All right. Thank you to all those who came out to speak this evening. And, Board, that will take us to item number 15, which is an action item, the resolution authorizing a bond issuance and the issuance of refunding bonds.

[04:45:58] Mr. Sumner and company joining us at the podium. Good evening, board.

[04:46:18] My name is Jacob Sumner. I'm the chief financial officer for the county. Thank you for allowing us to be before you tonight. I'm joined by, I'll be joined with this presentation by Courtney Rogers, who is sitting right behind me. He'll do the latter half of this presentation.

[04:46:35] He is our financial advisor with Davenport Company. He has been with us as our financial advisor for many, many years. I'm sure his entire career, but Courtney Rogers has been in the financial advising arena for over 30 years and has been with the county supporting us a vast majority of that.

[04:46:54] Before I get started on some of the details for tonight, I just want to thank a few of the staff that have particularly put in a lot of work on the attachments that you see in your agenda item tonight and will continue helping support us through the bond issuance process. That is our chief and our deputy chief of the Office of Investment and Debt Management, Daniel Green, and Lindsay Huff, who are also joining us in the audience.

[04:47:15] Thank you for your hard work. So tonight, we will be asking the board to take action on a resolution authorizing a bond issuance and issuance of refunding bonds. This total debt issuance is around \$156.55 million.

[04:47:33] And as the slide indicates, even though this is one financing, There are essentially three components that I'll walk the board through that we'll be using the funding for. The first one related to our funding for our capital improvement projects at \$118 million, a refunding of a portion of the 2023 bond anticipation notes that was used to purchase the property around Ravana Station, and then a potential refunding for our 2015 bonds for interest and cost savings.

[04:48:04] So the largest portion of this bond issuance at \$118.14 million is to help fund the capital projects that have already been approved by the Board of Supervisors. So these projects have already commenced. They've already been underway. The county has already incurred costs related to these projects. They are either a part of the FY26, so our current year capital improvement budget or were approved in prior fiscal years. Of the \$118 million, 70% represent school projects

[04:48:41] and about 30% represent local government projects. A few examples of the larger items would be familiar as you see these projects taking shape in our community. So about \$39 million of this funding goes to help fund the Mountain View Upper Elementary construction. About \$20 million for the ace academy at lambs lane and about another 19 million for school renovations renovations and maintenance replacement projects highlights for a few of the items on the local government side there's about 12 million dollars of the 118 will be representing funding for the

[04:49:21] courts so these are expenditures we've already incurred on projects and then also another about 5.8 million for for biscuit run the second component of this financing is a partial refunding of the \$58.8 million purchase of the Ravana Futures property. So as the board remembers, back in 2023, the board took out a five-year interest-only taxable debt to purchase the land around Ravana Station. This five-year note is intended to be short-term, and as you'll see,

[04:50:00] the interest rate on that note was 5.3%, and that was a taxable interest rate. And so if you compare the taxable to tax-exempt rates, you'll see a Deltan differential. But that was important because issuing tax-exempt or taxable debt allows the county to have more flexibility with how the property is used, particularly if there's economic development interest in it or potentially private investment that would occur on the property. Through staff analysis, we have

[04:50:32] identified a portion of that property that is planned for general public purposes and is eligible to be refunded or refinanced at a non-taxable rate. And so the middle section of this slide is we are looking to refund about \$24.9 million of that initial bond anticipation note. And we currently project the interest rate on that to be about 4% compared to the current interest rate we're paying on that five-year note at 5.3. And by converting this to long-term debt and at that

[04:51:08] lower rate at a non-taxable rate, we would anticipate about \$6.6 million of savings over the 20-year life of that long-term bond. The remaining bond anticipation note would be about \$33.9 million with a maturity in FY28. And as we move closer to that maturity period, we'll then be looking at taking action of what we would do with the remaining outstanding portion of that bond anticipation note. I wanted to add a visual for what we're talking about with the taxable versus non-taxable, a partial refunding of the total amount. So this slide and this graphic

[04:51:48] should look familiar. This is the property that was purchased with the bond anticipation note funding. The area that's in green with the labels rural area is the rural area of the property. So the property is roughly divided between development area and rural area. So the rural areas intended to be a buffer and we are not actively marketing those areas right now. And so you should recognize a couple of different land bays, land bay 55, land bay 25 and 40, along with the two land bays where AstraZeneca will be located.

[04:52:26] Those are all in the development area and are not part of this partial refunding. Hope that visual was helpful in what we're looking at. The final portion of this financing opportunity is the opportunity to refinance a portion or the 2015B bonds.

[04:52:47] They are eligible for refunding. And Courtney will go through the refunding opportunity in a little more detail from a financial perspective. But we are looking to take advantage of the interest rate market and have some savings over the remaining life of those bonds through this refunding.

[04:53:06] I do want to take a moment to talk about the financing and debt structure for this issuance. As was alluded to, the EDA did take action on this activity last night at their regular meeting. The EDA is serving as a conduit issuer for the issuer for these revenue bonds on behalf of the county.

[04:53:26] And the EDA is permitted to undertake this type of financing as part of the Industrial Development and Revenue Act in state code. That allows them to finance facilities for locality, the Commonwealth, and its agencies, and governmental and non-profit organizations as part of their charge.

[04:53:44] The county is solely responsible for the repayment of this debt and the payment of these bonds. There is no liability to the EDA, and the EDA does not pledge any revenues or funds for the repayment of those bonds as such. In the unlikely circumstance, an event of non-appropriation or an event of default arises in the future.

[04:54:03] The bondholders would look directly to the county for a payment and not the EDA. So that was just to reiterate that the EDA is a conduit issuer for this debt. The structure of utilizing the EDA as that conduit issuer has been utilized several times over the past 23 years.

[04:54:25] Back in 2003, excuse me, there was a financing framework that was implemented with the EDA, and we've utilized that financing. This would be our ninth time of using that financing vehicle with the EDA. We do anticipate the debt to be structured as non-taxable and would have a 20-year maturity, particularly on the new money that we were talking about earlier.

[04:54:47] I am going to take just a minute to talk about the differing financing types, different financing vehicles and provide the board and the public a little bit of a comparison between the the general obligation bonds and public facility revenue bonds which would be issued through the eda and i'm just going to go through some of the characteristics um of both they are uh similar and that that's how we you can fund capital projects and go and access the credit markets but there there are some differences between the two general obligation bonds are

[04:55:21] issued through a voter referendum and it has to be approval in that that voter action. Public facility revenue bonds, as I mentioned earlier, and the vehicle that we're using for this issuance would be through the EDA and their authority that they have in state code. There is a difference between general obligation bonds and these revenue bonds and the lead time to market. So as we're trying to access their credit markets, it does take a longer lead time to go through the general obligation bond process from the initial step when the board of supervisors would undertake

[04:55:56] the action to pursue geo bonds through public referendum through ensuring that got on the ballot to public voter education through the election cycle and then you would really work through the more what I'd call the credit financing component which is working through the preliminary offering statement working with the credit rating agencies until you finally do the bond sale and closing on the bonds. The public facility revenue bonds is much shorter. At the whole timeline, I just breezed through very quickly there. The public facility bonds are typically only at the latter

[04:56:32] half of that process. So it is working on the preliminary official statement, working with the rating agencies to obtain a credit, selling the bonds, and then finally closing on the bonds. So was a much shorter lead time to access the market. There is a difference in the project funding sequence between the two. So with general obligation bonds, when the referendum is going before the public, it is asking voters to vote upon projects that are happening in the future.

[04:57:03] So the general obligation effort and approval for those are ahead of any construction or any work that is going to be funded by the proceeds of that issuance. The same is true for public facility revenue bonds.

[04:57:18] You can take out those revenue bonds before a project starts and then draw down on those proceeds through the construction phase of those projects. But you also have the opportunity to seek

reimbursement of capital expenditures through the public facility revenue bonds because those expenditures have already happened.

[04:57:36] And as part of the budget appropriation resolution process, You'll recognize, as you've seen in prior years, a reimbursement resolution that authorizes the county to reimburse itself through bond proceeds for capital expenditures.

[04:57:53] And that's best achieved through the public facility revenue bonds. According to interest rates, general obligation bonds do yield the lowest possible interest rate based on the credit rating. And the revenue bonds are slightly higher than GEO.

[04:58:11] And I would say the differential and the spread between the interest rate for the two is very dependent on the issuer. So a triple AAA issuer between the two would have a smaller gap between an interest rate with a GO bond versus a revenue bond.

[04:58:29] And a credit that is much lower, like a AA or a single, would have a much wider gap between a GO and a revenue bond. Lastly, there are slight differences in issuance costs. The biggest difference between the two would be related to voter education, ballots, anything related to the election cycle related to the referendum.

[04:58:54] Both would see the typical costs related to underwriters, bond counsel, financial advisors, and those are in both types. So I'm going to hand the rest of the presentation over to Courtney Rogers. She's going to walk through a market update and the plan of finance.

[04:59:10] and then I'll come back at the end to answer any questions and before we present the resolution for the board. Awesome. Good evening. Thank you, Jacob. Good evening, board members. Great to see you all again. As Jacob said, my name is Courtney Rogers. I'm with Davenport and Company. I've had the pleasure of working with you all as financial advisor dating back to, I think, the year 2000, if you remember that, the old computer time change. I wanted to start off and just kind of give you a sense of where the market is today, and I always like to start off with the Federal Open Market Committee, because everyone talks about, oh, they may be cutting rates, and people think in terms of mortgages and things like that, and that's not always true in the taxes

[04:59:48] and market, because as Jacob said, we're actually going to be borrowing over a 20-year period, so we're going to have interest rates ranging from year one to year 20. And when the Fed actually does lower rates or increases rates, it really only affects the first five years of the taxes and yield curve, which you're going to see in just a moment. And so I wanted to start off there. Second, this is the AAA tax exempt. This is the 20-year rate, just the 20-year rate by itself. There's a company out there called Municipal Market Data. We effectively call them MMD. They go out and look at the market every day, see what's trading out there, and they put

[05:00:25] together this yield curve, if you will. And this is the 20-year rate. And it just gives you a sense that going back to, and this wasn't put together because this is when I worked with you, we just picked 2000 you can see rates have generally been going down up until we hit that low bottom during the COVID period and actually it actually started going a little bit lower slightly before COVID even came around. We hit that bottom and then of course as we came out of it rates started coming back up and so that's what you'll see on the right hand side goes since January of last year. It's been

[05:00:58] trading give or take around the four percent level. This shows you that same time period going back January 25 for each, for both one year, five year, all the way up to 30 year, just to kind of see where rates have been. You'll see the little heartbeat motion there around March, April. That, of course, was when the president announced tariffs. The market reacted. You can see it was a knee-jerk reaction. Before that, you'll notice that the lower rates were starting to trickle down faster than the higher rates. That was the Fed lowering rates. And then what happened after the market

[05:01:35] knee-jerked. It settled back down. You can see rates have been trending downward. But again, those lower rates were coming down faster than the upper rates. And you can see that on this yield curve. This shows rates from year one to year 30. The purple line is where we are today.

[05:01:51] The blue line is where we were a year ago. So you can see the shorter term rates have come down, but we've seen longer term rates go up very slightly, kind of back to a normal yield curve, if you will. So what is that all saying about what we might see in the market? We actually are in a good place market-wise. Take away the crazy low rates that we saw back around the COVID period.

[05:02:12] We are going to see rates below 4% is what we're looking at. You'll see in a moment we actually run because of the market disruptions and things like that that could happen. We ran market plus 50 to show you what we think it's going to look like in a moment. But we really think we'll probably be in a three and a half range if we went to market today. So let's talk about the plan of finance.

[05:02:35] So Jacob kind of went through what we're going to do, so I just want to talk about how we're going to do it. As we've done with you throughout our tenure with you, we've taken and put it into a competitive bid marketplace. This is all done electronically. It allows any of the large investment banks around the country that want to bid on the bonds to put a bid in at a given date and time. And so that's all done on the internet. It's based on the ratings.

[05:03:04] Jacob mentioned that. We'll be actually talking to the agencies next week. Every time we go out and do a bond issue, we have to get a new rating for those bonds. But it's based on where you are. We fully expect to still be in the AAA range on your issuer credit rating. And as Jacob mentioned, because of the appropriation nature, we expect the bonds to be one notch off in the AA1, AA plus rating.

[05:03:27] There's a public offering document that Bond Council Hunt and Andrews Kurth is putting together. And that basically tells sort of the story of the county, what we're doing, your financial and history on where you are, population, wealth levels, things like that.

[05:03:42] And that's what basically is like an offering document that essentially the bond purchasers are going to look at. The interest rates are fixed, so they'll be fixed on the day that we sell the bonds and then we're locked in. And so then we'll know the exact debt service and potential savings, which I'll talk about in a moment, if the refunding still works.

[05:04:03] And, again, what we're going to show you in a moment is the results of what we think it will look like, again, based on the market plus a cushion today. We've got the 26 borrowings on numbers 1 and 2, the roughly \$115, \$118 million issue on the tax-exempt side, and then the partial refunding.

[05:04:23] And then item 3 is the takeout of the remaining. We're projecting out into 2028, we're going to use a very conservative taxable interest rate to take out the remaining \$34 million of the 2023 B notes. So again, from an assumption standpoint, 20 years in both cases, and again, we think at plus 50, we'll be right at 4%.

[05:04:46] So again, we should be right around the 3.5% range if we went to market today. And then the planning rate assumption there, again, we're several years out at 6% on the taxable side. And generally, tax exempt rates versus taxable rates are going to be in the 1% to 1.25% range.

[05:05:04] We did see them a little lower during the COVID period, but for the most part, historically, it's been 1% or slightly above. So where are we today? So today, we've got just under \$250 million of tax-supported debt service. That's your county and school debt there.

[05:05:21] You'll see it's a downward sloping when you look at the principal and interest payments there in the graph on the right. This shows you the first column being the existing debt service from the previous page. We've got the next three columns being the new money, the refinancing of the Ravana, the tax exempt portion, and then the last one is, as you can see, two years later when we take out the taxable piece.

[05:05:47] So this is graphically what it looks like. So again, downward sloping, the red line shows you where your current debt service is now. There'll be additional revenues needed. You'll see there in budget 27, 28, 29 to get back down to that level. We always like to look at what is that going to do to our debt ratios?

[05:06:06] The two key debt ratios, you might recall, one is total debt service outstanding divided by the assessed value, personal, and real estate. And you'll see you're in great shape, well below your 2% line there. And then the other one is annual debt service payments divided by the budget.

[05:06:25] Think of it that way. It looks like we made a mistake there. We got the wrong title there. So this one is basically showing that 10% of your budget, we try to stay below that number. That's going to be important as you're looking at, as I understand, a very large CIP out there in the future.

[05:06:42] That's one of the things that I know we're going to be coming in and talking to you probably later this year about some of those things. But right now, you're below 8%, so you've got some good room to do that. But we know that there's some large ask of the school district that's out there in the future. So then the last thing is it's not a big refunding, but we're always trying to mind the pennies, if you will.

[05:07:03] And so we're looking at about \$11.5 million of debt that we did back in 2015. We're looking at debt service savings at around \$400,000 level. And as you might recall from some of the refundings we've done in the past, the market uses a 3% net present value.

[05:07:22] Basically, it's looking at the savings, present value, back, making sure you're taking into account all cost of issuance. If it at least meets that 3% threshold, then we usually move forward. It's sort of a national market thing, but also, if some of you might recall, back in the 90s, there was a state and local government committee that the state ran.

[05:07:43] You had to run every refunding through them and get approval, and they basically rubber-stamped everything at 3%. And they finally disbanded the group because everybody was getting what they wanted at 3%. So we've just used that as a guideline and policy, if you will. So here's the bonds that we're looking at.

[05:08:01] You can see that we had the good fortune of having pretty low coupons and rates back in 2015. And you might say, well, gosh, how are we able to do that if we're issuing debt at 3.5%? But that's over the 20 years. So you can see this is shorter.

[05:08:16] And I'm going to flip to the next page. And you'll see we're running this at current market at about a 2.7% in the bottom right corner of that box, the all-in TIC. So we are going to basically squeeze what we can out of it. So rounding out our presentation, just a few of the next steps.

[05:08:39] After tonight, we'll move into next week doing the credit rating presentations and obtaining that rating, looking to do the bond sale in mid to late April, and then we'll finally go through the bond closing process and receive the funds in early May. So Courtney and I are both available to answer questions, and Chair, I'll turn it back over to you.

[05:09:00] I do have a proposed motion on the next slide once you are done with the questions, sir. Great. Thank you both. We'll see what questions we have. Supervisor Malik? Thank you all very much. Each time I get to hear one of these, I understand a little bit more. So how important is timetable and the fluctuation of the rates that you see, and do you make a decision much more close to the time about go or no-go?

[05:09:23] On the refunding? Well, yes, the refunding. In particular on the refunding, we will, so roughly a week before the sale, we'll get the ratings back, and at the same time we'll finalize that preliminary official statement. So we put it out there roughly a week before the sale. And so we'll be monitoring the market, obviously, as we go along.

[05:09:43] If there's any big shifts, then that's when we really worry. We can pull the refunding if we need to, But roughly a week beforehand, we'll probably make that decision whether we do the refinancing or not. Now, as far as whether to go to market with the new money, is that part of your question? You know, at this point, we need to put the funds back into your fund balance because you've spent a lot of the money already.

[05:10:04] And so, you know, if there's a crazy, you know, market disruption, I'll harken back to March of 2020. We were about to do a couple hundred million dollars for the city of Richland's utility program. and we were going to we actually had the rating agencies in the first week in march you might remember about march 16th is when the shutdowns happened and so we were getting our ratings back right after that so we had to postpone our sale for about 45 days before we were able to for the

[05:10:33] market calmed down if you will from that crazy time thank you supervisor pruit um i i hope you'll understand if i have some questions that are tending more towards the thing that is at this moment suddenly, thanks to some present company, politically more salient. And that's going to be the general obligation bonds versus typical revenue bonds. Part of the thing I want to know is whether or not we do consider the option of general obligation bonding as

[05:11:09] part of our normal process. I understand that there's suitability questions because of the impacts it has on timetables. Is there a specific hard and fast criteria? Is there maybe a specific project size that might trigger ah this is a circumstance where we might actually better be served by a so i'll start out with saying it at the end of the day we it's obviously the board's decision how they want to go whether you want to go in one one area or another one way or the other um a lot of the decisions that our clients have made over the course of my career 35 years in

[05:11:45] this state has been about timing um jacob mentioned and i'll just throw out that if you think about it if you're going through your CIP process in the fall, you make a decision of what projects you want staff to go forward with, you adopt it during the budget time frame, then you've got to go to a referendum. So you're looking at possibly six to eight months before it ever gets to a vote, and then you've got to go

roughly three months, two months to go to market. So you're almost a year later. And so it depends on the projects. If you're needing to get going with a project, I mean, let's look at last several years. If you wait a year, that project cost is going to

[05:12:23] go up more than five basis points, I can tell you that, in terms of the value of some of these larger projects that we've seen. So a lot of our clients have made the decision not to go through the referendum process because of just timing, because it just takes time. And at least in the Commonwealth of Virginia, they have the opportunity to come during the CIP and say, I don't like this project, I like this project.

[05:12:46] Hopefully they've done that. And at that point, it can become a financial decision, yes. There are some counties that will do some referendum geo bonds and some lease bonds, depending upon the projects, because some are not maybe as popular as others, sure.

[05:13:04] But since we've been working with the county in Albemarle back, as Jacob said, since 2003, we've gone the EDA route. Because you've had the benefit of AAA ratings and the differential has been so nominal, I know five basis points is maybe not something that every day person understands, but it's five one-hundredths of 1%.

[05:13:27] It's not a big number, but when you're talking about \$100 million, it can be several hundred thousand dollars worth of difference in interest rates, yes. But the other thing you need to understand is we could lose five basis points in our market in one day. And so if you're going to wait six or eight months, you could lose 50 basis points.

[05:13:48] It could also go down 50 basis points. On that point, I want to highlight a point of possible discrepancy and what I assume might be the source, which is one of our speakers suggested that the gulf in basis points was more significant than what we were assessing.

[05:14:05] And I might assume that's because we are such a high credit-rated agency, right? That's a little bit of it. I did have privy of seeing the statements earlier today. So the one thing that we saw in the information that we were provided was that the comparison that he was using was not apples and apples.

[05:14:26] What I mean by that is the 35 basis points that he used to get to part of that 48 was comparing revenue bonds and geobonds. But he wasn't comparing lease revenue or revenue bonds that we use in Virginia to geobonds.

[05:14:42] There were hospital bonds and other revenue bonds that are much worse credits. And so the average, if you will, is a lot bigger because of that. I'll give you an example. So Loudoun County has been one of my clients my entire career for 35 years.

[05:14:58] Last year in May, we sold over \$100 million of GEO bonds, and 15 minutes later sold \$75 million of EDA bonds. They were six basis points apart. I'm not sure you can get much better information than that. Do you have municipal clients in states that allow municipalities to issue GEO bonds without referenda?

[05:15:21] Yes, actually. Are they used more freely and more frequently in those? Almost exclusively. Almost exclusively. So I actually oversee our practice in Georgia for the last 13 years, and so in Georgia, they have something called intergovernmental revenue bonds.

[05:15:39] So it's similar to our EDA, but they're not appropriation-backed, because under their laws, there's an intergovernmental revenue document, or just between the, I'll call it their EDA. They use different acronyms, their EDA in the county, and by law, the courts see that as a GO obligation.

[05:16:00] a basically a full faith and credit obligation so the rating agencies give them a credit for that type of bond at the same level as I think it's worth noting that a previous speaker noted that you know we're a little see conservative locality with our financial policies and that makes it so that a typical revenue bond is it's kind of de facto doing the same thing because we are so precious about our credit rating agency board I just wanted to illustrate this last point, to have an expert kind of support what I had suggested

[05:16:35] on Monday, which is this is a ripe request for our legislative delegation this year. This would be something that could be used to realize incremental, but not insignificant savings moving forward.

[05:16:53] I think it would speak to some of the fiscal stability concerns that the other party has while still allowing us to have the kind of flexibility and agility we would need to move on this bond market.

[05:17:10] There is no reason we have this kind of patronizing state that does not allow us to issue these types of bonds, especially when we are demonstrated such a responsible fiscal agent. We could even ask them, hey, maybe just only make it available to such highly rated counties if you're going to be so paternalistic.

[05:17:33] And if I could add, Supervisor Pruitt, there are a couple of counties in their charter that have the ability already to do this. And as you probably know... I know Arlington issues exclusively geo-bonds, and I looked at that and I was like... And I can't remember the names of the... There's some counties that aren't even Northern Virginia that actually can, by their charter, do geo-bonds without referendum.

[05:17:52] And as you probably are aware, cities in the Commonwealth can, without referendum, do geo-bonds. Up to a 10% assessed value. Remember, our policy is 2, and a lot of our clients, some clients use 3 and 4, but nowhere near 10. If you did 10, you're going to lose your rating.

[05:18:08] Am I correct that we can statutorily adopt the, I feel like I read this somewhere, that we can adopt the bonding powers of a city if we chose to? Ooh, I'm not aware of that one. Okay. I can find the state code section at a later date, but I think there's a way that we could essentially convert ourselves into a city for bonding purposes.

[05:18:30] We'd have to run that through our bond council. Maybe this would get to the same point I'm trying to get at. But it would be helpful to make this a tool that we can use more readily in the future. And so to that end, I'm helpful that the point has been raised a little bit more. Something else that might help as you're thinking about it, too, because we did a little bit of homework.

[05:18:49] Out of the 95 counties, not all of them are our clients, but a lot are. Eighty-five we've actually assisted with, at least during our careers, the guys that I work with and ladies at Davenport have done lease revenue bonds or now revenue bonds. We've kind of dropped the lease lately.

[05:19:06] The other thing that I'll mention is just in the last five years, we've done a couple billion dollars worth of. So it is used very widely in the Commonwealth. Great. Thank you. Supervisor Lapisto currently. Thank you very much for the presentation.

[05:19:22] I understand we're issuing, we need to issue these because we already have obligations that have been, like the courts are finished. Center 2 will be finished in August. The elementary school will be finished, so we need to pay for those.

[05:19:41] That's correct. The \$118 million of the new money that's part of this issuance is to reimburse the county for those capital expenditures that have already occurred. Very correct. okay so that's that's one thing and the uh to make sure that we get things done you know in a quick you know fairly quickly and we don't want to explain why our fund balance dropped substantially when we talk to them the next time okay exactly exactly and i do understand that usually geo bonds or would normally be something for example if if the board of supervisors if we

[05:20:21] decided that we wanted to put in a football stadium or I don't know you know something else like that that would be a good reason to go out for a referendum it's really up to you all honestly you know if you wanted to get real public input right exactly exactly and some of these other things I mean we require them and the community wants us to have them also we hear about that a lot. So I just want to use that as a point of clarification. Thank you. Supervisor Missal.

[05:20:54] Great. Thank you. Full disclosure, this is not an area of my expertise. So some of my questions may be not too highbrow. But first of all, I do appreciate, and this has sort of been as a new guy coming in, I've really seen the fiduciary responsibility and intense focus and commitment that this county has on fiduciary responsibility. And it shows with the triple AAA bond rating, one of 54, I think, right, in the country.

[05:21:22] Is that right? Yeah. And I also hear concerns from several about transparency and ensuring that we're including the county and the community in these discussions. So is it my interpretation, is my interpretation correct that when we, so when I hear about things like we've already committed these funds and just now we're starting to figure out how to pay for them, that's not really correct, right?

[05:21:49] I mean, we've had, is it or is it not, we've had in mind the approach to how we were going to pay for these projects and is it true that the community had the opportunity through public forum and hearings to weigh in on whether or not we actually did these projects at all is that true um yes and in different arenas so i will use the northern elementary school that is in the the current uh five-year cip so uh when when that

[05:22:23] projects and if that project continues to move forward um and that moves to construction um let's say in in the in the boards currently um your 27 through 31 uh proposed cip uh construction would be in year one i'm sorry um design would be in year one construction would be in year two we we are planning on on taking out the debt after that project is uh underway so that we our financial modeling that we have that we project out our debt service and our debt management and our debt budget we are anticipating that we would issue that debt probably about a

[05:23:01] year or two years after that has been appropriated and part of that is because it takes time for that capital project to to get up and running and to start moving into construction so the the funding from an appropriation standpoint would be available in that that year that it's appropriated but it will take us a while for that project to get up and running for us to have expenditures related to that and then we do the financial modeling we are then looking back or looking into the future of when we would have our cash flow needs to then do a bond issuance to reimburse us for those for those capital expenditures so the timing is a little bit different of when

[05:23:36] we do the capital projects versus the debt issuance and so that is part of the capital improvement plan that we review as part of the budget process that has multiple public hearings that you're aware of and town halls that we can get public input on so that's that's what I was referring to is public input in a different arena as opposed directly related to when we issue the debt that's helpful. Thank you. And I know we've talked about five basis points and the, you know, just the cost of time. And I think everybody who's in the business is aware that, I mean, we've seen

[05:24:10] escalation of 30% plus over the last four or five years. And so timing is absolutely critical on this. Can I add something to what Jacob said too? And I'll liken it to this. If you're going out and build a house, you've got to have money up front. And so you're basically borrowing from yourself, think of it that way using your own cash and waiting until you know what the final amount is and you're actually starting to pay it back not before you finish the project but two or three years down the road. One of the things we've found over the last several years in particular is you want to move as fast as you can to get a project done because of that inflation that we just talked about but part of the problem is sometimes it doesn't go as fast as you think

[05:24:50] and so we've had clients go and borrow the money up front you start paying principal and interest on it and you haven't even finished the project yet and so this does help spread your cash flow out a little bit better from the repayment stuff yeah that makes total sense i think there's some impression that the numbers these numbers are new and people weren't aware of them and and that's just not true i mean they've been seen before they've been planned for and identified through the public process correct um slide 20 can we just jump to that real quick i just have one clarifying question i think i know the answer to so here um this does not take

[05:25:30] into consideration any future debt correct this is based on basically this actually it just takes into account the future debt of what we're talking about tonight yes um so you've got the light and i'm sorry i didn't go through in the detail the dark green is existing debt the light green is the new money the 115 or so million the blue is the take out of the ravana to make it tax-exempt, and then the TAN is our projected takeout of the ban taxable piece in 2028.

[05:26:02] So beyond that, we don't have anything new. We didn't take into account the refunding here. It's just for, obviously, we don't want to count on that. But we don't have any future here, correct? Sure, which would obviously impact this chart. Right. I know you guys went through that as you run through CIP, though. Got it.

[05:26:17] Thank you. That's all. Supervisor Duncan? I have no questions. Well, I don't have any questions. I understand what we're doing and how we're doing it. I think it's useful to think of, and Ann, you're going to have to help me with my memory here.

[05:26:35] We did the bond referendum in 2016, the GO. Prior to that, was it the high school, Western Albemarle? They did one back in the 70s. So I think for those interested in why you do or don't do GO versus referendum, the lead-up conversation to the July 16, 2016 vote, which was a good 16, I guess, year and a half after there was conversations of this nature happening

[05:27:13] between both the school board, of which I was the chair at the time, and the Board of Supervisors, which back then, some of it was a little bit more mixed politically. So it's not just you could say, oh, well, that was just one party or the other. But the learning that was happening in the discussion

about, well, what projects might you choose to do a GEO for versus doing it this way, that was pretty well vetted out.

[05:27:38] And it was done in comparison of why you might do a GEO bond. So I'm pretty well, I'm remembering a lot of that education and remembering why we did the school projects as a G.O.

[05:27:53] And frankly, the savings was kind of an extra piece. It was a good point, I suppose, if you're going to the polls. But it was really about, you know, after years and years of not having certain investments, to say, all right, let's see what the people really think.

[05:28:11] I mean, but there were also auditoriums full of people coming out and speaking to those specific projects as well. So it wasn't, you know, I feel like they could have done it without the GEO and everybody would have been happy and fine. But the supervisors at the time, and I think the school board at the time, appreciated the political will that came with the vote being there.

[05:28:34] So it's not like afraid to go that way. In a lot of ways, it gives you a lot more political cover. But when you start taking in at the time, I remember scrutinizing how much it was going to cost to add it to the ballot, how much the, you know, just every dime got scrutinized in that conversation leading up to it.

[05:28:54] And you just have to make judgment calls at that point. So I think that's historically something that maybe we do see it as a useful tool because the size of our CIP is getting to be such, as we've all been saying for weeks and even going back to our December meeting, we don't we got we got to start thinking of things differently the geo bond or this type of bond issuance are really just the mechanisms we have to figure make other big calls uh and have the public weigh in on before we even get to these type of things relative to to what uh kind of total

[05:29:30] programs we are because i mean the point i've made in the budget about if you take out the current high school request the school division still has a 300 million dollar cip request before we even get TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT MILLIONS OF DOLLARS THAT ARE THERE, WE'VE JUST NOT HAD TO DO THESE SIZE OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS IN THE PAST.

[05:29:52] SO SCRUTINIZING IT FROM EVERY SINGLE ANGLE JUST TO BE EFFECTIVE IN PROVIDING THE CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE THAT WE NEED IS GOING TO HAVE TO TO OCCUR. AND YEAH, WELCOME EVERYBODY'S INPUT AND THOUGHTS AND IDEAS ON THAT. WE'RE NOT GOING TO BE CLOSED OFF TO ANY OF IT.

[05:30:10] SO I APPRECIATE YOU BEING HERE. Are there any other questions or comments? Yeah. Thinking back to the recession and how quickly the loss of revenue and the tax cut that was made that first year in 2009 zeroed out the capital program.

[05:30:26] I know quickly it took seven years, basically, to even begin to get back in harness. That brings us to the time that Chair Galloway was talking about. There was still tremendous discussion, debate between the two boards because the Board of Supervisors at the time did not want to do anything, Even though they could have saved millions, even building just the Crozet Library during the recession instead of after would have saved \$3 million in that one project, which is 30%.

[05:30:52] I mean, it was awful. So anyway, I think that there was a tremendous opportunity in the referendum for the school board to say to the board, see, there's public support for this. We have to do this now. And that was a really helpful part of the discussion to sort of move the needle off Top Dead Center.

[05:31:09] And I know there was when, after years of working to try to accomplish what the staff accomplished with the purchase of the land around Verbena Station, people complained to me bitterly about the cost of that property. And I said, well, when you're facing losing the station altogether in a BRAC and the annual return for the county is over \$600 million for the county alone, this is pretty good math from my perspective.

[05:31:39] And they all said, oh, never mind. Take back my question. I don't want to debate this anymore because it made such good sense. So that's sort of the background that I have that brings me to this. Thanks. Gentlemen, thank you both for the presentation. We do have one more slide as a proposed motion for the board to consider.

[05:31:59] All right. Would someone like to read the motion that is on the screen? I'm happy to. I move to adopt the resolution attached to the staff report as attachment A. Second. All right. Is there any further discussion? All right. If the clerk would please call the roll. Ms. LaPiesto-Kirtley? Aye. Ms. Malik? Yes. Mr. Missel? Aye. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway? Yes.

[05:32:20] All right, motion carries. Thank you. All right, we are going to move to our next item, which is now the first of our public hearings this evening. This is number 16, Fiscal Year 2026 Budget Amendment and Appropriation. Mr. Davidson is with us. Good evening. Good evening. Ryan Davidson, Deputy Chief budget. I'm here to present this public hearing and action item to amend FY26 budget. A couple of quick slides that we'll get through and then at that time I'll turn it over to the board

[05:32:59] and to the chair for any questions, comments, or concerns they may have and to hold the public hearing. The Virginia Code requires us to hold a public hearing when we're going to amend the budget for any amount of funding that exceeds a change of more than 1%. That's currently what is before us tonight. Overall, the budget amendment is roughly \$39.5 million. Of that amount, \$1.1 million was approved by the board as part of prior appropriations in January, February, and March, and the additional \$38.4 million is under consideration for approval tonight.

[05:33:33] As I mentioned before, overall, the amount of this amendment is \$39.5 million, and it's broadly made up of the categories that you see above. I will say the first two categories with The debt fund appropriations and the capital improvement fund appropriations are mainly related to the refunding item that Mr. Sumner just spoke of recently.

[05:33:52] I will say that why this is coming before you as an appropriation is more about a matter of timing than it is a change in the cost. Our normal budget appropriation cycle does not anticipate refunding, and so this is just moving those costs into this fiscal year, and it is all part of our overall CIP plan and our debt plan that we've been discussing with the board as we've moved through the budget appropriations.

[05:34:13] So there's no change in that overall plan. It's just a matter of a timing adjustment for us. And then I'd also say the \$324,000 in special revenue fund appropriations are primarily related to plastic bag tax, CACVP, and some economic development authority funds.

[05:34:33] To wrap up the presentation, staff's recommendation for the board is to adopt the resolution in attachment B after holding the public hearing. And I will say that attachment A for tonight and from the previous board meetings in January, February, and March, I'll contain the additional details behind these appropriations.

[05:34:54] And so at this point, I will turn it over to the chair and the board for any questions and to hold the public hearing. Thank you, Mr. Davidson. We'll see if there are any questions first. Supervisor Malik? No questions. Thank you. Supervisor Pruitt? Nothing for me. Thank you. Supervisor Lepisto-Kirtley?

[05:35:10] No questions. Supervisor Missal? No questions. supervisor duncan no questions all right i do not have any uh questions we will open the public hearing do we have anyone signed up we do not we have no one signed up for this public hearing we will close the public hearing all right the matter is back before the board any final questions or comments all right the motion is there you go the recommendation at the bottom i move that the board adopt the resolution attachment b second all right any further discussion all right if the

[05:35:47] Clerk would please call the roll. Ms. Lapista-Kirtley. Aye. Ms. Malik. Yes. Mr. Missel. Aye. Mr. Pruitt. Aye. Ms. Duncan. Yes. Mr. Galloway. Yes. All right. Motion carries. Thank you, Mr. Davidson. Thank you. All right, board, we will move to item number 17. This is a public hearing on ZMA 2025-6, Hollymead Town Center, Area C, Block 7 and Block 9 Amendment.

[05:36:15] And, oh, Mr. Newberry snuck up there before I even saw you. And just a reminder to make sure you're right into the mic. Thank you, sir.

[05:36:35] Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Chair and members of the board. My name is J.T. Newberry. I'm a senior planner in the Department of Community Development. I'll be providing staff's presentation tonight on the rezoning in Hollymee Town Center Area C, which is filed under ZMA 2025 No. 6.

[05:36:53] Before we look closely at the aerial map, I'll begin by sharing specifics of the request. The applicant is seeking to amend the existing Code of Development and Proffers to add 40 dwelling units to the maximum number of dwelling units permitted in Area C. That would take the maximum number of dwelling units from 370 to 410. The proposal would also reduce the minimum amount of non-residential square footage required in Block 9 from 20,000 square feet down to zero and permit residential uses in that block. And finally, there are several minor

[05:37:32] changes to the code of development that would add clarity and bring consistency to how these two blocks are treated with the rest of area C, and they are listed and summarized on page three of the staff report. So this aerial view will help orient us to the area we're discussing. The area outlined in red is is all of area c of hollymead town center so we're right behind the target on route 29 north and the area is comprised of of nine separate blocks all nine blocks can be seen

[05:38:08] on the application plan in attachment a5 six of these blocks are fully developed two are partially developed and finally the two blocks are vacant which is the focus of tonight's presentation That's blocks 7 and 9, which are shaded in blue on the map.

[05:38:28] Here's a look at the zoning map. Each of the subject parcels for tonight have a yellow star on them. Both are zoned planned development mixed commercial, which is consistent with the rest of Area C, and that's the dark purple color on the zoning map.

[05:38:46] Tonight's rezoning proposal doesn't change the zoning district itself. However, a rezoning application is necessary to update the code of development and proffers. Here's a look at the land use map, and this is taken directly from the Places 29 master plan.

[05:39:05] Blocks 7 and 9 are the parcels with the yellow stars on them, again on this map. Both parcels are designated for commercial mixed use, which calls for primary uses of retail and commercial service. Residential uses are a secondary use in this designation.

[05:39:23] At the time that Places 29 was adopted, the commercial mixed-use designation was applied over areas that were either already developed as commercial shopping areas or approved to be developed as such.

[05:39:39] And the master plan recognized that as development continued to occur, there would be eventual conversion of these areas to a more mixed-use type of development where residential and non-retail uses would develop and support the centers around them.

[05:40:00] So the centers are the pink hatched areas with the letter C on the land use map. So some highlights from the proposed amended code of development are summarized on this slide. Again, the proposal seeks to increase the overall number of units by 40 from 370 to 410.

[05:40:22] And these blocks would develop with single-family attached or multi-family style units. With respect to affordable housing, the application aligns with the housing policy in effect at the time of approval. So for the 100 units that are approved but not yet built, 15% of those units would be provided as affordable, and for the proposed 40 new units, if approved, they would meet the current housing Albemarle policy, where 20% would be provided as affordable.

[05:40:58] These units would be similar to other blocks containing residential units within Area C, developing at two to four stories in height, and providing amenities like a pocket park or tot lot within both of the blocks.

[05:41:14] Staff recommends approval of this request after finding two positive aspects and identifying no concerns, the applications consistent with the Places 29 Master Plan, and the amendment could result in more affordable units being built than what is currently approved.

[05:41:33] At the October 14th Planning Commission meeting, the commission voted 7-0 to recommend approval. And with that, I can take any questions that you may have. Thank you, Mr. Newberry. Supervisor Malek?

[05:41:50] Thank you. Is there anything in the proposal that I missed, I'm sure, about trying to pay the \$16,000 per unit instead of building them? Because if there's not, I wouldn't like there to be a condition that they have to be built.

[05:42:11] No, beginning on page 17 of the Code of Development, the amended code of development begins the discussion of how the existing approved units would be treated and how the proposed ones would there's nothing with respect to cash and loo okay and part of one of the blocks has the townhouse looking i'm not sure exactly what the configuration is but they're so similar it would just migrate down the hill basically what they're planning yeah and the the applicants proposed uh presentation tonight may include more information about the specific form.

[05:42:49] All right. Supervisor Pruitt? I have no questions. Thank you. Supervisor Lepisto-Curtley? No questions. Supervisor Missal? A couple of cool questions, and I can ask the applicant this as well. It seems like deja vu night for me here a little bit. So I don't remember. The updated proffers are simply to say that it will be in general compliance with the Code of Development, right?

[05:43:09] That's correct. Were the traffic generation numbers looked at? Was there any additional trip generation numbers that might trigger additional proffers? Did you guys look at the proffers as a whole against the new development request? The transportation figures were examined, and the consensus was that the existing permitted commercial uses had the potential to generate more trips than what would be generated by the proposed amendment.

[05:43:38] Got it. And therefore, no additional transportation proffers were requested. Nor were they asked to be reduced. Okay, thank you. No other questions. supervisor Duncan no questions all right I do not have questions at this time and we will then open the public hearing and let me just check we do not have any members of the public signed up do we have an we have an applicant this evening so if you'll read the well let me do the abbreviated version sure so we'll ask the applicant to come forward mr. Schimp you have ten minutes to make your presentation the board will then ask questions and then you'll have a

[05:44:18] a chance for rebuttal if you need it, but we'll probably have a little back and forth anyway, as is allowed in the public hearing, before I get myself into trouble saying that. Thank you. I'm Justin Shimp. I'm an engineer of Shimp Engineering. I'm representing Dr. Hurt tonight, who's the owner of these properties via Post Office Land Trust. Now, I have a presentation.

[05:44:38] Well, I see Mr. Taylor has jumped in front of me with his presentation here for the next project. I don't know that I need to put my presentation up in the sense the information is the same as what was shown in the staff report it was very thorough report and the essence here is we're essentially fixing the zoning that was too strict when it was developed so in 2003 when these PDM sees with the code developments were developed there was a pretty stringent you shall have residential here commercial there and that essentially led to blocks that were not developed over time because the use is permitted in the vision in 2003 are really no

[05:45:15] longer viable, practically. You'll be familiar with Block 9. Dr. Hurt started to build a building in 2010 or so, a commercial building that never got finished. And essentially that now will be torn up and replaced by townhomes or similar structures, because that's now the demand for the area. The only thing I'd point out that wasn't pointed out in the staff summary is that if you look at Hollomay Town Center as a whole, or probably most any mixed-use district you have. You generally say that the comprehensive plan recommended density is 6 to

[05:45:51] 34 units per acre. Well, you're nowhere close to that in Hollymead Town Center. In fact, even though we're upping the units, we've increased to the 40 units on these blocks, we're maybe at 20 dwelling units per acre is our high side, whereas chunks of land where Target R, Harris Teeter, etc., have no residential component at all. So as a whole, these areas are really underutilized by residential, even though certainly you've seen a lot of townhomes and things come in those areas recently when compared to the Comprehensive plan for that particular neighborhood. It's actually quite short of housing

[05:46:27] So this is a remedy to get the zoning into compliance something that's billable And we were ready to move forward with a plan development to build some housing in this area Any additional housing above what was previously approved we subject the current housing Albemarle policy for affordability So that's really a mark someone dad. We can go back to slides you have there and took their questions, but This is maybe creating, if you think about how the RIO form-based code was developed with its density being not unlimited totally, but a higher density range, if you were to redo Holleymead Town Center today, you'd probably do it in a similar fashion.

[05:47:03] The buildings are of that same form. There simply was a restriction to where residential could be that I think we now no longer do in those sort of districts for good reason. Very good. We'll see if we have any questions. Supervisor Malek? No, so you would describe your application as more of a form-based code than the old-fashioned color of the doorknobs, et cetera, that Neil's always complaining about.

[05:47:27] It's trying to get to that. The Holleymead Town Center original approval included things like the maximum setbacks, building heights, and things that brought buildings to street. But they also included restrictions on density, which are sort of not in form-based code. So we're sort of wheeling back that and saying, well, these areas could be either commercial or residential in their future build-out.

[05:47:47] Certainly the current market is they'd be residential, we fully expect that to be built. The commercial uses are still allowed, but now the residential will also be allowed in these particular blocks. Thank you. Supervisor Pruitt? I have no questions. Thank you. Supervisor Lepisto-Kirtley?

[05:48:03] I notice you have a provision for the 40 units, either 60% AMI for rentals, 80% for homeowners. Do you know which way it may go?

[05:48:20] Because I know there is, we are trying to get to 60% AMI for renters to be able to give, you know, the people who don't, can't afford a home, home buyers. Sure. I'll tell you that the product I'm laying out in the property now is probably more owner-occupied type, but it could be rental.

[05:48:43] This was originally supposed to be commercial 23 years ago, so I hesitate to predict what exactly it might be until it gets built. But it will end up likely a mix with this density, but the policy would be that if somebody built, you could build a product that could be sold or rented, the same product.

[05:49:01] If it's rented, it would have to fall to that 60% AMI threshold. So whatever product type is built, I think, could be either. You would not see a product that would be sort of up for sale only. It definitely would have a rental component in this neighborhood. Thank you. That's all. Supervisor Missal?

[05:49:18] I guess my question is also around affordable housing, so I appreciate your bringing this up to kind of current zoning codes and so on. Are you also doing that with the housing album? You're doing it with just the 40 units, right?

[05:49:34] Correct. So 20% of the 40 units will be at 60% AMI for rental. Yeah, so the 100 that were approved previously are sort of under the old rules. Those were built, so in Block 2, years ago, we changed the similar situation for Block 2, which is across the street on Timberwood Boulevard.

[05:49:51] And there were townhomes built there. And there were, all the affordable units were built and sold in that area by the builder per that policy. Okay, that clears it up. Thank you. No other questions. Supervisor Duncan? Just my only comment is I wish we were maxing out the residential density, but no questions.

[05:50:12] My question is a little bit more of a curiosity than really a deciding factor for the application. Have you thought about how the side that's going to be on Berkmar Drive, I mean, that's going to extend Airport Road?

[05:50:30] So that's a funded project, and that will go. I'm trying to remember if it moves left away from you or moves right. I think it moves the left away from here from here as it's heading towards airport road um I'm on vdot site but I can't find a design on it I'm just end of the day thinking about those homes like right now don't have a road that has the traffic of berkmar drive coming through I mean I'm just saying are

you thinking about which way things are facing and all of that knowing that you're going to have berkmar drive as a road there in the next handful of years we are and i think a lot of say that the code development doesn't really give us a choice about how we think about

[05:51:08] that. It basically requires the units be up on the street, I think a 10-foot maximum setback, and then sort of facing Birkmar. I think if you travel around to older cities, it's not uncommon to have three, four-story row houses on a pretty busy street. It's not common here, but I think it's not uncommon. It's more for the folks who buy them to kind of get used to that, but we have to plot the code development i think it will ultimately look good a lot of these buildings are three and four stories so your bedrooms are going to be above the street level so you have a

[05:51:43] little bit of break from the on-street activity yeah i was thinking more like you know once the road's there and somebody looks at the house well this looks like this was designed without this road here what happened but i'm just hoping that it that it you know i'm not even worried so much about the people living there next to the road because that's been planned it's just that it all looks the way it should and i'm sure you'll handle all that i think i think the purpose of the county's you know long-term plan for burkemark i mean all the way through high me town centers to create that consistent you know uniform look and i think everyone who comes along and builds it will have to follow that essentially and we're okay with that i think it's different from what has been

[05:52:20] seen but it's not different than what somebody would be happy to live in in a prime location like that all right any um yep go ahead and follow it uh for my i was lost in dc last month and it reminded me of my drive around trying to get back to downtown.

[05:52:37] And you're absolutely right. Lovely old houses and a sidewalk away from the road. And it was jammed with people like me being lost. It reminds me also of around the corner, Timberwood North, are all those, I think Couture designed them years ago, townhouses right at the street.

[05:52:53] And they're getting all that traffic now that is going to be divided later between those who want to go north and stay on the new Berkmar section and the others who want to go west who will continue to go out to Laurel Hill. So I hope that it all works well. Thank you. The layout is the same, that there will be garages in the back, basically, in your street in the front.

[05:53:12] So I think it's a nice, it will look very nice when it's all built out. It's taken its time, but I think it will be very nice when it's all done. And remind me about private streets, because I've been seeing how smaller developments are really having burdens put on, in 10 years put on a few residents to be able to take care of private streets so your back alleys where the back doors and the parkings are would be not public but every all the other streets if there are any would be public design and taken into the system possibly that we don't know that

[05:53:49] there are townhomes there are instances where you have certainly in this situation most of the units will face either timberwood boulevard or burkmar right there are internal units that may be on some sort of private travel way. One thing to think about in context of this sort of thing is you have potentially 140, you know, let's say a condo, for example, on this small parcel. So the ratio of individuals to road to maintain is a lot better than six homeowners on a private road is a mile long. So because of the density, you have that burden shared of a lot more people in a much,

[05:54:24] you know, in a more confined space and much shorter roads per unit. We might have 40 feet of road per unit versus 500 feet in a more rural setting and does each one of the blocks have their own hoa how does that work if it's if they'll be developed together most likely so there'll be one hoa for block seven and block nine all right supervisor missile did you have a follow yeah i'm just curious a couple quick first of all i really appreciated supervisor duncan's comment about maximizing the density you know we've got the infrastructure here so what did you guys look at actually bumping the density up further was it were there any limitations that kept you from

[05:55:01] doing that the past there were limitation we did this about two years ago and to change block seven and there was a little bit of discussion on the traffic so as you go up in residential units at some point you approach the threshold of the commercial I think it was agreed at this point in time that the 40 more still was under the threshold of any sort of commercial uses it might be there there could be a limit let's say for example we said oh we're gonna put 600 units here yeah now it's not practically feasible in this small chunk of land, but it somewhat disagree. It is possible, indeed. I can see it is very possible,

[05:55:38] but unlikely in this location. But it was traffic. We were trying to stay within the realm of the original traffic, so we did not exceed what was calculated and proffered previously. So you didn't want to bounce your proffers to be more extreme? Correct. At some point in time, there could be a threshold where you'd say, well, this could be higher, and then the proffer could be revisited.

[05:55:57] so you weren't really you weren't limited for example by surface parking spaces yeah if we did a park parking deck for example could be built uh the four story height limitation might limit you at some point also you know there's a right this much acreage you might need to go to six or eight stories to get a 34 units per acre yeah i'm just thinking as we're in the middle of thinking through the zoning uh modernization you know and we're talking about improving and increasing density in the development area how do we facilitate that you know these are good case studies to look at and say this is what could have been differently to help maximize the density in the development area.

[05:56:34] So if it's dealing with traffic generation, then it deals with roads, right, and how much capacity, carrying capacity you have on the roads. If it's water and sewer, it's something else. If it's parking, that's easier, right? Yeah, we were trying to work from the framework that had been approved back in 2003.

[05:56:51] We're not trying to step too far out of that, just for simplicity's sake, as much as anything. Totally get it. Yeah, thank you. All right, any further questions? All right, we will close the public hearing. Just a reminder, there were no members of the public signed up for this item, so the matter is back before the board.

[05:57:10] And I will offer, it's in the Rio District, I'll offer the motion. If we could, I move that the board adopt the attached ordinance to approve ZMA 2025-6, Hollymead Town Center Area C Amendment, as in attachment F.

[05:57:29] Second. All right. The motion has been made and seconded without objection. If the clerk would please call the roll. Ms. LaPista-Kirtley? Aye. Ms. Malik? Yes. Mr. Missel? Aye. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway? Yes. All right. Thank you, board. Thank you, Justin. Motion carries. All right, board, we will move to item number 18, a public hearing for conveyance of ACSA utility easements on county parcel 62 2 c 0 advertised as sub 25 176 utility easements across county-owned parcel

[05:58:08] 62 20 c 0 never going to say that out loud again i don't say all the zeros in the tax like supervisor good evening mr barnes good evening i'm actually not here to make the presentation. So that Gil is, he stepped out. Well, then I retract my good evening to you, Mr. Barnes.

[05:58:32] Camera's running. Here we go. No worries. Good to see you. I do not, I retract nothing. Good evening, Mr. Langell. Good evening, everybody. Just give me one moment here. All right. Good evening, everyone. My name is

[05:59:08] Cameron Langell. I'm a principal planner with the Planning Division of Community Development, and I'll be giving you the staff report on this request for two ACSA easements on a county-owned piece of land. So the request pertains to Tax Map Parcel 62-2C. There are an existing RWSA sanitary line on the property, and this request is looking to do two ACSA easements to allow sewer to connect

[05:59:42] to Belvedere phases four and five. Under state code, we have to have a public hearing for any new easements on county land. So this is the property in question. It's 31.47 acres. It was acquired by the county in 2020 because it was proffered as a greenway with the original Belvedere rezoning that was approved in 2005. So the property is bordered on the east by the south fork of the

[06:00:15] Rivanna River and then the main section of Belvedere that was rezoned is located south of that as you can see North fields and some other residential neighborhoods are to the west But I'm going to use my laser pointer the location of Belvedere phase five is actually just off the screen It's a little difficult to see Belvedere phase four will be located up here Both of those phases are by right phases. They weren't rezoned with the neighborhood model district back in 2005

[06:00:49] so they're just zoned R4, and they need these ACSA sewer easements so that ACSA sewer lines can serve the development there. So this is under review with a subdivision plat right now, subdivision 2025-176, and what you see on your screen is sheets 2 and 3 of attachment A, and what it's meant to show is the new easements that are going to be created.

[06:01:17] ONE OF THEM IS FAIRLY SMALL. IT IS, I THINK IT'S 693 SQUARE FEET, AND THE OTHER ONE IS 973 SQUARE FEET, SO IT COMES OUT TO JUST OVER 1,660 SQUARE FEET. I'M GOING TO SWITCH BACK FOR A SECOND. IF YOU WANT TO KNOW WHERE THOSE NEW EASEMENTS WOULD BE LOCATED ON OUR PROPERTY, IT'S WHERE YOU SEE THE STARS, GENERALLY. AND SO THAT SAID, THAT'S MY PRESENTATION. I'D BE WILLING TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD NOW.

[06:01:50] all right thank you uh supervisor malik so i'm not an engineer but it sounds like they want to just hook up to the existing sanitary line and need the box to dig the dirt in yes so that rwsa line it's known as like an interceptor line or a trunk line so it basically collects sewer from a lot of developments in albemarle county going all the way up to hollymead and it transmits them down to their treatment center at moores creek or the woolen mills area and so these

[06:02:21] two new ACSA lines that would connect to that would just serve phases four and five. Yep, exactly. Okay. Thank you. All right. Supervisor Pruitt. I have no questions. Thank you. Supervisor Lepisto-Curtley. No questions. Supervisor Missal. No questions. Thanks. Supervisor Duncan. No questions. I almost called my own name. I have no questions. All right. Do we have anyone signed up for this item? All right. So we will open the public hearing without having any members of the public hear. We will close the public hearing.

[06:02:51] The matter is now back before the board. I'll look to my left and right. Any additional questions or comments? Ooh, this one's in the Rio District 2. So I will move that the board adopt the attached resolution, attachment C, to authorize conveyance of the easements upon final review and approval as to form.

[06:03:16] Second. All right. Is there any further discussion? I think the clerk would please call the roll. Ms. Lapista-Kirtley? Aye. Ms. Malik? Yes. Mr. Missel? Aye. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Ms. Duncan? Yes. Mr. Galloway? Yes. All right. Thank you, board. Motion carries.

[06:03:33] Thank you, gentlemen. And now we will move to item number 19, ZMA 2022-2, SIG Property Rezoning. And it looks like we're keeping the team here for this one. All right. So good evening, everyone.

[06:03:50] Cameron Langell again with Community Development. I'll be giving you the presentation on ZMA 2022-02, which is known as the Sieg property rezoning. So the specifics of this proposal before we get in all the images and details, there's six existing parcels that are zoned R1 and HC Highway Commercial.

[06:04:08] They measure 62.4 acres and they're requesting to be rezoned to the neighborhood model district and they would be subject to the ZMA application plan and code of development to allow for a mixed use development. Part of the request is asking to designate 3.6 acres of the Preserve Steep Slopes overlay district for disturbance that would be primarily associated with new road and utility infrastructure in order to allow the development to occur i'll show that later on a slide but it is noted on the application plan where exactly the disturbances are so where we're located

[06:04:43] our parcels are highlighted in blue we're at the southwest corner of the i-64 exit 118 interchange at the Route 29 and 250 bypass. This is a pretty zoomed out image, but there is one existing use that is not proposed to be rezoned, and that's this building that you can see right here.

[06:05:05] That's the Virginia Eagle Beverage Distributing Company. They're zoned HC. They're going to stay HC. They're not part of the SEAG proposal, but our properties, again, are in that light blue or teal color. Surrounding uses, to the west, there's some single-family detached homes and then undeveloped properties. Further west, you can see the future location of Hedro Park. The main street that you see on the north side of our properties, of course, is I-64, and the bypass then runs down along the south side of them. Across the bypass, you can see the neighborhood of Sherwood Farms.

[06:05:42] Redfields is also located in this area, but they do not connect to Route 29. Then as you go further north you get up to the Fontaine Research Park which is in the top right of your image and on the north side of I-64 there's the Ragged Mountain Reservoir. So this is focused in a little bit more but it shows the current zoning. The light green is the R1 residential and that's only one of the properties which measures 43.8 acres. The other five which are measure 18.6 are HC Highway commercial that's the red color so there's several overlay zoning districts that apply i won't bother

[06:06:22] reading them all out for you but they're on the screen and for a second i just want to talk about the types of buy right development that you could do on these properties under the r1 district they would be able to do between 43 and 68 dwelling units by right 68 dwelling units they would have to use some zoning bonus factors to get that high density but that's what they could do by right in the hc zoning district it's mostly a heavier commercial district with a focus on automobile uses and things like that but you can do a special use permit to do residential uses up to 15 dwelling

[06:06:55] units an acre so on the hc property in theory they could get anywhere between 279 or 373 residential dwelling units using bonus factors through a special use permit approval in total That would be anywhere for both R1 and HC, 322 to 441.

[06:07:17] So this is an image from the comprehensive plan. It shows the future land use designations that apply to the properties. The red color represents what used to be known as regional mixed use, but under AC44 that has now been changed to community mixed use.

[06:07:34] It's essentially just a naming change. All the uses are the same. There's green areas that you can see within our properties, And that notes where there is the Preserve Steep Slopes Overlay District and also other areas that were just meant to be protected and left undisturbed for the purposes of providing benefit to the entrance corridor of I-64.

[06:07:57] So now we're going to get into what they're proposing. Basically, the residential units would be between 275 and 600 units maximum. At the maximum, that's a density of 9.6 units per acre. This application came in under the previous affordable housing policy, but the applicant is proposing to do sort of a mix between our old policy and our new policy.

[06:08:22] They're going to do 20% of their total units as affordable units, even though they're only required to do 15%. The way they're going to break up the affordability rate is half of those units would be at 80% AMI, and half would be at 60% AMI.

[06:08:39] There is the potential for retail and commercial on this site. They're actually committing to do a minimum of 100,000 square feet and up to a maximum of 440,000 square feet. As I'm sure you can imagine, it's the development areas, so they're connecting the public water and sewer with ACSA.

[06:08:57] One other factor I know that might be a question, so I wanted to mention it since this is an entrance corridor. The by-right height of buildings in this development would be four stories or 60 feet, but they could go up to five stories or 70 feet with approval of a special exception.

[06:09:17] So on the previous image and this image, you can see their main primary road network, which comes off of 29. So access to the overall development, they'd have two entrances on Route 29. The one that's further right on the screen would be a right in, right out only, And then the one on the south of the screen would actually be a new, fully signalized intersection.

[06:09:41] Internally, there would be shared use paths and sidewalks along these streets and others that you can't see. There would be parking lots and private travelways that would be built, just depending on how the uses play out. But these are the primary street networks. The legend on the right tells you whether you were looking at sidewalks or 10-foot shared use paths along each of these roads.

[06:10:03] In terms of interconnections, they are proposing to do a public road connection to the property to the west, which is also in the development areas. Multimodal within the project, they're going to be doing a new transit stop.

[06:10:19] And then another significant factor to mention is that they are proposing to do upgrades to the existing park and ride parking lot along Teal Lane, which is actually within the overall Route 29 right-of-way. used by folks to park their cars there and then travel off to work the commitment they're making is to doing improvements to that park and ride lot up to the cost that would be equivalent to doing 25 to 30 new parking spaces in that area I will mention that they are also doing a pedestrian crossing at the

[06:10:55] fully signalized intersection the way that it has been set up and proposed in the code of development and the application plan is that there would be dedicated pedestrian crossing only at some point in each of the turn movements that could be going on at that intersection so that was just something that they were proposing to sort of help enhance safety with that crossing just some other relevant details this is just related to open space and parks and green systems 12.55 acres minimum open space would be provided that includes amenity spaces those things like public gathering areas tot lots playgrounds

[06:11:34] overall the total acreage comes out to 21 20.1 percent of the site and then they would be doing landscaping buffers along the entire perimeter they vary in width depending on which part of the property we're at but adjacent to I-64 and route 29 which is basically the north and south side that would be a 30 foot wide perimeter and then on the east and west would be 10 feet so to talk about the preserved steep slopes disturbance I'm going to use my laser

[06:12:07] pointer. You'll notice these areas, I have them labeled with area 1, area 2, area 3. The dark green color represents existing preserved steep slopes. That brown or tan color that you see over portions of each of those green areas are the preserved slopes that they're asking to disturb. It comes out to about 160,000 square feet, which is nearly equivalent to 3.6 total acres, but as you can see, particularly over on this side a lot of that disturbance would be associated with the improvements and site work that they need to do to be able to install

[06:12:46] the new streets within the project you know utilities we running adjacent to those streets as well so that's where a lot of the disturbance comes from I can go into the analysis of these if we need to during the question-answer period but there's a significant portion of the staff report that dives into each area specifically and talks about how it meets you know different criteria of managed slopes versus preserved slopes overall staff feels like we could recommend approval of these disturbances and again I can answer any questions you have once my presentation is finished so the staff recommendation for this

[06:13:21] application we identified the following positive aspects it's consistent with the land use and density recommendations of the southern and western neighborhoods master plan they are providing new transportation Improvements that are consistent with transportation recommendations from the master plan like I said that includes transit stops upgrades to the park and ride lot multi-use paths Internal pedestrian facilities it also is providing 20% of affordable housing with is which is consistent with the county's affordable housing policy The one concern we did know is that there are some enrollment

[06:13:56] Capacity issue projections at both Red Hill and Monticello high school in the future and this development would contribute students at each of those two school levels Again, staff recommended approval of this at the December 15th public hearing with the Planning Commission.

[06:14:12] They voted 5-2 to recommend approval. At this point, I would be glad to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you very much. Supervisor Malek? Do we know yet about other private road requests on the interior?

[06:14:30] You mentioned clearly a public road connection to the west, but I'm sort of on the warpath about private road expansion nowadays. So they haven't made any request to authorize private streets at this point. We can ask the applicant their intent when it comes to designing any private streets within there.

[06:14:46] I was mostly thinking more about if they do commercial uses, like the parking lots and travelways that are associated with those uses aren't actually streets. So they're privately owned by the business that owns the parcel that they'd be located on. When it comes to the streets that would be serving residential units, I imagine they'd be doing public, but we can ask if they think there might be a chance they'd be trying to do privates.

[06:15:12] So something like Stonefield, where they have all those parking lots, the individual businesses are responsible for plowing the snow? Or maybe the whole shopping center would take it a lot? Yeah, usually it's a management company that probably owns a significant amount of the parcels, and they would be the entity responsible for that.

[06:15:29] So some organized fashion, right? Even though it's not publicly owned and it's not BDOT, it's not going to be individual people out there with shovels. That's correct. Okay. and on one of your slides you had heard something about the public the tell a little bit more about the exist the multi-use path on the east side of 29 bypass after the crossover at the light there's supposed to be some connection to some path going north that's then going to connect someday yeah so this will probably be uh the best slide to show it so that gold color that you see along these streets is meant to represent the shared use path.

[06:16:09] The crossing at the intersection would be right here, and the applicant is proposing to construct the pathway all the way up to this location, which that is where Teal Lane enters onto Route 29. So an enterprising pedestrian could walk there and pick up a bus to town or a carpool or something like that if they wanted to.

[06:16:33] All right, thank you. Supervisor Pruitt. The Keel Lane Park and Ride, can you help me understand, is this that lot that I always see that's full of folks right by the church?

[06:16:51] And that's entirely in the public right-of-way? Fascinating. Historic use. What services serve that park and ride, or is it just used for whatever the hell? Yeah, that whole area, Route 29 used to go right through the middle of the interchange.

[06:17:10] That section that you're looking at going up to the VDOT salt shed is all old Route 29. It's been sort of historically just informal park and ride. It's never been something that's really been part of the system. So this is an opportunity to improve it and to bring it into the VDOT park and ride system.

[06:17:29] And there's no hazard of VDOT coming back and saying, actually, we want all that land for something else. Gimme, gimme. Well, we can, right now, VDOT's, there's been multiple studies of that interchange. The latest pipeline study has actually been looking at transportation solutions and not, unfortunately, really finding something suitable.

[06:17:48] But they have been talking about, even with that study of building that parking right there, maybe even increasing its size. So I think it's something that VDOT sees as a positive. On this subject of VDOT and their intersection with this project, I've had a member of the public suggest to me that our local VDOT office had been opposed to this project and it was submitted to a higher level of review to get over them.

[06:18:17] Can I get some illumination on that, if that rings any bells? I don't think that necessarily VDOT was in opposition to the project. I know that it was a long period of the traffic study and trying to work on different solutions. Ultimately, we arrived at something that they supported, which you have before you today.

[06:18:37] I think those are all the questions I have for this structure. Thank you. All right. Supervisor Lepisto-Curtley. I just have one question regarding the pedestrian crossing on 29. Is there a median in the middle, or will there be a median in case someone can't make it all the way across?

[06:18:59] Yes, there will be a median in the intersection. Whether it will be something that will be such that a pedestrian can make it all the way through in one signal or it is a two-stop or two-phase crossing, those are details we'll work on as we move forward to the site plan phase.

[06:19:19] But the intent is to, you know, there will be some pedestrian refuge in the middle of the road. Thank you. Those are all the questions. Supervisor Missal? Thanks. I just have a couple questions and this is the third public hearing I've been a part of on this multimodal connections interconnections off sites so zooming out a little bit and connections back over to Fontaine Avenue can you speak a little bit to those please we've done some preliminary investigations looking at how to either connect from where the park and ride a lot essentially is

[06:19:56] either into Redfields yeah there are opportunities there there's an old crossing that went under the railroad. It's kind of a wide culvert that could be used, but it doesn't really link into a system where the applicant has access to get to the streets up at Redfields, something that maybe is a possibility if we work with the Homeward Association. We also looked at potential to use the same culvert and go on the eastern side of the railroad tracks and under the I-64 bridge.

[06:20:24] There's a large rip-wrap slope on that side of the VDOT bridge. It's not really a suitable place to make a connection however if you go from the park and ride lot and head north on teal lane and go past salt shed there's actually four bays of that bridge 64 crosses the railroad the river one of those bays has nothing in it it's just open dirt so there's an opportunity to go through there and then potentially connect through two small vacant private parcels to the back of the forestry department and from there pick up a network that could take you to Fontaine Research

[06:21:01] Park. Thank you. On affordable housing, I know they're shooting for the 20%. I seem to remember there was a shorter timeline for affordability than is required by the current housing out-moral plan. I'd have to look that up in the code development right now, which I can do and get back to you on that. Yeah, no worries, or I can ask the applicant that too. And then the last question is, has any miracle kind of fallen from the sky that you are aware of related to VDOT and their attention to exit 118 that we're not aware of are they still studying it unfortunately um

[06:21:39] on the northern side of the interchange you're aware that um they do have a funded project at Fontaine Avenue and that will allow them to take the sort of northbound route 29 movement to uh westbound 64 and relocate that to Fontaine the problematic movement is really the southbound movement on the bypass with the two signals that they put in several years back.

[06:22:06] There's just not enough storage capacity there. VDOT had another pipeline study this year, looked at other options to potentially deal with that. Right at this point, they don't seem to have the solutions that are coming up are not really meeting long-term goals, and they're sort of stepping back and trying to find if there's another solution set.

[06:22:28] Thank you. That's all. Thanks. Supervisor Duncan? Yeah, I have a few questions. The first one is, how long has this property been in the development area? This property has been in the development

area. Well, the five properties that are zoned Highway Commercial closest to I-64 have been in the development area going back at least, as I know, 1996 or longer.

[06:22:56] The big parcel that most of this project is, the majority of it was also in the development area. And then in 2015, there was a comprehensive plan amendment to bring the portions of it that weren't, which were very small sections.

[06:23:12] Bring that, and it's probably half to two-thirds of that adjacent parcel to the west to bring those into the development area. And so that was done when the county was doing the periodic comp plan updates that we do, but it was 2015.

[06:23:32] From my research, it's been since 1971, actually. Of course. Yeah. And then you briefly mentioned some of the uses that could be done under the current zoning with the highway commercial.

[06:23:48] In the zoning code, there's a list of, oh, I don't know, over 45 items. Are all of those things that could be done by right? So like car washes, fire extinguisher and security products, hotels, self-service storage facilities, machinery sales, are all of those things that could be done by right as it's currently zoned.

[06:24:15] As it's currently zoned? Yes, under the highway commercial zoning. Yeah, anything that's listed as a by-right use under HC in the zoning ordinance could be done by-right. And then I did have a question sort of just about DEQ stormwater regulations.

[06:24:34] So, you know, obviously they're building on currently what is, you know, sort of ugly woods. When you build impervious services, are you required to kind of mitigate that so that the net result of the runoff is essentially the same?

[06:24:50] Yeah, so our state stormwater regulations apply to the site, which we've adopted to county standards. It's our Water Protection Ordinance, WPO. So that's treating for both the quantity of stormwater that would be on site, and then it's treating the nutrients within that stormwater.

[06:25:10] It's all meant to sort of comply with the Clean Water Act, Chesapeake Bay Act, and all of that. And as far as I'm aware, the applicant is proposing to meet all of our standard water protection ordinance regulations, and that's something that we review for compliance at the stage of site plan or subdivision plan, road plans.

[06:25:31] One clarification to make sure, for a 10-year storm, so if you have a much larger storm, they may not have to detain that larger storm equivalent to what it would have been if it was a forested lot. I want to be clear on that. And then my last question is, part of the traffic report says that U.S. 29 is a high-speed principal arterial designed for long-range travel and that it's part of the arterial preservation network, and then it also talks about level of services.

[06:26:00] I was just wondering if you could explain what those classifications mean and what the level of service means. So I think you said a corridor or statewide significant? Correct, and like the principal arterial, just like what does that mean sort of for the public?

[06:26:20] So principal arterial, they have sort of classifications for roads. Obviously principal arterial is one of the highest classifications for, you know, travel and volume and speed. It is a corridor of statewide significance. The state identifies several roads throughout the state, mostly interstates and some of the larger 29, 250 are ones of examples that are corridors of statewide significance.

[06:26:48] It's an effort by the state to try and maintain these corridors to serve more regional needs as opposed to being lots of new businesses with new intersections on those businesses, other streets trying to use it more as a local street, this intent to try and keep it as a regional arterial. That's all I have right now. Just as a side note, that's when you see the smarts go in front of us and the ones we can submit versus what MPO, because MPO is limited to just projects that are considered of statewide significance, and trying to get at this exit for

[06:27:25] a while. I hear they up there in Richmond, they were chasing leprechauns looking for extra money for transportation yesterday but didn't find any at the end of the rainbow the the traffic impact analysis that was done is it done with you sometimes these projects are a little further away than what they account for so are the improvements at fontaine was it it wasn't real it was that part of the impact analysis and then what they're doing at heading west on 64 like was

[06:27:58] that all part of it or no, that you're aware of? Thank you. Kevin McDermott, Deputy Director of Planning. So the traffic impact analysis did already consider, they were fully aware of the Fontaine changes, and they analyzed their impact to the closure of the left, northbound left turn onto westbound 64, if that's your question. That was considered and saw no additional impacts from it and then the traffic impact analysis for this site take that into account

[06:28:38] i mean i'm sorry i asked that wrong did this is what vdot has been studying uh to try to figure this place out does it take this project's improvements into the account into their study right now yes it does we are uh evaluating both vdot is fully aware of this proposal that's on the table and um and they're considering that as they're coming up with their options because this i think if i read right has like an r cut coming out of it potentially or did i read

[06:29:09] that wrong um there are no r cuts proposed um there is the existing um entrance the gold eagle entrance uh they're proposing to make a right in right out and so in effect that's sort of like an RCUT because they will have to make a right, go down to the signal and make it. Was there an earlier iteration that that was in there and all the conversation about lighting and all of that? Did I get hung up in a planning commission meeting minutes?

[06:29:39] There have been a lot of, the applicant and I see their transportation engineer is here if you have a lot of detail questions, but I will say that when they were analyzing the options for connecting their development to 29, they looked at RCUTs, They looked at green tees.

[06:29:57] I think at one point they did even consider roundabouts, and they landed on the idea of doing the standard signalization at the southern entrance. And then they've thought about the timing of that with the current one there and trying to, I mean, are they using the improvements here to try to solve some of the problems that are existing north?

[06:30:20] Like, are these improvements trying to help that too, not just the site? They're not, I don't think it's going to help it, but I also, according to their analysis, it's not going to hurt it. It's not going to change it. Well, it can't hurt it. I mean, well, I guess it could get worse, but, I mean, they're struggling.

[06:30:37] I mean, I'm not speaking out of turn. Our engineer for Culpeper said the ideas they have over there for 118 are half-baked. He said that in public. So, I mean, that's the, this, we've been trying to get at this 118 exit issue for a while.

[06:30:53] Correct. i don't want to get this too clouded up in this particular project but when we think about impacts and improvements to a place it's like well how are those helping the bigger piece along that corridor i think the biggest problem here is that trying to get on eastbound 64 the the biggest problem we're currently experiencing the light and the southbound like yeah and so this is the improvements of this particular one is farther south of that i guess you could speak to the back to the corridor statewide significance and trying to principle arterial question of that light being on the,

[06:31:28] you know, south of the interstate, or, yeah, south of the interstate, it's one more signal along a road they're trying to, you know, allow that throughput on. But they analyzed the R-cut as one of the options, and if I recall correctly, you still need to, you know, to have a turnaround on the R-cut and the obstruction, you may still need a signal to help that R-cut function.

[06:31:52] Do you know, Kevin, in your years of doing smart scale applications will, you know, up until this point there, this is not an approved project. So it wouldn't be in something we've submitted in terms of having the density there.

[06:32:07] Does it, the fact that it develops or will be developed now and approved help a smart scale application in terms of scoring? Yes, it should. If there is non-residential uses on the site that we can submit as part of that, that would improve the score, especially because it's so close to that intersection.

[06:32:29] Thank you. I appreciate it. The only other question I have, and it's your one unfavorable factor, and we can get into it, I guess, more, and I'll probably speak to the applicant some about it.

[06:32:45] But I think it said 54 was the number for elementary students, and this is Red Hill. And Red Hill is one of our smallest schools in the whole county. The capacity level, I think it's, in fact, from a capacity standpoint, the smallest.

[06:33:02] So their September 30 enrollment this year was like 177, and I can't remember if they have pre-K there or not. But the 177 number is just their K-12 enrollment. And I believe on the reports, the capacity is slated at 180.

[06:33:22] If they have pre-K, then they're over the 180. They're probably at another 10 or 12 students. Now, you've got 54 showing here as the unfavorable for that elementary school. At 20 students per class size, that's almost two and a half times, two and a half classrooms.

[06:33:38] If we adjust that downward, because maybe all those students won't necessarily show up, you still could have 30, 25, 35. if you were like underestimating that so i'm bringing this up now is that when we look at these projects and we think of mitigating impacts like we've heard stormwater we hear the traffic impacts we hear things like that as a staff when we look in the face of a 550 million dollar cap request from the schools where well half of it's not even getting a capacity we're building two

[06:34:15] elementary schools now but those are in different areas it'll never touch this area what do we do when these projects come in to try to help get the project to offset that as an impact because i've never really seen what i could say oh okay well maybe if it's not even direct that it could help us try to figure out what to do with those i mean a project like this could produce i don't know that 54 might not be the right number but the number's not probably 20 so it's going to be somewhere between those if it was agner or woodbrook or some of these other places where

[06:34:53] we got a northern elementary school and they redistrict i mean all that's can is kind of being handled and we've all said oh well we're okay with the density going up here because of the new school and same over uh at mountain view but this one's trickier for that school population so what do we do or how do we approach that from a county to go okay that's going to be an impact that we have to contend with not so worried about it at the high school level because they've got the center model and the hit to the high school and the way students move etc not going to be as critical but but that particular school is going to be critical at so I'll stop now and see if you

[06:35:30] have a response or reaction yeah I can respond to that you know we look at anticipated impacts to schools as one of the biggest factors when we're reviewing these zoning map amendments so when it's going through the review process with staff we pull the long-range planning advisory committee reports from the school system and look at their projections and how many students they expect a single household to generate within that school district we calculate it at the elementary middle and high school level and we we give that information to the applicant if they're not outright proposing something on the very first submittal to offset their impacts to schools

[06:36:08] it we're kind of in a tricky place as staff because we're not allowed to suggest proffers as an example, but we do tell them, you know, unless you do something to offset, this will be noted as an unfavorable factor. And if there's no offset, it just drops into the column to your satisfaction. For staffs, not satisfaction, but judgment or recommendation or what have you.

[06:36:33] All right. Great. Before I turn to public hearing, do we have any other questions for staff? Just looking left, right. Okay. Claudette, we'll open the public hearing. Do we have anyone signed up for this item so we have no members from the public signed up but we do have an applicant with us this evening mrs davies and you have 10 minutes for your presentation and then the matter will come back before the board if we have any questions or comments and then if you want to rebut everything we say we'll give you some extra time at the end of that good evening all right

[06:37:13] good evening i'm ashley davies with riverbend development thank you to members of the board staff, and residents for reviewing the SEEG proposal. Our goal has been to design a project that thoughtfully aligns with the county's long-term vision for housing opportunities and economic vitality while providing meaningful community benefits. The 62-acre mixed-use development site is located at the crossroads of Interstate 64 and Route 29 with 56,000 cars

[06:37:53] passing daily. And at just 1.5 miles to Fontaine Research Park, Sieg is a strong location for commercial development and workforce housing. The Sieg property, or portions thereof, have continuously been part of the designated development area since 1971, over 50 years ago. Land assemblage by our company began over 20 years ago, and we've been in the active rezoning process for four years. Directing housing into designated development areas is one of the county's primary strategies for preserving rural

[06:38:30] land and avoiding sprawl. The residential component of SEAG is not only appropriate, it's fully consistent with long-standing county policy and places housing in proximity to major employers and existing services. The Samuel Miller District, where SEAG is located, has the largest land area but the lowest population density and the least commercial activity. With primarily single-family housing today, this is an opportunity for thoughtful economic expansion and diversification

[06:39:04] of the tax base. Growing the tax base helps reduce pressure on existing homeowners, and balanced growth here also relieves development pressure elsewhere. Only 7% of the development area land remains available for development, and past rezonings have delivered just 58% of the recommended housing in the comprehensive plan. That makes sites like SEEG critically important. There are no apartments, no attached housing options, and no affordable housing

[06:39:39] opportunities in the Samuel Miller District. SEEG addresses that need by introducing approximately 600 new homes within a thoughtfully planned mixed-use community where people can live, work and play. Importantly, 20% or 120 homes will be affordable, with half of that at 80% AMI and half at 60. These homes create opportunities for teachers, healthcare workers, service employees, and first responders to live and belong in the community they serve. A majority of the site will

[06:40:15] be dedicated to 440,000 square feet of commercial, including office, industrial, medical, and retail use possibilities. Traffic is one of the primary concerns raised by residents and stakeholders.

[06:40:32] Because of that concern, a detailed traffic impact analysis was conducted as part of the review process to ensure responsible development. That study, approved in 2023, shows the project will not create significant impacts to the surrounding roadway network. In addition, the project includes the installation of a new signalized intersection approved on Route 29 by VDOT, which will improve safety and accessibility for the existing distributorship and surrounding traffic movements in the area. Tractor trailers that service existing and proposed commercial and industrial uses will

[06:41:09] be able to safely access the site. We recognize that today the site is largely auto-oriented, and that is true of many neighborhoods within the county's development areas. The comprehensive plan anticipates that these areas will evolve over time through incremental improvements in connectivity, infrastructure, and land use.

[06:41:30] This project represents a step forward toward that long-term vision. Think of someone living at SEEK and commuting a mile and a half to Fontaine Research Park versus that same person living in the outlying counties. This conceptual plan shows how the site comes together with housing, commercial, and infrastructure integrated across the property.

[06:41:57] The existing Virginia Eagle distributorship is here with the Orange Star. We hope you receive their letter of support. Housing is shown in white with the senior living facility by the entrance. Commercial areas covering two-thirds of the site are depicted in purple.

[06:42:14] The yellow dashed line is the 10-foot shared-use path that runs throughout the community. the new signalized intersection is in the orange circle at the bottom and then staff already mentioned the right in right out and the full access to teal lane those were two goals of the comprehensive plan we also have the proposed trailhead parking that would be for the future hedgerow park up in the upper corner a transit stop is in the heart of the commercial district and then the constructed upgrades to the park and ride.

[06:42:56] In addition to expanding housing options, the project provides meaningful economic benefits to the county. Based on current projections, the development will generate approximately \$5.7 million in annual tax revenue once fully built out.

[06:43:12] This revenue supports essential county services such as schools, public safety, and infrastructure. The project will also contribute approximately \$11 million in tap fees, helping fund

improvements to the county's utility systems without increasing costs to existing residents.

[06:43:32] We will also spend over a million dollars connecting two separate water pressure zones in the county, improving water quality and pressure for existing customers. Before a single building goes vertical on the site, we will have made a \$25 million investment in developing the site to be pad ready.

[06:43:52] 1,000 construction jobs will result from this \$480 million project, and we estimate that 1,000 permanent jobs will be created. In addition to the economic benefits, we've made significant environmental improvements, cutting impacts to preserve slopes by a whopping 34%.

[06:44:16] and we've included a biofilter system along the entrance road to improve water quality as it enters Morse Creek. It's important to note that this site has been previously logged and is currently dominated by invasive species such as kudzu. Development of the site will give the opportunity for more intentional environmental stewardship. Over 2,200 acres of public land have been conserved near the Sieg property, including the 340-acre Future Hedgerow Park,

[06:44:51] dedicated to the county in 2015. This largely untouched land is ideal for low-impact trail systems. Broader connectivity, particularly to the regional greenway networks and parks, is an important long-term goal. SEEK is a meaningful first step, providing internal trail networks and initiating connections where feasible, while recognizing that the larger regional connections will require county coordination and investment over time. The seek proposal is a clear opportunity to support responsible growth in a designated development

[06:45:29] area while providing tangible benefits to the community consistent with the comprehensive plan this project expands meaningful workforce and affordable housing options that do not currently exist in the samuel miller district it strengthens the county's financial position through approximately 5.7 million in annual tax revenue and 11 million in tap fees we appreciate the board's time and consideration this evening and we respectfully ask for your support and approving this proposal thank you thank you all right supervisor malik questions for the afternoon thank you very much

[06:46:08] for that introduction um my questions are sort of out of order because i was writing them as you were going along looking at blocks three and four they're forested sort of at this moment correct and so will there well actually i'll roll it back the time frame what comes first the residential first or three or four first or is that unknown at this time um it's unknown at this time uh we're in talks with several contenders for the commercial blocks but as you know um

[06:46:45] Nobody can sign on the dotted line, certainly until after a rezoning is in place and usually once we're into the site plan review. So we're feeling good about that. So the residential may lead, but if the commercial comes to the table soon, that could be a great first step because of that initial infrastructure investment that it will take.

[06:47:10] I guess my better question to have asked was, wherever you're working, Will you limit the timbering to that area? I'm thinking of 2004 when 80 acres, 29 north in the Rio District was all timbered and only five acres was worked on.

[06:47:27] And it created incredible damage to neighborhoods, both sides of 29. So in trying to avoid that kind of circumstance, that's the sort of guidelines I'm looking for about how you're going to break it up. Yes, yes. So it would be area by area. Small parcels. Yes.

[06:47:43] Excellent. Next. Here. So I'm intrigued by the trailhead parking. What work has been done to sort of validate that that could actually happen? Because I know there's somebody else in between your parcel and the park, the future park.

[06:48:02] Yes. So when we initially started the rezoning, we were working in conjunction with the neighboring sweet spot property. So there is an area of trail that we'll need to go in between our site and the hedgerow site.

[06:48:20] but even so we were planning to do the parking back in this area and we feel confident that that easement will come into play and they want to move forward with the development of their property as well so that will come in as part of that development and i would predict that the impacts to morris creek are pretty have high potential so how how do you deal with that in your construction on i guess blocks three and four are a little flatter than the areas where the residential will be but there's still going to be disturbance and slopes and velocity and

[06:49:00] things so those all worry me when we get strange rain patterns that we seem to be having nowadays yes well we're fortunate to have a wonderful engineering team i don't know if scott wants to get into any major details about how he's thinking about the site specifically but you know in general terms we are you know meeting all those state regulations but scott has looked at the site much more in that vein if if you want to speak to any of the stormwater component sure

[06:49:38] thank you uh scott collins with collins engineering um yes we have a number of storm ponds on the property uh one our biggest one's right there below block six that would be a actually stormwater pond there and there'll be other stormwater ponds as well throughout the other blocks another one right there above block two so those two will handle a lot of the runoff that will be in place from day one to handle storm water and handle erosion control first and then storm water when it's all after that and then we were i think it actually showed that one slide of

[06:50:14] um sort of the bioswale along the entrance road adjacent to block one which we think will It's going to help any runoff kind of coming down those preserved steep slopes that would try to sort of outfall directly to Morris Creek.

[06:50:30] That was the purpose of that swale, to help with that stormwater in that location. Thank you. I'm very partial to by the swales. Excellent. Thank you very much. Supervisor Pruitt. Supervisor Malik already handled one of my questions about the connection with Sweet Spot and the Trail.

[06:50:50] The other question I had is when you gave your estimate of 1,000 direct jobs, I assume that's from the commercial spots, assuming they develop at maximum capacity. So that includes the commercial, and I don't know if I mentioned, but block one, that is the footprint of a senior living facility.

[06:51:14] So that does assume full build-out of all the purple blocks and the senior living facility. I think that's all I have at this time. Supervisor Lopisto-Kirtley? Yes, the same questions I have have been answered except for I want to, you mentioned about the native, not native vegetation, but the vegetation like the kudzu and such.

[06:51:41] So is your proposal to be able to rid the area of the kudzu? We will have to spend a lot of time with the kudzu management, certainly, and that is that is the goal. Thanks that's all. Supervisor Missal? No questions thanks. Supervisor Duncan? Yeah I have a couple of questions and comments. My first one is as

you know frustration over the housing and that the housing amounts were limited. I'm also sort of concerned that

[06:52:18] you know could be a minimum of only 275. I don't know is there a way that we can guarantee that we're going to get 600 units other than you saying you will um well we are both a home building company and we often partner with apartment builders so um we love building homes and as you know we initially came in um offering more and we did pull back to 600 um from 1200 and

[06:52:52] that was intentional just to pay respect to the the traffic situation in the area and we've spent a lot of time with our traffic engineer and finding the right balance of uses on site that are really the the best use of the site but not overburdening the surrounding area so i feel certain that we will hit that 600 number um i have a question too just sort of in general about how much commercial space because it feels like i hear from a lot of people that like oh commercial

[06:53:30] isn't selling they're converting commercial to housing is there a need for this much commercial space so i think this site is different than i mean what you've been experiencing on the board A lot of what you're seeing are primarily residential neighborhoods that had a commercial component.

[06:53:53] And that can be really challenging in today's environment. Where this site is different is the fact that it has so much commercial dedicated and its location at the intersection of 64 and 29.

[06:54:09] So I think it gives it a much, much more heft and momentum and gravity to make something special happen here. And then my last one is, I sort of have a long comment in front of it, but there is a question coming. And it's related to the concerns around traffic and kind of going back to the pipeline study with 29 and stuff.

[06:54:33] And I know the public has had a lot of concerns about the traffic and stuff. And so I just wanted to point out, VDOT's website has the average daily traffic counts from 2024 on Route 29.

[06:54:49] And from Red Hill to 64, there's 19,000 cars a day. From 64 to the city line, it's in the 50s. And for comparison, on 29, from Rio to Hollymead, there's 49,000.

[06:55:07] I know your traffic report stated that you'll probably add 7,500 to 10,000 trips a day. And I know that that can sound like a lot, but when you're at only 19,000 on that section, you're still not even up to what is on 29 past 64.

[06:55:26] And so, you know, the road can handle the traffic. The road design can handle it. But, you know, only if the traffic intersections work smoothly and work is designed. The project pipeline study that VDOT is doing, they, I know they've pulled it because public feedback wasn't favorable.

[06:55:50] They pulled their application from what was going to be in the smart scale. But their initial proposed solution to this was to have an intersection at Teal Lane. So my, I guess my main concern is if you put your intersection at the southern end, like, are you locked into that?

[06:56:14] Does that lock VDOT into not being able to remove the intersection at the highway? Have you guys kind of talked with VDOT and looked at this holistically? And because I assume if you put your intersection at the southern end, VDOT then can't remove the intersection.

[06:56:31] Well, they could remove it, but if it would take out the possibility probably of another intersection to solve their solution. And what I don't want to see is a situation like we have right now with Fifth Street and Wegmans where those are two close intersections.

[06:56:48] They were not sort of thoughtfully integrated into how to make sure that we're making this whole corridor work and not, you know, causing significant traffic on, again, the really, you know, corridor that's designed to move a lot of traffic through.

[06:57:07] First of all, thank you for your level of detail in the comments. And I certainly appreciate everything that you're researching and looking into. We do have our traffic engineer here tonight, so I probably will call him up to get you into his level of detail about it.

[06:57:28] But I'll just preface it by saying that he is in very close communication with VDOT. He understands what they're looking at, and they have taken our site and what we're proposing into account.

[06:57:44] So I don't think that there's any level of conflict there with what we have proposed and what they're thinking about. but i'll let carl walk you through that component good evening yes good evening members of the board my name is carl holtgren with grove slate in richmond where the traffic engineer on the project have been for working on this one for several years now so i appreciate

[06:58:17] the question i think the a couple things the proposed traffic signal at the main entrance that we've been talking about got the highest level of scrutiny from VDOT. I mean, it was approved by the local office here in Charlottesville, the district office in Culpeper, and had to be signed off and approved on by the state traffic engineer in Richmond. So it got the highest level of scrutiny. In terms of spacing from the interchange, that driveway is intentionally at the very, I'll call it the southwestern end of the property to maximize the spacing from the

[06:58:55] interchange to give as much flexibility for a potential change at the interchange in terms of if VDOT decides to relocate that signal or do something different up there, we've located the access point as far away from that as possible to give as much flexibility as possible. That's probably the best way to answer that. Does that help? A little bit, but like say VDOT, say they came back and said, no, our initial idea for the project pipeline is to have an intersection at teal lane is that then going to be too close to your intersection if you have an intersection at

[06:59:30] the southern entrance um it's not something we've studied in detail what i what i would say is you know that the signal that the proposed signal we're talking about for the driveway um will be coordinated with the existing signal at the ramp or if that signal at the ramp is relocated to teal or somewhere in between those two signals would be coordinated so that they would the limit the interruption to traffic flow on 29. For example, you know, at the Sieg intersection, most of the

[07:00:06] green time is going to be given to 29, both directions. It'll just stop once in a while to let dual lefts turn out of Sieg to go north on 29, and then 29 will receive more green time. The situation at the ramp, at the eastbound ramp, is actually the southbound left turn movement receives most of the green time. So the green time at the northbound direction is actually limited there. It won't be limited at Sieg. So really the, maybe a better way to say it is the ramp signal is the bottleneck on the corridor. It won't be this signal at Sieg because the Sieg

[07:00:45] signal, most of the green time will be on 29. Is the crosswalk then going to be at the southern intersection? Yes. Even though the road with like the housing development and the park and ride is up at teal and the gas station or commercial is going to be up farther so that that's going to be the natural place that people are going to want to cross but there's going to be no intersection with the crosswalk there right

the plan is to put the the pedestrian crosswalk where the signal will be so that there'll be a protected pedestrian phase across 29 we don't want people crossing 29 at an

[07:01:25] unsignalized location right but you're gonna the natural point for people to cross is going to be like at Teal Lane, but there's going to be no crosswalk there. So you're expecting people to walk down and then walk back up? Yes.

[07:01:41] I mean, we're balancing a lot of factors here. The most important thing, in my opinion, is getting that signal as far away from the interchange as possible to maximize the signal spacing. One of the downsides to that is the pedestrian path might be a little bit longer, but the location was chosen intentionally.

[07:02:02] Extensive coordination with VDOT. I can't emphasize that enough. is how we've ended up at this point but the the plan is to provide a pedestrian a signalized crosswalk where you hit the button you get the countdown and it should be time so you can get all the way across um there's a previous question about would there be a pedestrian refuge in the median i mean we haven't gotten to that level of detail yet but most signals in this situation have a a refuge island in the middle with a button so if someone does doesn't quite make it all the way across they can stop in the median hit the button again get another protected phase the next time around i yeah i i would just i would love to see a coordination between the people working in vita

[07:02:42] with the project pipeline and this to figure out a solution that makes sense especially if they are ultimately considering moving the intersection at the interchange that's all i have yeah i don't i don't know how they'll feel about they don't like to put lights too close together right right especially at 29 but uh they got bigger fish to fry than worrying about the proximity of that intersection to 118.

[07:03:12] I don't know. They should have done it right the first time. And I don't know. I don't know if there is a natural area to cross 29. There's not a natural area to cross 29 in the Rio District.

[07:03:27] And it's not even a walk. You better run. There's a bridge now. That's the natural place to cross. We have the bridge. I can say that now. I'm good on transportation stuff, so I don't have any further questions there.

[07:03:44] Thank you. I'm not promising you won't be called back up if another question comes up. No problem. So could you go back to the slide that had your concept with the build-out?

[07:04:00] Can you give me an idea of the yet, like are you theorizing what the mix will be between multi-unit versus just single-family detached? Was that in there and I missed it? It's not in there specifically.

[07:04:18] So in this iteration, I would say, gosh, it's probably 400, 200 would be my guess. 200, the single-family detached?

[07:04:33] Attached. So 400 detached? 400 apartments. Okay, that's attached. So 200 single-family detached. No. So apartments and then more like...

[07:04:49] any single family detached are going to be no detached none okay i thought i heard that coming along here my apologies um because that would get me more concerned about the school number if there's single family detached no no i think um i think that these units will not produce i mean in the apartment buildings we found they haven't produced as many children and also something to consider is that this project you know from today it's probably at least a 10-year

[07:05:24] build out for the entire site so it gives us a runway to work with the school system on appropriate solutions and your i mean your affordable units will we're finding that families are living in the affordable units and that will impact your schools differently which is why in some ways if ever when we start thinking of this new data to inform things i think we're going to start getting at that nuance like oh this project has x number that's a sidebar um the um so you go to your slide ahead of this because i think this is your answer to the i pose to staff about what we're

[07:06:03] getting to help offset your the one with your numbers maybe it was the font the next slide am i i'm taking it that like the question i asked them about what are we getting to help with the impact to schools this is your response to that yes it is has staff done have we done our analysis on the revenue that the project brings in have we fact-checked or done our own because that i mean eventually that's what i mean my hope is for that that'll be in the scorecard eventually that when we start thinking of the scorecard and how we use the development area and when projects

[07:06:40] come in that we can we can see those you're looking at me like this has never come up before not uh we've talked about a lot of stuff with the schools and school card uh you know scorecard um calculating uh tap fees things like that we i that's a something we can definitely work on yeah i would i hope i think that should be in the scorecard when we think of what we're getting from a project sitting the way it is was bringing in one amount of revenue and to this point it's bringing in others and that would go to helping answer a question of well if it's not proffered

[07:07:15] what will the site yield us to be able to help not just with schools but in this case this heavy on this school burden were you getting ready to say something there cam i mean just for one portion of this screen based on what i know the tap fees are per residential unit um if this developed up to that that maximum that figure is pretty close to it and that doesn't include any potential commercial tap fees so but well the tap fees are supposed to help with the infrastructure

[07:07:49] of the water going. So that's one thing. The other side here, the annual tax revenue and those type of things are what are, should be the ongoing revenues we see from the property that hits the general fund that ultimately goes to the things we're trying to do. Fire service that has to go, police service, the schools, etc. So I mean, I appreciate having the information there.

[07:08:19] Now, we could probably go back and forth several times as to whether these numbers justify and how that all plays out. But I think we'll save those comments for, in theory, when we get to the scorecard and start thinking about how do we consider these things in a way that makes it seem balanced.

[07:08:39] Some of this is probably going to have to go into a matching fund or into the transportation leveraging to be able to get hit to a smart scale to do some sort of match to get at the score to fix the 118 piece. I mean, the monies are all in one big pocket, so it depends on where they go.

[07:08:57] Do you have any response or reaction besides this to my school concern? Well, you said that timing it out, it's going to spread, so it's not going to be immediate. Any other thoughts on that? So I think, like I said, with an apartment development, you do have more one-bedroom and smaller two-bedroom units that are less likely to have families with lots of students, more geared towards professionals or couples.

[07:09:28] You know, I think we've talked about this a lot in the past. As we bring developments forward, we've proffered two sites, two school sites to the county already that we see no movement on utilization of

those sites for schools.

[07:09:47] So we've gone down that path in the past, and, you know, We hope that one day they will be utilized for a good public use, but that's yet to happen. So, yes, we feel like it's a county issue that we all need to look at together at this point.

[07:10:08] Yeah, we have to figure out how to pay for the things to go on there. The proffered land wasn't enough to get us there for the project. It was a start. But I appreciate your point. Interior to the site, you know, enough of these applications have come before us where, you know, We throw out the tot lots or the amenity space.

[07:10:29] For the residential portion, I see the trail piece and where the trailhead is going to go and all of that. But from a standpoint specifically for kids 8 to 12, probably even more 10 to 14, that pre-driving age where you don't want to be on a tot lot, how are you all figuring out or thinking about amenities?

[07:10:52] Because they're going to be landlocked. Now, there could be maybe biking. I forget if there's mountain biking slated over at Hedro. is there or is it banned from there i think it is slated for that area i forget but anyway that aside you know mountain biking could be something that a lot of ages take but there's hardly ever anything for that pre-driving age in terms of amenities it's tough to find in rio and on 29 and rio road and places like that but since there's not just easy places to get to their high school etc like what kind of things do you think would be in there to try to appeal to that

[07:11:28] or could there be or would you be would you that has nothing to do with my decision this is an appeal to your creativity to go that that's something that we i hear regularly with all the developments going on in my district about what are these kids supposed to do they end up going and playing on the tot lots and they get in trouble for hanging out at the tot lots then they go to the trailhead and they get trouble for hanging out at the trailhead you know and then they're just walking around on the sidewalks and they get in trouble for walking around on the sidewalks so like what can these kids go and do that's a legitimate activity and i it is a little

[07:12:03] baffling that projects don't market to that or think about that or provide something like that i'll stop now ashley you just are done with my line of thinking here but i would hope that if this goes into place that you all think about that and part of it is that some folks are saying we shouldn't do this project because it's so disconnected from everything else right you've got the pedestrian piece that's all right we're going to make improvements and if we compare it to what exists now it is better it would be better but better for for to go where and i think it's a little bit of a misnomer of it just automatically thinking that's going to be a negative everybody

[07:12:42] seems to think if you live in dunlora that you have access to all this pedestrian activity where where i used to live that it would take me 20 minutes just to get to rio road no matter which way i walked and i got creative and found trails that could make it faster so even in the densest areas we have places where the internal nature of it is just what exists and it's going to be more important for what can exist inside of that when some of the outside connections not going to not necessarily be there um i you know i hope the commercial what kind of commercial things

[07:13:18] are you thinking in here so right now we're talking with large retailers restaurants gas stations we're talking with the potential office user so it's really a variety it's like a mix of what might come off the interstate yes could be a hotel and then i mean the local residents who don't want to have to then battle the

bad intersection and go into the interior part of 250 if you think of that as the ring coming from the south will say oh i'll hit that retail

[07:13:58] spot because that i won't have to go through all the rigmarole of everything else yes there's really nothing you know nothing else in that area so that could be a really great benefit but i just wanted to say i love your commentary about you know uses for teenagers i live in a neighborhood that has exactly that issue. It's got a couple of tot lots kind of thrown in random locations that people utilize, but not as many options for the teenage group. And I think

[07:14:31] in some of our neighborhoods, we have incorporated items such as the workout gear. So you have like a trail system and then there's exercise gear that you stop and do different you know reps and sets of things and different kind of things that you can climb on and I feel like that's been really popular but it is yeah it is something that we will intentionally think about I don't know what the answer is because I'm sure they'd love things like climbing walls and things that

[07:15:09] They're more intensive, but then you get into a liability issue or needing to staff it at all times. But I think it's a great challenge to us, and we're also thinking about that as we work with the housing authority and their residents.

[07:15:25] So West Haven, South First Phase 2, we have those same issues. There's a lot, a lot of children in kind of a small, compressed space. so how do you plan for all age groups so i'm learning more about it and will be better educated on it by the time we actually design this site plan but it's definitely something that we're thinking about and want to solve well i appreciate that um i have folks have asked questions about storm water that have been answered i'm just double checking my notes this the steep slopes

[07:16:03] had been answered and the housing piece was mentioned all right um just going to look to my right and left any additional questions for the applicant let me just go through everyone real quick then supervisor malik um so i'm would in your um business sectors the light industrial r&d flex all those activities would fit even absolutely something different so more often scientifics and things like that would be happily welcomed yes and they're included in our code of

[07:16:36] development okay excellent and why my cursor won't move here here we go um and just along with what supervisor gallilee was saying about the teens in crozet this has been a problem for years and they're always they're begging for a skate rail linear thing that could just because they're always getting scolded for using the rails on the stairs in the park and things like that so but kids who have great access to pedestrian things but there's still nothing to do is hard for sure so thank you for all that i'm all set all right supervisor preuitt um supervisor

[07:17:14] galway's comments made me immediately answer in my head well they're all gonna go past the salt shack and they're going to go to the railroad and they're just going to hang out on the railroad and smoke clove cigarettes obviously sounds fun um but then it occurred to me that we actually haven't talked about the railroad is quite proximate and pretty accessible by foot to the the proposed pedestrian use path has there been uh any communication coordination with uh norfolk southern in this in this process for our shared use path um no everything that we are proposing

[07:17:50] is within the existing vdot right of way so we have not had any specific conversations with them on that topic okay thank you i'll just say that the future plan that we were considering would probably try and stay outside of the way right away as well yeah i can picture the because that was also what i was

assuming would make sense there's that whole area underneath 64 that you can go on foot i wandered that way on accident having gotten lost on the fontaine hill before um and i think you can do that entirely by staying on the the westward side of the rail right i just walked over the railroad and i didn't encounter any roving teenagers though collect cigarettes

[07:18:30] supervisor lapisto currently uh yes i chair galloway brought this up about amenities and such and i know i've been thinking about totlots too and are they worth it i don't know i mean i'd like to see larger spaces but are you thinking something like for the that age group uh basketball torque uh courts or court i don't know if you're intending on having an HOA that's probably getting down too much into the weeds but you know is that something that's um i don't know what else

[07:19:04] the kids like to do at that age basketball pick a ball yeah i think we'll look at all the the typical suspects there but i also love the idea of a skate park because i mean the city one is i mean there are always tons of people of all ages there so that's been a wonderful asset so yes we're just in the idea stage right now okay thank you that's all uh supervisor missle thanks yeah just one thing i don't think it was clarified the affordable housing appreciate the additional

[07:19:37] effort to go above and beyond on that is the affordability limited to 10 years it is currently okay thank you uh supervisor duncan any additional yeah just one question you might not have the answer to it yet since you don't have the occupants but thinking about like a thousand jobs and the wages do you have any sort of idea of like are these going to be a thousand minimum wage jobs are they you know in kind of like the mid-range do you have like a guess of what we might be

[07:20:09] getting i think it will be a wide range uh depending on if we get office users you know there will be lots of staff in the assisted living facility um there could be a large amount of retail so those types of salaries but yeah it'll it'll be a vast range all right um okay thank you thank you uh we will close the public hearing and the matter is back before the board i'll do a round just to see if supervisors want to make comments before we move to a motion

[07:20:47] supervisor malik this watching this evolution for the last 15 years on this site has been a winding path i'm actually the impact of this number of units of housing and maintaining the business employment side to a large extent is important i think it might work better than all much more residential and less business and hopefully the traffic will sort of offset each other by doing things at different times of day and not all be focused at commuter time which

[07:21:24] may ameliorate things and just continuing to maintain that manufacturing side and i look forward to learning more about the specifics of how the how it's proposed if it's approved because i think there's great potential to do this well i know there have been considerable concerns and i tried to ask all the various questions that i had heard to be able to get these things to be better addressed. I know that in 15, 16, there was great anger at me, particularly because I

[07:21:59] was looking at it as an employment site rather than a forest. And I tried to explain to people, you know, the forest could be gone tomorrow by right. And so this is, yes, I would love to keep the forest for sure, but it's not protected in any way. So just like Monticello, it's not protected in any way. It's just the good graces of whoever has it at the moment.

[07:22:21] So this is good planning, I see. Thank you. Supervisor Pruitt? Yeah, I want to just begin by saying we have heard comment from several members of the public that have suggested that this would be

more desirable as light industrial, after that more desirable as commercial, after that more residential, kind of creating an order of preference in those things.

[07:22:47] And I'm mostly driven by just the detached and fairly isolated nature of it, given the traffic situation. I don't know that I disagree with that ordering of preferences, but also I say this all the time, right?

[07:23:04] We manipulate side constraints. We are not a planned economy in that capacity, in that capital P, capital E sense. We select from options that are given to us based on the side constraints that we implement.

[07:23:23] And so I think this is a, it is not what I might think of as the ideal use for this situate, for this parcel, but I think it is a solid use for this parcel. I also do sometimes when I hear concerns raised, I try and think of whether or not I can picture other scenarios where that set of concerns could apply.

[07:23:47] And so I was sitting here, and I realized that I can think of a development that is almost identical to this. Has anyone here ever been to the Costco in Washington, D.C.? Springfield?

[07:24:03] I'm thinking the Dakota Crossing. This is on the east side of Washington, D.C., right on the northeastern point, exactly like this. is a it is detached it is right off of a major thoroughfare is coming off of New York app where you come in on the east side there's one kind of very like a single-lane arterial that you take into this development on the left are a bunch of big-box stores Costco a few other big-box tenants and some smaller like a Coldstone creamery over there but on the right hand side are a bunch of

[07:24:37] residential developments with some higher density and there's no other way in or out of this area. It's completely isolated in a fairly high traffic area. It presents the same set of problems and at the end of the day it works. It does not have people having these kinds of traffic snarls that I think we're afraid of. It does not have the kind of pedestrian fatality that I think we might be worried about. It figures itself out. So I am not ignorant to the

[07:25:13] the questions that the public have posed, I don't want to ignore the possibility that we have desire paths that are inconsistent, kind of what Supervisor Duncan was gesturing toward, that desire paths are going to emerge that are inconsistent with the shared use path we're trying to push people toward.

[07:25:31] But I think this is probably the best possible proposal that we're going to get based on the side constraints we've implemented. Supervisor Lapisto-Kirtley? Yeah, I agree. I think this is the best we're going to get for this property. Would I like the entire thing to be commercial?

[07:25:48] Yes, office space, commercial, light industrial. That's not realistic because I think you do need, we do need residential, and it does avail itself of residential. I don't like the idea of crossing 29.

[07:26:04] However, I think they've come up with, VDOT has come up with a good plan that will probably work to get people from one side to the other. And so considering everything, I just think it's a good proposal, and I'll be voting in favor of it.

[07:26:21] Supervisor Missal. All right. Thank you. So it shouldn't come as a surprise to the applicant. I'm just going to lead with saying I'm not in support of this application as is currently proposed. It's my third public hearing. First, the applicant, I think, deferred. Second was, I think, a vastly improved application.

[07:26:40] I was in the minority of the planning commission who recommended approval. This is all stuff you know, but just as a reminder, you know, I've had lots of times to think about this, and I really

appreciate the time and commitment that it's taken. I understand how much work it takes to get to this point, and I appreciate Riverbend, and I really think you all develop with the best intentions at heart for the community.

[07:27:03] You know, you all know this. I fully appreciate and stress maximizing development in the development areas. I think, you know, I support expansion of infrastructure to support development in the development areas.

[07:27:20] And I appreciate the thoughtful approach that's been taken. And I also appreciate the benefit of internal trip capture for the mixed use that you all are proposing. However, I still can't envision and support 600 units of residential development on this property.

[07:27:38] It's a parcel that, as we've spoken, is largely landlocked. It's just not a place for residential yet. I support housing, but location matters just as much as quantity. The transportation and exit at 118 is an unknown risk.

[07:27:55] It's my commute every day, so maybe that's my issue, is that I'm always there, I'm always seeing it, and I see near accidents almost on a daily basis, including yesterday, because I was thinking of you guys. You know, without an actionable solution to this issue, I think we're not only impacting folks that might live in this development, but we're also impacting the folks that are commuting through this area.

[07:28:18] And this is all really, in a sense, on us. It's on VDOT. It's on Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority. If we're going to be stressing development in the development areas, we've got to make sure we're proactively getting in front and providing infrastructure to be able to handle that.

[07:28:35] The key external connection to the Moores Creek Greenway is unfunded. It's physically constrained and uncertain, so the pedestrian connections are challenging. so in summary thank you again i understand what you've gone through to get here the years of work and the money i appreciate the preparation and the goal of expanding the development area and the extra lift to get to the additional affordable housing levels and you all have proven that in this in this region and i know you would do it here too i just don't feel that residential is an appropriate use for this site i would support this site as an employment area which would benefit from the immediately adjacent

[07:29:14] highway connections. That's it. Supervisor Duncan? Yeah, just considering the, you know, what could be here by right, I think a lot of the traffic is, would be pass-by traffic. Contrary to Supervisor Lapisto-Curtley, I would love it if the whole thing was housing.

[07:29:36] And the economic development, I think this is all a really great development. My, you know, main concern obviously is the, you know, whole interchange and coordinating that with VDOT, but I also do feel confident that VDOT also wants a solution to that area and is going to have input in this. So yeah, I'm obviously very supportive of this. All right, thank you. I'll lead with my, I think the fact that it's in the

[07:30:08] development area. I think the interesting part of this location, usually I would be of the mind to want to see the increased or the enhanced density but because of the nature of where this is at i think having scaled it back some works um and i think it'll make the commercial more viable to have that block of residential there with it in addition to the interstate and the north south traffic on 29 you know folks always envisioned back in the day that belvedere was going to have all those great retail options in it and belvedere's got double triple by full build out it'll have a

[07:30:45] lot more units than this but nobody's going to go off a rio road and drive down past the center into retail that's i mean why would they do that when just another two minutes down the road they can just pull off and stop at all the different things along 29 but when you consider what is along this stretch the pull-off becomes the place to do it because now you're already past everything there's nothing necessarily competing with it and i think that would really pop and enliven for the folks that live there because then when we while it may not be connected to the greater network or to the greater development area it can become something in where internal people actually could

[07:31:23] maybe then walk to the grocery store or have the senior living facility and have a place to live near it with somebody that's in there and you know once they figure out how to keep the teens satisfied and the pre-driver satisfied then I'll then I'll be in on that so I think the mix is good I think this is a good spot for having this type of development and appreciate the different iterations.

[07:31:49] I think that I'm satisfied with the stormwater, the steep slopes, concerns that were there. I think this is smart from that standpoint design-wise. I think with VDOT, VDOT has finally hit with this particular exit.

[07:32:07] They have hit the bottom of trying to go, well, we've tried big things and we didn't do it right to begin with. We've tried bigger projects to try to fix it. we couldn't get those funded and then it keeps getting value engineered down and i hate to say it but the u-turn at fontaine is one of those options right but i think they finally hit the bottom of the bungee cord and are swinging back up and understanding that they can't keep finding the solution by dropping and they have to climb in elevation again to figure out the piece that's what i take away from my work in the mpo and the conundrum that is this exit um i think this

[07:32:45] development both commercial and residential will help a smart scale application and justifying and helping the scoring with it and i mean maybe all commercial scores technically in points but i think vdot pays attention to where the residential is going to uh you got to remember that the roundabout in front of rio point and the green tea at belvedere weren't even on the list when when those projects got approved um so i just offer that um my biggest concern remains the schools um i'll probably be looking in and making comments about this site when we get to when we

[07:33:23] start seeing scorecards and considering revenue as a way to help us decide if the how the project makes sense to offset impacts like that the 10-year timeline of how it could phase in and seeing those students means it won't just drop 50 or 60 students into red hill um i but but this is going to be one that i'm going to be thinking about as well when we think about our cip and how we have to get at it forget all the big projects that are kind of taking up the public airwaves right now red hill is one of the older schools that's not lost on me and in addition to

[07:33:57] being one of the smallest and just a little fact about red hill it was the one school that wasn't included in the bond referendum in 2016 because it had just got some updates their security frontage some some improvements to the building so it was the one that that bond referendum didn't touch but i'll be supportive of the project uh this is in the samuel miller district you may not want me so we may need someone to make the motion for supervisor uh missile if the is it possible well let me read what the since we don't have the screen it would simply be to adopt the resolution

[07:34:36] attach the staff report as attachment d i move that we adopt the staff attachment d in the report sorry i don't have oh thank you i move to adopt the ordinance attached to the staff report to approve the attachment d for the seat property rezoning second all right is there any further discussion all right uh if

the clerk would please call the roll miss lapista kirtley i miss malik yes mr missel no mr pruit hi miss duncan yes mr galloway yes all right motion carries five to

[07:35:12] one. Thank you to the applicants. Thank you board. Okay that will take us to item number 20 from the board committee reports and matters not listed on the agenda. Supervisor Malik. I don't think I have anything tonight. Thank you. Supervisor Pruitt. I'm not sure I have anything. Don't have. I did not prepare mentally a review of what we went over at the DJPDC so I might kick that to you. Supervisor

[07:35:49] Lepisto currently? Yes, we had an EDA meeting yesterday and we approved another round of funding for United Ways and Vision Enterprise Grant Program to support small businesses accessing financing to grow their business and we also approved a match for Bel Air Farm for state infrastructure for a state infrastructure program to invest in a refrigerated truck to grow their meat specifically pigs business and also being able to deliver fresh fruit because they have

[07:36:25] several permanent or they have several farmers markets where they are but also in the city of Charlottesville so it enables them to bring the fresh fruit and everything like that in the refrigerated truck that's all was that an AFID grant pardon an AFID AFID grant from the state that we're matching, the EDA's matching for the Bel Air Farm?

[07:36:50] The agricultural? Okay. Yes. I heard a yes, but anyway, wherever it was. Okay. Thank you. Boy, Neil's been a go-to today. Way to go, Neil. Yeah, yeah. All right. Supervisor Duncan? Supervisor Missal? I thought I went there. Good way to close.

[07:37:08] Supervisor Missal? I swear if you say I have nothing, I'm going to be real. I've been a part of many work sessions on a budget recently. I don't know if you all are aware of that, but no, I have nothing. Thank you. See, I could have went right to Supervisor Duncan. Supervisor Duncan?

[07:37:24] I went to the chamber public policy meeting last Wednesday, and we had a presentation by Sam Sanders, the city manager, on kind of the work that the city is doing kind of for the homeless. And he gave us sort of the big picture and also just sort of a list of things that they are doing.

[07:37:45] And one of the things that really struck me is, one, they're working a lot on it. But he also really sort of addressed, like, the continuum of care. And as he met with providers and asked kind of, you know, how are we meeting this need?

[07:38:01] And whenever there's a gap, and they were like, you know, we're not doing X, Y, Z. He's like, well, this is part of the problem. And so he's kind of identifying the gaps and is sort of working on solutions to those. He talked about the holiday drive thing, the building and the facility that's going to require, you know, community investment.

[07:38:25] But the main thing that he really stressed was that, you know, this problem isn't new. This problem didn't start with him. And that fixing it or, you know, addressing large chunks of it because it's never going to be solved, but that it takes time. And the one thing he just really requested is that people, you know, be patient and kind of allow the process to play out, allow the Holiday Drive project to kind of come to development and to, you know, financially support it and financially support the Salvation Army facility that is raising money.

[07:39:00] But to just, he just kept asking people to be patient and to know that work is being done to address the situation. So it was really encouraging and just really helpful to realize that a lot of work is

going on, even if we don't see it immediately.

[07:39:19] All right. The TJPDC did meet. We're starting the executive director's evaluation process. We did provide what we had heard in public comment to Chair O'Brien of Fluvanna County regarding the Tenaska plant, which I believe is tonight.

[07:39:38] They meet at the same time we do. Was it last night? I thought they met at the same time as us. tonight yeah so they may still be there trying making those decisions um oh and i just lost the uh well i have to remember that there was i remember i was going to update something on a different another county um but we did share the feedback we had heard from public comment with them so that's the second time i know that we've passed along that information um and then i did

[07:40:11] ATTEND MY FIRST ACRJ MEETING WHERE WE DID GO OVER THE BUDGET, WHAT THEY'RE PROPOSING, SO KIND OF GETTING UP TO SPEED AND LEARNING HOW THEY BUDGET OVER THERE, BUT IT WAS ALL WELL DONE. AND THEY'RE TRYING TO REMEMBER THE -- I DIDN'T WRITE THE NOTE DOWN, THE TIMELINE OF THE PROJECT, BUT THEY DID PROVIDE A PROJECT UPDATE ON THE RENOVATIONS THEY'LL BE MAKING TO THE JAIL. SO THINGS SEEM TO BE PROCEEDING AS THEY SHOULD BE FOR THAT PROJECT. BUT OTHER Other than that, that's all I have.

[07:40:45] And we did the county executive earlier. So if nothing else, then board, we will adjourn to April 1st, 2026, 1 p.m. in Lane Auditorium.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com