

Virginia:

AT A REGULAR MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 2:00 p.m. in the General District Courtroom located on the third floor of the Nelson County Courthouse, in Lovingson, Virginia.

Present: Ernie Q. Reed, Central District Supervisor – Chair
Dr. Jessica L. Ligon, South District Supervisor – Vice Chair
Jesse N. Rutherford, East District Supervisor
J. David Parr, West District Supervisor
Candice W. McGarry, County Administrator
Amanda B. Spivey, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk
Grace E. Mawyer, Director of Finance and Human Resources
Maureen Kelley, Director of Economic Development and Tourism
Dylan M. Bishop, Director of Planning and Zoning

Absent: Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Reed called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m. with four (4) Supervisors present to establish a quorum. Mr. Harvey was absent.

- A. Moment of Silence – Attendees observed a moment of silence.
- B. Pledge of Allegiance – Dr. Ligon led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Christina Evans - CEO, Jefferson Area Board for Aging (JABA)

JABA CEO Christina Evans expressed gratitude for the tremendous support provided for programs and other support measures offering critical safety nets to seniors, adults with disabilities, and caregivers in Nelson County. She said that without these, many individuals could face isolation, food insecurity, and health issues.

Ms. Evans reported that the Cecilia Epps Community Center has provided over 4,900 hours of activities to 31 center members, who also received more than 1,300 hot meals prepared by an in-house chef. She stated that aging services coordinators delivered 1,630 hours of support to 120 individuals, ensuring they connected with available services and programs to continue living in the community. Ms. Evans said that for frail and homebound seniors in Nelson who need nutrition support, the home-delivered meals program provided 3,446 meals to 55 individuals. She reported that 144 individuals received assistance from the insurance counseling program, and the long-term care ombudsman advocated for 76 elders to protect their rights. Ms. Evans stated that this year, with help from a grant provided by the Nelson County Community Fund, JABA launched two new evidence-based pilot programs at the Cecilia Epps Community Center: Bingocize and “A Matter of Balance,” both of which promote fitness, health education, and fun to maintain overall health and mobility.

Ms. Evans shared a story about a 78-year-old client named Bea who had spent her life caring for others. Ms. Evans stated that when Bea was no longer a caregiver for her family member, she was looking for a place to enjoy activities with peers. She reported that after learning about the Nelson Senior Community Center, Bea was thrilled to begin attending, finding new things to do and becoming a member volunteer so she could continue helping others. Ms. Evans stated that staff arranged transportation for Bea, enabling her to attend even when she was unable to drive, and Bea continues to express her love for others through new friendships at the center.

Odin Clark-Cearley – Nelson County High School Senior

Mr. Odin Clark-Cearley stated that he was present to provide an update on the Nelson County Sister Cities initiative. He reported that he and Brayden Murphy are working with Maureen Kelley to draft the letters to be sent to the international communities. He said he is investigating program opportunities such as foreign exchange, trade programs, culture days, and other possibilities for the high school as well as middle and elementary schools. He thanked the Board and said they were still open to suggestions.

Edith Napier – Arrington, Virginia

Ms. Edith Napier stated that before she began her comments, she wished to address the Board, especially since JABA representatives were present. She asked the Board to look at the Ryan Apartments, which were originally

set up for seniors. Ms. Napier reported that during her last visit, the apartments were not in a condition suitable for seniors and stated that there was room for improvement now.

Ms. Napier stated that she was honored to speak on behalf of the Nelson County Juneteenth Celebration Committee, expressing gratitude to the members who were present. She said the committee was preparing for the fourth annual Juneteenth celebration of Nelson County, scheduled for Saturday, June 20, 2026, at 3 p.m. She reported that the community would be hearing much more about the event and receiving flyers. Ms. Napier stated that the event continues to grow in reach and impact, offering the community a space to honor history, celebrate progress, and invest in the future.

Ms. Napier reported that in 2025, the theme focused on historical Black colleges and universities and the educational opportunities they offer to all students. She said college students were present to share their experiences and answer questions from attendees, creating an inspiring and exclusive dialogue that resonated across generations. She stated that the committee was grateful to the Nelson Heritage Center for once again opening its doors to host the event. Ms. Napier said that although the Juneteenth Committee operates independently, they deeply value the Center's support and partnership in making the celebration possible.

Ms. Napier requested a \$5,000 donation on behalf of the citizens of Nelson County to support the 2026 Juneteenth celebration. She also asked that this contribution be considered as a recurring County budget line item, ensuring continued support for this meaningful tradition. Ms. Napier stated that the investment would help provide enriching programs, foster educational engagement, and celebrate the diverse heritage that strengthens the community—and the committee could consider to provide opportunities that uplift, inform, and inspire.

Elwood Waterfield

Mr. Elwood Waterfield addressed the Board, stating that he was currently homeless. Mr. Waterfield made several allegations about misconduct by County officials and law enforcement, stating that the Board members were all going to be impeached. Mr. Waterfield then commented that the JABA adult protective services help outreach line did not work and had not been in service for three years.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Rutherford moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Parr seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors unanimously approved the motion unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote, and the following resolutions were adopted:

A. Resolution – R2025-76 Minutes for Approval

**RESOLUTION R2025-76
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APPROVAL OF MINUTES
(March 11, 2025)**

RESOLVED, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the minutes of said Board meetings conducted on March 11, 2025 be and hereby are approved and authorized for entry into the official record of the Board of Supervisors meetings.

B. Resolution – R2025-77 FY26 Budget Amendment

**RESOLUTION R2025-77
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AMENDMENT OF FISCAL YEAR 2025-2026 BUDGET
November 13, 2025**

I. Appropriation of Funds (General Fund)		
Amount	Revenue Account (-)	Expenditure Account (+)
\$ 295.56	3-100-001901-0033	4-100-999000-9905
\$ 23,345.00	3-100-002404-0035	4-100-031020-7038
\$ 31,200.00	3-100-009999-0001	4-100-091050-7125
\$ 8,089.86	3-100-003303-0051	4-100-999000-9905
\$ 16,370.00	3-100-001901-0034	4-100-031020-3040
\$ 22,062.00	3-100-001899-0009	4-100-033010-6002
<u>\$ 4,010.00</u>	3-100-001899-0017	4-100-031020-5803
\$ 105,372.42		

II. Appropriation of Funds (School Fund)

Amount	Credit Account (-)	Debit Account (+)
\$ 50,954.00	3-205-002404-4070	4-205-064600-8000
\$ 40,000.00	3-205-002404-0028	4-205-061100-9301
<u>\$ 103,000.00</u>	3-205-002404-0029	4-205-062100-9302
\$ 193,954.00		

IV. PRESENTATIONS

A. VDOT Report

There was no report provided as VDOT was not present for the meeting.

B. CVPED Program Updates – Helen Cauthen and Katie Dulaney

Ms. Helen Cauthen, President of Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development (CVPED), stated that she would provide a brief update on new initiatives at CVPED. She expressed her appreciation for the Board’s support since CVPED’s inception, nearly 30 years ago. She reported that the partnership, a public-private entity including Nelson and the counties up to Culpeper, and the City of Charlottesville, has operated for almost 30 years. She stated that CVPED leadership includes Nelson County Administrator Candy McGarry, with public sector representation by county administrators or their designees. Ms. Cauthen said Susan Gruber of UVA Community Credit Union currently chairs the board, noting that the chair alternates annually between public and private sectors. Ms. Cauthen recognized Nelson County Economic Development Director Maureen Kelly for her creativity and support on the team.

Ms. Cauthen reported that since 2023, several notable developments have occurred in the region, with the recent AstraZeneca announcement involving a \$4.5 billion project—creating 3,000 construction jobs and 600 permanent positions at the Rivanna Future site adjacent to Rivanna Station. Ms. Cauthen stated that this project will benefit the entire region and is notable for attracting an internationally recognized company, which is uncommon for the area’s economic development, as it has typically focused on smaller, privately held companies. She said AstraZeneca’s presence will attract suppliers and create warehouse opportunities, benefiting existing businesses, and further details will be available as the project progresses.

Ms. Cauthen stated that regional economic activity has been elevated due to data center developments, including EdgeCore’s \$17 billion project in Louisa County and additional investments by AWS, Cielo, DataBank, and CloudHQ in Culpeper. She said these figures are extraordinary compared to typical local expansions. Ms. Cauthen reported on the new Central Virginia Innovation Corridor strategic roadmap, which was pretty much based off of Route 29, and spans from Nelson County to Fauquier and covers both planning districts 9 and 10. She stated that the focus is on regional strengths in national security, IT, advanced materials, data science, AI, robotics, autonomous vehicles, life sciences, and biotech. She said the new Manning Institute for Biotechnology at the University of Virginia’s Fontaine Research Park will hire 100 researchers and their teams to accelerate technology commercialization and clinical trials. Ms. Cauthen stated that Ms. Kelley is involved in this effort and that a \$100,000 planning grant from GO Virginia supports the initiative, with potential for additional funding based on study recommendations for implementation.

Ms. Cauthen reported that the Charlottesville Regional Chamber’s Defense Affairs Committee now operates under CVPED, expanding its focus from Charlottesville-Albemarle to Nelson County and all the way to Culpeper. She stated that the committee will support defense companies and those seeking to supply or expand into national security work. She reported that Miles Davis has been hired to lead this effort as the new Defense Affairs Committee Director. Ms. Cauthen said this initiative is separately funded and she expressed optimism about opportunities for Nelson County businesses in the sector.

Ms. Katie Delaney stated that she was providing an update on ongoing talent initiatives and has been collaborating closely with Ms. Kelley, and also Matthew Brown. She noted that Matthew Brown has been consulting on connecting interns to the beverage and wine industries. Ms. Delaney reported that this partnership has been successful and has worked with VTOP, a state initiative offering wage matching for interns and small businesses, which benefits most beverage industry companies. She stated that the UVA career team has engaged with these efforts and that there has been progress with PVCC as well.

Ms. Delaney said Nelson County has contributed to sector momentum region-wide, with initial conversations starting with the Board. She reported that livingcentralva.org is regularly updated to support talent attraction and retention, highlighting each locality's unique qualities, industry sectors, and testimonials from regional companies. She added that the website also emphasizes regional livability and quality of life. She stated that for Nelson County, CVPED has been effective in promoting the craft beverage industry, especially with the

wine grant. Ms. Dulaney indicated that the website contains substantial information on recreational opportunities, and they were constantly working with Ms. Kelly to optimize the site. Ms. Delaney said Nelson County is frequently mentioned as a desirable place to live in the region, citing its land, affordability, creative community, and natural attractions. She invited further conversation and questions from the Board for her or Ms. Cauthen.

Mr. Rutherford asked about Northrup Grummond in the region. Ms. Cauthen noted that was not part of the region as it was in Waynesboro. She noted that they did try to get the expansion, but CVPED was the second choice. She indicated that they did have the Northrup Grummond facility next to the Shoppes at Stonefield, where they do the command centers for submarines.

Ms. Cauthen responded that as CVPED talked to companies outside the area, they broaden that conversation to Eli Lilly, Merck, etc. to try to attract suppliers—especially smaller folks that fit into the region. She added that they did not need thousand-job projects that did not fit in the region, but they would like some robust things that benefit smaller companies.

Dr. Ligon commented that she campaigned on wanting to create jobs in the County, which the County always says it is friendly to business yet has none coming. She asked what the major hurdles were and what they needed to do to pave that path.

Ms. Cauthen responded that sites and buildings are the biggest challenge, as most companies want an existing building and most buildings in the region are not new or modern. She noted that they were fine for companies that were already here, but they are tougher to sell when companies want a newer building and are able to look up the entire East Coast.

Dr. Ligon acknowledged that even with the price of construction and renovation, it seems it is always more expensive to renovate a building that is already there.

Ms. Cauthen said that typically, many of CVPED's clients want an existing building; secondly, if there is a site, it needs to be ready to go. Ms. Cauthen said Shannon Hill Regional Business Park was a great example, wherein Louisa County decided to invest in that land, which is almost 700 acres. She said they got two different grants from GO Virginia for due diligence, totaling \$1.3 million, and then got \$11 million from the state to do site due diligence. She said doing that work put them in a position to attract EdgeCore, which was able to take that site because it had been advanced to a Tier 4. She said the biggest challenge throughout the region is those Tier 3, 4, or 5 ready-to-go sites that they can pitch because if it's just land, it's very hard to make a case. She said she would be happy to sit down and talk more about what that means and how to do that.

Dr. Ligon commented that she liked the idea of making Lovingsston an opportunity zone but was told that was not possible, and she would like to know why.

Ms. Cauthen responded that there are designated opportunity zones, but she was not certain how localities could make themselves one if they were not already. She offered to find out that information. Ms. Kelley noted that Nelson County did not qualify to be a designated opportunity zone.

Ms. Cauthen noted that she and Ms. Dulaney, along with the CVPED staff were available any time to sit down and answer any questions and talk through the issues.

C. 2026 TJPDC Legislative Program – David Blount, TJPDC (R2025-78)

Mr. David Blount, TJPDC Deputy Director, said he was presenting the Regional Legislative Program for 2026 for approval, and following up on his previous visit in September. He stated that three main priorities were continuing from 2025 to 2026: public education funding, budgets and funding, and land use and growth management.

Mr. Blount reported that public education remains a perennial position in advocacy for realistic state funding levels for K-12 education, noting the change in position this year highlighted anticipated higher costs associated with the upcoming re-benchmarking of K-12 education costs which is done every two years. He stated that the second priority, budgets and funding, expresses continued support for increased state aid to local programs—specifically state programs administered locally—and opposition to unfunded mandates and any restriction or usurpation of local revenue authority. He said that new language in these two priorities recognizes the evolving federal funding relationship with states and localities and further emphasizes opposition to shifting costs to localities or restricting funding for programs previously supported by federal funds.

Mr. Blount stated that the third priority, land use and growth management, reflects ongoing concerns about legislation seeking to limit or usurp local land use authority. He reported that, given the considerable attention

this issue received before the 2025 session, no changes have been proposed for the coming year. He explained that the legislative positions section addresses recommendations beyond the top three priorities, mentioning several updates.

Mr. Blount said that under the Children's Services Act (CSA), new language opposes caps on state reimbursement, an issue addressed in the past year. He reported additional language encouraging investment in local social services departments for administering revised SNAP and Medicaid programs, support for rural hospitals facing reduced Medicaid funding, and support for increased funding local communities to assist low-income working families with child care costs. He stated that the final change concerns transportation, referencing work done at the TJPDC and letters sent to regional legislators, with added language supporting more state investment in transportation infrastructure.

Mr. Blount said he welcomed any questions and sought the Board's approval of the program.

Mr. Rutherford asked if there was an expectation that localities would do some form of match for SNAP benefits. Mr. Blount responded that it was still being discussed but has not been decided yet, and there had been some discussion at VACo about that. He added that they did not know yet what the amount the state might be able to look for because of the error rate—and it is dependent on whether the rate can get below 10%, then there is a tiered level of how much state investment would be needed, then the question remains as to shared costs.

Mr. Reed commented that the TJPDC keeps the Board up to date on all of these items, and he noted that there would be a new administration at the state level. Mr. Blount said education was a continual job, and he appreciated their comments and encouraged them to come to the General Assembly during session.

Dr. Ligon stated that she has been looking for someone who can come and teach the Board about the equation for the composite index, as it seems like every decision they make is a misstep, and they are paying more and more. She said it seems the state feels the County has the money to pay towards the schools—and if they cannot change it, she wondered if there were people out there that would teach them to stop making the wrong decisions.

Mr. Blunt responded that there are people in the Virginia Department of Education that know the LCI formula from every angle. He offered to give this some thought and identify those who might be able to provide this. He noted that when they are getting ready to receive the updated composite index numbers, there is always a two-year lag—so they are looking at data that is two years old, and by the time they are getting to the end of the next biennial budget at the state level, they are based on something four years old.

Mr. Rutherford moved to approve **Resolution R2025-78** as presented. Dr. Ligon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote and the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION R2025-78
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APPROVAL OF THOMAS JEFFERSON PLANNING DISTRICT
2026 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the draft Thomas Jefferson Planning District Legislative Program for 2026 lists three top legislative priorities; and

WHEREAS, the program includes a priority addressing public education funding; a constant position on budget/funding issues that supports state aid to localities and opposes mandates and cost shifting to localities; and support for local authorities to plan and regulate land use and growth management; and

WHEREAS, the Legislative Program also contains additional positions that focus on the most critical recommendations and positions in other areas of current interest and concern to localities in the region;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors, that the 2026 Thomas Jefferson Planning District Legislative Program be and hereby is approved by said governing body, with the legislative program to serve as the basis of legislative priorities and positions of the member localities of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District for the 2026 session of the Virginia General Assembly, as presented on November 13, 2025, as well as incorporation of recommendations put forth by the Board, as applicable.

D. 2025 MAPP2Health Report – Ryan McKay and Jen Fleisher, VDH

Mr. Ryan McKay, Director of the Blue Ridge Health District, reported that he represented the Blue Ridge Health District, which includes the health department in Nelson County, and he noted that he would provide a brief overview of the Community Health Assessment (CHA). He indicated that Jen Fleisher, their project officer for the Community Health Assessment and the Health Improvement Plan, was also present.

Mr. McKay stated that the IRS requires nonprofit community hospitals to conduct a community health needs assessment, known locally as the CHA—with drive being to gain an understanding of community health needs and outcomes and to identify how organizations and resources can be used to improve health outcomes over time. He said the assessment spanned 18 months and covered Nelson and the entire district in partnership with UVA Health and Sentara Martha Jefferson.

Mr. McKay reported that the CHA was published in September, the process repeats every three years, and they are now in the health improvement plan phase. He stated that MAPP2Health 2.0 introduced a steering committee, which had not existed previously, and the core group includes UVA Health, the health district, and Sentara; their role is to maintain communication, collect recommendations from the steering committee, and perform data gathering and analysis. He said the steering committee is critical in expanding the breadth and scope of information about health needs in the communities, including physical and mental health as well as social drivers of health (SDOH) such as economics, education, and place of residence.

Mr. McKay stated that many organizations, led by Ms. Fleisher, participate in the process. He reported that the Nelson County steering committee includes Rachel Reutinger with Nelson County Schools, and the Blue Ridge Medical Center, all of which are active partners on the committee. He stated that they seek primary information directly from Nelson County residents and utilize online surveys to gather input, and this year's approach is more grassroots and focused on generating information from community members experiencing challenges.

Ms. Jen Fleisher reported that they came up with three priorities to focus on for the Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), which is the implementation of the assessment. She said they would focus on chronic conditions, specifically obesity and mental health—lowering obesity rates and improving mental health; healthcare access broadly, which is getting the right care at the right time in the right place; and the social drivers of health, which are healthy food access, economic stability, and transportation.

Ms. Fleisher stated that for priority three, they know that UVA Health is not in charge of healthy food banks or growing healthy food, but they can partner with and measure and support the organizations that can make an impact on that. She said that ultimately, people with healthy food access are healthier overall, which can reduce ED visits and any kind of intersection with the hospital. She noted that whereas priorities one and two are really on the ground or downstream areas, SDOH are upstream interventions. She said this includes better transportation to get people to their medical appointments and also reduce the stress of daily life in managing how to get from one place to another.

Ms. Fleisher stated the “targeted universalism” template they used to drive a lot of their work was borrowed from Chicago's Healthy Cities. She said pertaining to Nelson, rural localities, low-income residents, black and African-American residents, and Hispanic and Latinx residents are populations most at risk for poor health, and thus they will be priority populations for any implementation that is done.

She said that “targeted universalism” means everyone will be elevated in the goals that apply to these three priority areas, because they will be working on transportation not only for the priority populations but for everyone at large, in that the effects will be very broad in just focusing on our priority populations to start. She said the strategic objectives are pretty basic, but their goals are kind of somewhat lofty—such as maintaining active lifestyles, physical and mental wellness, and strong community connections.

Ms. Fleisher reported that for their data collection, they went out and interviewed 100 individuals from Nelson County, talked to over 1,000 people online, and spoke with 300 people in one-on-one interviews. She said they then worked with the steering committee and the core group to distill down that assessment and come up with the stated priorities. She reported that they also looked at secondary data like the census, and state data for trends and disparities, which validated where and with whom they spoke. She added that they then distilled it down to the priorities as presented.

Ms. Fleisher said her team returned in the fall to present initial data to those interviewed and asked for solutions to the identified problems. She said they conducted one-on-one interviews throughout the district, including Nelson, to determine which changes would have the greatest impact. She reported that they gathered information through a randomized door-to-door survey in Tract 9501, which included Arrington, Gladstone, Norwood, Shipman, Schuyler, and Wingina. Ms. Fleisher said they knocked on 238 doors and received 100 responses, asking people about mental health, obstacles to health, needed supports, and existing resources. She stated that because the survey was randomized, it was statistically sound, so the responses could serve as a

proxy for other rural localities within the district. She said key informant interviews were conducted as a second step, with about 6% of respondents from Nelson County, reflecting the County’s proportion in the district, and these interviews occurred at 17 different events and locations, with follow-up in the spring.

Ms. Fleisher reported that they conducted four focus groups: people with disabilities, Spanish-speaking community health workers, the reentry community, and the LGBTQ community. She said there were 22 total respondents, three of those groups had a person from Nelson County in them. She stated that online surveys generated the highest number of responses, including 42 Nelson County residents. She reported that a stakeholder survey was also conducted with organizations serving the district; 35% of these survey participants said they served clients in Nelson County. She said providers were asked for their perspectives on obstacles and supports to health for their clients.

Ms. Fleisher reported that they conducted a photovoice project with seven Monticello High School students to capture adolescent perspectives, using photographs and focus groups to discuss assets, well-being and resilience. She stated that students identified mental health and community connectivity as top priorities, emphasizing peer support and leadership rather than adult intervention. Ms. Fleisher said these students showed strong commitment to their own and their peers’ health.

She reported that secondary data, including the Area Deprivation Index, was used to select Wingina and Norwood for focused surveys. Ms. Fleisher said the Arrington-Wingina tract scored 70% higher for deprivation indicators compared to the nation, including: crowding, lack of plumbing, higher poverty thresholds, less homeownership, higher rents, and lower incomes. She stated that for the first time, UVA and Sentara patient data was used, revealing high rates of obesity among UVA patients, especially in the Wingina census tract. She noted that there was also a high percentage of hypertension among UVA patients, south of Wintergreen where it was more sparsely populated, with an older population. Ms. Fleisher reported racial disparities in top health issues and emphasized a focus on reducing these gaps, particularly among Black and African-American residents. She noted that the top health issues were blood pressure, obesity and heart problems.

Ms. Fleisher stated that county health rankings and roadmaps showed Nelson County had a value at least 10% worse than the state in several problem areas, especially in social determinants. Ms. Fleisher stated that tackling any of these 12 indicators should yield progress, but acknowledged that issues like food insecurity require long-term solutions.

SECONDARY DATA

County Health Rankings & Roadmaps

An "X" indicates that the locality has a value at least 10% worse than the state's.

The number listed reflects the amount of "X" in that category.

The blue highlight indicates a particular outlier for a problem area. For instance, under "Social Drivers," Nelson Co. was at least 10% worse than the state average for 12 out of the 17 indicators.

Problem area	Nelson
Health	6
Premature deaths	
Child deaths	
Injury deaths	X
Motor vehicle deaths	X
Firearm deaths	X
Suicide deaths	X
Fair or poor health	X
Low birthweight	
Teen births	X
HIV	

Problem area	Nelson
Behavior	2
Smoking	X
Physically inactive	X
Excessive drinking	
Alcohol-related driving deaths	
Drug overdose deaths	
Health care access	2
Primary care physicians	
Dentists	X
Mental health providers	X
Prevention	0
Preventable hospitalizations	
Flu vaccination	
Environment	1
Traffic volume	
Air pollution	
Access to exercise opportunities	X

Problem area	Nelson
Social determinants	12
Income	X
Children in poverty	X
Free/reduced lunch	X
Food insecurity	X
Uninsured	X
Housing problems	X
Income inequality	X
Access to healthy foods	
Single-parent households	
Child-care centers	
School reading scores	
High school education	X
Some college education	X
Census participation	X
Social association	X
Juvenile arrests	
Broadband access	X

She reported that the primary health problems identified were diabetes, blood pressure, mental health, weight issues, and heart problems. Ms. Fleisher said the main obstacles to health were lack of healthcare access, time, healthy food, money, transportation, and challenges related to aging. She stated that money was the number one support needed for health improvement, followed by community support or “peer-to-peer assistance.” She said older adults especially valued neighborly help and group activities for accountability and health improvement.

Ms. Fleisher reported that implementation efforts would include healthy eating classes, budgeting support, transportation to classes, community-led groups, and mobile free health care. She commented that there were Nelson homes that had several cars parked in the driveway, but they were non-working vehicles, and there was not enough money to get the cars running, so the resident was still relying on a neighbor for a ride since JAUNT did not service that part of Nelson. She said most Nelson residents interviewed were traveling at least 30 minutes for medical and 45 minutes for dental appointments, she noted that there was a need for improved

transportation and dental services. She stated that it was necessary to increase awareness of available resources, such as the Blue Ridge Medical Center's services. Ms. Fleisher said keys to progress were supporting Nelson County programs that are aligned with CHIP initiatives and legislative work on transportation, economic stability, and healthy food access.

Mr. Reed commented that what stands out to him is poverty and income disparity, and not seeing that on Ms. Fleisher's final slide indicates that a lot of this is beyond her purview—but it really isn't because the cost of health care is a huge piece of this, and he would like to see that acknowledged more clearly.

Ms. Fleisher explained that the people they interviewed are representative per the census of Nelson's socioeconomic status, but they actually spoke to more people who were living within poverty or range of poverty—so they did get the full range. She said they also spoke to those who were very well off, and it matched their population set, but they got a little bit more on the poverty side. She clarified that they are not saying that poverty is not an obstacle; they are saying that money is the obstacle, so it is a reframing of that. She agreed that economic stability is critical to health, because whether you qualify as someone who is living at a certain AMI for a poverty entitlement package or any kind of other supports, everyone they spoke with elevated the economic and money piece as a driver towards their health. She noted that they can see that in the deep data of the report.

Dr. Ligon asked how the County could help the mental health situation if they are not going to rely on the healthcare system.

Ms. Fleisher responded that the health care systems all want you to trust that they will give you care—but Medicaid is in a big shift right now, and ACA and all insurance is going to really impact how people seek and approach care. She said they need to focus on where they have the most leverage to impact the initiatives outside of that realm that support that system, such as providing healthy food access by putting a grocery store in Norwood if someone is looking to obtain permission to open one there. She also noted that if JAUNT were to look to expand service into those underserved areas of Norwood and Wingina, the Board should say yes. She emphasized that whenever they can align initiatives and funds to remove these obstacles, that is where they can step in as a legislative official.

Dr. Ligon said things happen faster on the private side rather than in government, and she would advocate in zoning to allow things like small grocery stores.

Ms. Fleisher stated that private investment was required, and those working on the CHIP ranged from private individuals to private foundations to organizations and agencies—anyone can work on the CHIP. She added that it just depends on where they can have the most impact with available resources.

Mr. Rutherford asked what “social drivers” are.

Ms. Fleisher responded that they are non-healthcare related impacts on health such as transportation, education, built environment, and the homes people live in. She said the first time she went to Norwood, she asked residents what they needed to be healthy—and they responded with things like fixing an AC to alleviate mold, which aggravates asthma and building a ramp to enable someone to get out of the house. She noted that Blue Ridge Medical Center is committed to addressing social drivers such as transportation and has a van to pick patients up.

V. NEW & UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Piney River Water and Sewer Rates (O2025-09)

Ms. McGarry reported that this was an extension of their discussion on the Piney River Water and Sewer System rates. Ms. McGarry said public notice was provided and a public hearing was held on October 14th, and the Board subsequently deferred action on the proposed Ordinance O2025-09. She showed the proposed rates and effective dates for water and sewer rates and fees for monthly service, including grinder pump fees.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE O2025-09 WATER & SEWER RATES AND FEES-
MONTHLY SERVICE + GRINDER PUMP FEE

Service	Existing	1/1/2026	7/1/2026	7/1/2027	7/1/2028
Water Usage - (4,000 gallons monthly minimum)	\$29.90	\$34.36	\$38.82	\$43.28	\$52.20
Water Usage - (per 1,000 gallons > monthly min)	\$6.10	\$7.36	\$8.61	\$9.87	\$12.38
Sewer Usage - (4,000 gallons per month)	\$29.60	\$39.22	\$48.85	\$58.47	\$77.72
Sewer Usage - (per 1,000 gallons > monthly min)	\$6.85	\$7.91	\$8.97	\$10.03	\$12.15
Grinder Pump Fee	\$9.00	\$12.07	\$15.14	\$18.20	\$24.34

Ms. McGarry stated that the customer base comprised approximately 206 customers: 5 with water only, 18 with sewer only, 83 with sewer and grinder pump, and 100 with water, sewer, and grinder pump. She showed the customer base by service, including current monthly bills and projected bills under the proposed ordinance amendment effective January 1st, July 1st, 2026, July 1st, 2027, and July 1st, 2028.

PINEY RIVER WATER & SEWER SYSTEM (PRWS) CUSTOMER BASE
PROPOSED ORDINANCE O2025-09 WATE & SEWER RATES AND FEES- MONTHLY
SERVICE + GRINDER PUMP FEE

Customer Base By Service	Current Monthly Bill	1/1/2026	7/1/2026	7/1/2027	7/1/2028
Water Only - 5	\$29.90	\$34.36	\$38.82	\$43.28	\$52.20
Sewer Only - 18	\$29.60	\$39.22	\$48.85	\$58.47	\$77.72
Sewer & Grinder Pump - 83	\$38.60	\$51.29	\$63.99	\$76.67	\$102.06
Water, Sewer, & Grinder Pump- 100	\$68.50	\$85.65	\$102.81	\$119.95	\$154.26

Ms. McGarry said that for the group with water, sewer, and grinder pump—about 100 customers—the current monthly bill was \$68.50. She stated that the first proposed rate in January would increase the bill to \$85.65, with subsequent increases to \$102.81 on July 1st, 2026, \$119.95 on July 1st, 2027, and \$154.26 on July 1st, 2028. She explained that the same chart displayed the dollar and percent changes for each customer group, highlighting the proposed rates for January 2026.

Ms. McGarry reported that for the customer group with water, sewer, and grinder pump, the dollar change in January 2026 would be \$17.15 or 25%. She stated that the July 2026 rate would increase by \$17.16 or 20%, July 2027 by \$17.14 or 17%, and July 2028 by \$34.31 or 29%. She explained that the total increase across the period would be \$85.76 or 125%. Ms. McGarry said that alternate percentage increases and their equivalent dollar impacts on the proposed water and sewer rates were considered. She stated that the monthly service for the most expensive customer base—water, sewer, and grinder pump—was used as an example, with the existing rate at \$68.50. Ms. McGarry explained that every 1% increase would add \$0.69 to that rate, and she provided further examples of the dollar impact for 3%, 5%, 7%, 10%, 12%, 15%, and 20% increases.

TABLE 2. ALTERNATE % INCREASES AND EQUIVALENT \$ IMPACT TO PROPOSED WATER & SEWER RATES AND FEES – MONTHLY SERVICE MOST EXPENSIVE CUSTOMER BASE EXAMPLE

Table 2: Alternate % Increases and Equivalent \$ Impact	Existing	1%	3%	5%	7%	10%	12%	15%	20%
Water, Sewer, & Grinder Pump - 100	\$68.50	\$0.69	\$2.06	\$3.43	\$4.80	\$6.85	\$8.22	\$10.28	\$13.70

Ms. Grace Mawyer stated that staff was asked to pull data for Piney River operational revenues and expenses, and five years of data are shown in the chart, covering fiscal years 2021 to 2025. Ms. Mawyer said the revenues are derived from water and sewer fees, as well as connection and installation fees. She stated that the operational expenditures include general expenses for repairs and maintenance, excluding capital expenditures. Ms. Mawyer reported that in every year except for FY21, expenditures were higher than revenues. She said that in some years, a transfer from the general fund was made to cover additional capital expenses for Piney River.

FIVE-YEAR PRWS FUND OPERATIONAL REVENUE/EXPENDITURE BUDGET & CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Revenues	\$ 151,205.27	\$ 172,852.74	\$ 195,176.95	\$ 130,828.81	\$ 155,752.57
Operational Expenditures	\$ 132,992.94	\$ 194,687.65	\$ 204,726.60	\$ 160,841.93	\$ 227,807.69
Revenues/(Expenditures)	\$ 18,212.33	\$ (21,834.91)	\$ (9,549.65)	\$ (30,013.12)	\$ (72,055.12)
General Fund Operations Supplement	\$ 0.00	\$ 21,834.91	\$ 9,549.65	\$ -	\$ 72,055.12
Revenues/(Expenditures) after General Fund Operations Supplement	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ (30,013.12)	\$ 0.00
Total Capital Expenditures	\$ 219,000.20	\$ 87,538.80	\$ 73,838.00	\$ 1,833.00	\$ 26,875.00

Ms. Mawyer stated that this transfer helped absorb some operational overages and is presented in the chart as a general fund operations supplement. She reported that there was no general fund transfer in FY24, which resulted in the net amount remaining negative. She said the total capital expenditures for each year are listed at the bottom of the chart. Ms. Mawyer stated that these expenditures were used for both the disinfectant project and the pump station repair project.

Ms. Mawyer reported that the chart displays the five-year Piney River fund expenses, broken down into breakeven rates for both operational and combined operational and capital expenses.

	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	
Total Operational Expenses	\$ 132,993	\$ 194,688	\$ 204,727	\$ 160,842	\$ 227,808	
Monthly Expense	\$ 11,083	\$ 16,224	\$ 17,061	\$ 13,403	\$ 18,984	
Break-Even Customer Rate (Operations only)	\$ 53.80	\$ 78.76	\$ 82.82	\$ 65.07	\$ 92.16	\$ 74.52
						5-year average
Total Capital Expenditures	\$ 219,000	\$ 87,539	\$ 73,838	\$ 1,833	\$ 26,875	
Total All Expenses	\$ 351,993	\$ 282,226	\$ 278,565	\$ 162,675	\$ 254,683	
Monthly Expense	\$ 29,333	\$ 23,519	\$ 23,214	\$ 13,556	\$ 21,224	
Break-Even Customer Rate (Operations + Capital)	\$ 142.39	\$ 114.17	\$ 112.69	\$ 65.81	\$ 103.03	\$ 107.62
						5-year average

Ms. Mawyer said that total operational expenses were converted to a monthly expense and divided by the total number of customers to calculate the operational breakeven rate. She stated that the average operational breakeven rate over five years is \$74.52. Ms. Mawyer reported that the same process was applied to the total expenses, including capital expenditures, resulting in an average operational and capital breakeven rate over five years of \$107.62. She said that no breakdown was performed to provide separate breakeven figures for water, sewer, and public pump rates. Ms. Mawyer stated that such analysis would require additional time, so a flat breakeven rate was calculated using the total number of 206 customers.

Ms. McGarry stated that other considerations for proposed water and sewer rates and fees for monthly service involve possibly shifting the effective date of the initial increase from January 1, 2026 to a later date. She said they could also look at applying different monetary or percentage increases to the existing rates referenced on slide 7. She reported that they could also look at using a 5-year average breakeven rate, including operational and capital expenditures as Ms. Mawyer discussed on slide 9.

Ms. McGarry stated that the Board may authorize fewer than the four proposed rate increases and she noted that staff was open to additional suggestions or combinations of the aforementioned options. She reminded the Board that adopted rates may be lower than those advertised for public hearing, but not higher. She said the next steps involve generating discussion on the proposed and alternative rates for water and sewer monthly service. She also reported that discussion is needed on the proposed other rates, fees, and charges outlined in O2025-09. Ms. McGarry stated that the Board could consider adoption of O2025-09 as proposed or provide staff with direction on consensus to amend the proposed ordinance, which could be brought for consideration at the December 9th regular meeting. She said that maintaining the conversation is important and that staff require direction.

Mr. Reed suggested that they first hear from Mr. Parr since his district is served by this.

Mr. Parr stated that he has had a lot of conversations and feedback from the community, and it was clear that the proposed schedule is unaffordable for the vast majority of the community. He said he was not hearing much concern or pushback about the meter sizing and fees. He noted that he thought the meter sizing and fee schedule was realistic, and he supported that.

He said what he would like to see them do is consider a different percentage increase per the chart on Page 7. He commented that one of the problems is that they have not had any increases in many years.

Ms. McGarry confirmed that the last one was in 2013.

Mr. Parr stated that they need to implement regular annual rate increases, such as 5% each year, and keep the meter sizing and fee schedule they have proposed where they match those with other things in the County. He said that looking at this as a break-even or for-profit venture is not in keeping with the intent of the original project. He noted that the project was a solution to a public health crisis in the community. He said he supports adjusting connection fees and implementing a regular even increase in the monthly fees.

Dr. Ligon said she has not had time to break it all out percentage-wise, but increasing the rate to \$74.52 with the water sewer grinder pump is a 10% increase, which is what the break-even point would be if all the numbers were the same. She said the numbers are not all the same, and they went with the highest rate, and at the 12% to 15%, they would get closer to break-even. She added that the proposed 22%, 33% increases every year for several years in a row is unsettling. She noted that since she has been Supervisor, the Piney River System been running at increasing loss year over year, which is not a good trend and takes from other projects that create jobs. She said there needs to be an increase and would like them to discuss a one-time increase between 7% and 10%, but also not table it for future increases.

Mr. Reed commented that tabling it for future increases makes sense to him as there is no way to predict what the Service Authority and other economic factors will do in the future, so setting a five-year schedule is probably not in anyone's best interest. He said initiating something now—given that it has been 12 years since any increase—is really important, and they must start taking some steps. He said if they were to start that at the first of the year, they could have a percentage change to at least get them on that route. He stated that his intuition is that it is probably better to do increases mid-year instead of the first of the year, without tying anyone now into what the increase is going to look like going forward. He added that the ultimate goal is that this become not just served by the Service Authority but part of their system, which also makes the most sense for him and the County.

Dr. Ligon stated that the Service Authority will not want this with this move, and setting something up yearly would actually be more predictable and nicer to the public—so when it gets tabled several times because of politics, the customers do not get hit again in 10 years with a 35% increase. She added that predictable, low, and public is better for the community.

Mr. Rutherford said he understands and agrees with Mr. Parr about why this came into existence, noting other systems in a similar situation that eventually did get absorbed—with Shipman being an example of expansion due to water issues. He said Schuyler and Lovington also got hit with some increases, but he could not recall those percentages. He said he agreed with Dr. Ligon at the 5% or 10%, or somewhere in between those two numbers, and would like to give people time such as a January 1st date for everything to become effective then. He added that it needs to be in their budget cycle and recognized like anything else they do related to taxes, so they could consider this when doing a public hearing with taxes.

Mr. Parr suggested a multi-year percentage chart effective with the fiscal year—beginning July 1, 2026—with 7% to start. He said that would give everybody time to prepare. He commented that he would rather be at 5%, but did not want to be at 10%.

Dr. Ligon asked Mr. Parr if he was suggesting 7% yearly, or possibly 7% initially with a lesser percentage for the future increases.

Mr. Rutherford asked if this rate had to be decided each year with an individual public hearing, or if they could do a five-year.

Ms. McGarry responded that they can do it for the number of years they advertise. She said they did January 2026, then July 2026, 2027, and 2028. She noted that she thought they could just do July 2026, 2027 and 2028.

Mr. Rutherford said he supports 7% flat and wondered if that would be compounded the following year.

Ms. McGarry confirmed that it would be compounded.

Mr. Rutherford asked if they could change this halfway through if needed.

Ms. McGarry responded that they could with another public hearing.

Mr. Parr said he agreed with the 7% flat approach and the proposed increments.

Ms. McGarry stated that the connection fees and these fees were the primary points of discussion, but there are other fees such as yard hydrant fees, returned check fees, inspections fees proposed in the ordinance.

The Board agreed to address those fees now and have everything effective July 1, 2026. Ms. McGarry noted that staff would make all of the updates to the ordinance and bring it back in December for adoption.

Mr. Parr mentioned that a “yard hydrant fee” has nothing to do with the red fire hydrant that is in your yard—it is the little spigot that sticks up in your yard that you hook your water hose to.

Ms. McGarry noted that the County does pay for the fire hydrant protection.

Mr. Reed clarified that staff would bring another ordinance to the Board in December, and they did not need to conduct another public hearing as long as the amounts were below what they had presented previously.

VI. REPORTS, APPOINTMENTS, DIRECTIVES AND CORRESPONDENCE

A. Reports

1. County Administrator’s Report

Ms. McGarry provided the following report:

- A. Board Elections** – Ms. McGarry congratulated Mr. Reed and Mr. Rutherford on re-election to the Board and to Mr. Cameron Lenahan, elected to represent the North District. Staff will be coordinating orientation days in December for Mr. Lenahan and County department heads and constitutional officers, with additional Board training opportunities to follow.
- B. DSS Building Project** – The site has been cleared, the parking area has been demolished, and site work has begun.
- C. Department of Social Services Agency Corrective Action Plan** – Agency CPS Referral Data for October is provided, with an existing discrepancy between the total validated referrals (11) and the total of referrals separated by category (12), which State VDSS IT will be looking into:

Total Referrals Received = 16	Results of Referrals Validated:
Validated = 11 (data discrepancy noted)	Investigations = 1
Screened out = 5	Family Assessments = 11
Percentage Validated = 69%	Percentage Investigations = 10%
Percentage Screened Out = 31%	Percentage Family Assessments = 90%

As of the November 6, 2025 CAP review, the agency has made significant progress across all program areas and will be transitioning over the next three months from a corrective action plan to a supportive services plan, which will provide continuity of support for staff and the new director to preserve the department’s positive momentum. She congratulated DSS leadership and staff on their achievements.

Ms. McGarry stated that she has provided a detailed report for October from the department; hereafter, this will be provided to the Board with the other monthly departmental reports. She noted that the supportive services plan would start in January and last about three months. She said applications for the Local DSS Advisory Board are still being taken, pending the Board’s advisement.

D. Christmas Lights – Ms. McGarry reported the following:

- **Nellysford (CVEC):** CVEC has said that they will be completing the necessary updates to the outlets on the light poles over the next few weeks. They will pick up the lights from the County once they are ready to be installed and will install the lights for the County in Nellysford. She recognized CVEC for their assistance with this project.
- **Lovington and Shipman (AEP):** Staff has spent two months communicating with AEP, collecting pole numbers and working with Chamber of Commerce volunteer Paul Carter, who confirmed light pole numbers and locations in Lovington and Shipman. AEP has told the County that they are responsible up to the metering point, and any electrical wiring and connections beyond the meter were the customer’s responsibility—with a certified electrician needed to assess and address any customer owned wiring, receptacles, and conduit on the poles. She has asked AEP representatives to revisit this issue. Jeff Brantley has obtained a quote from a local electrical contractor for \$2,732 per pole to perform the work that would be required, and there are 25 poles—making that total around \$65,000. Due to the anticipated cost, a written informal solicitation of a minimum of four bidders or offerors would be required by the County’s purchasing policy. She said while they are working towards a successful solution, staff is not sure if there will be lights in Lovington and Shipman this coming holiday season.

Ms. McGarry noted that an alternative discussed with Mr. Brantley earlier in the day was to have County staff install the lights on poles where the receptacles and wiring look safe for use. She noted that they did not know which poles, or how many, were in need of repairs. Mr. Rutherford asked what Paul Carter had determined. Ms. Spivey said that in her conversations with Mr. Carter and what the Chamber of Commerce had indicated in their letter, it was apparent that work needed to be done for them to be safely used.

Dr. Ligon asked if they could put a mini-solar panel and battery pack. Ms. Spivey responded that staff had that same thought.

Ms. McGarry said there was also about \$500 worth of light bulbs to replace, which is minimal in comparison to the pole rewiring efforts but still a cost.

Mr. Rutherford asked if CVEC was able to assist at all with the AEP situation from a manpower and/or logistics standpoint, as CVEC people have assisted in previous years.

Ms. McGarry emphasized that they were trying to work this out, and they were also checking on whether the Lovingson sidewalk project involved relocating the utility poles—not taking them out and going underground, as they did not want to spend a lot of money on these poles if they are going away.

Mr. Reed stated that he felt Dr. Ligon’s suggestion was a good one, and they could set a target for how many poles to address. Mr. Rutherford said it would be great if the AEP and CVEC could help figure this out, and he offered to help. Dr. Ligon commented that it may be a no-go to have a lithium ion battery next to electricity.

Ms. McGarry reiterated that Ms. Spivey and Mr. Brantley were working hard to resolve the issue.

E. Virginia Tourism Corporation (VTC) – Tourism Region – The VTC has established the Central Virginia Tourism Region, which includes Nelson, Madison, Greene, Albemarle, Louisa, Fluvanna, Amherst, Campbell, Appomattox, Prince Edward, Nottoway, Buckingham, Cumberland, Goochland, Hanover, Powhatan, Amelia, Dinwiddie, Chesterfield, Henrico, Prince George, and Sussex. Nelson and its other GO Virginia Region 9 Counterparts of Albemarle, Greene, Orange, Louisa, Fluvanna, Culpeper, Rappahannock, and Fauquier are interested in applying to the VTC for the creation of a distinct tourism region under the VTC structure that would allow more targeted investment, improved data collection, and a unified brand message aligned with the economic and cultural identity of GO Virginia Region 9. The VTC application process requires passage of a resolution to this effect by the governing bodies of the applying entities; the Board will be more fully briefed and asked to consider such a resolution at an upcoming regular meeting.

F. FY 26 General Fund Financials through October - 33% into the year, 67% remaining – Aside from property taxes and license fees that are billed at certain times of the year, local revenues are tracking as expected. The second half of 2025 property tax bills have been sent out and are due December 5. Staff continues to monitor the County’s primary economy driven revenues such as local sales tax, recordation taxes, meals and lodging taxes, and interest on investments. Expenditures are also tracking as expected; transfers to other funds from the General Fund are made in the first quarter of the fiscal year and departmental budgets do not yet reflect the approved FY26 salary increases, which will be transferred into those budgets in the coming months.

G. 2026 Reassessment – 2026 Reassessment notices are expected to go out to citizens by the end of November and will contain information on how to schedule a meeting with assessors regarding property valuations. Following the assessors’ hearing, citizen hearings can be scheduled with the Board of Equalization – a citizen review board to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Those hearings will be conducted in February/March, with information provided via public notice.

H. VACo Conference – Supervisors Reed, Rutherford, and Parr were in attendance. Ms. McGarry stated that she attended sessions on:

- Economic Development Benefits of Future Energy Solutions – Future energy solutions including small nuclear modular reactors (SMRs) and nuclear fusion, the latter touted as the long-term energy solution, and the tax benefits associated with hosting these, along with their colocation with data centers and the need for the state and country to win the AI war with China.
- Building the Workforce in Virginia – CTE and building regional and state partnerships along with working with higher education and private employers was discussed, as well as the impact of AI on the workforce; it was stated that AI may not replace you in the workplace, but someone who knows how to use AI will.
- How Virginia Counties Are Working with AI – Google data centers coming to Chesterfield and Botetourt counties were discussed as well as examples of how Fairfax County has employed some AI strategies to reduce administrative burdens, primarily in the area of law enforcement and emergency call centers. Human supervision and a “Trust but Verify” theme were noted as key in using AI-based platforms, as was having an AI policy in place.

I. Meals and Lodging Tax Collection & Lodging Entity Tracking – The number of lodging units went from 820 to 821. Rental Scape is the selected STR monitoring and tracking software platform, and staff is in the procurement process.

2. Board Reports

Mr. Rutherford:

Mr. Rutherford thanked constituents for reelecting him as East District Supervisor, and he offered to be available via phone and email; he also congratulated Mr. Reed.

Mr. Rutherford reported that at the recent TJPDC meeting, they talked about a lot of the legislative landscape. He stated that at the VACo conference, they had some interesting discussions with other localities related to data centers. He said that AI leads every topic right now, including what that means to the workforce and the economics of the state. He said that he and Mr. Reed attended the Virginia State Budget Outlook, and it was interesting to see what the state is encountering, particularly with Medicaid and Medicare and whether they are going to absorb some of that. He also noted that Virginia's economy is still going in a solid direction for the Commonwealth overall. He said there was also a lot of discussion about the potential for by-right solar, given the new composition of the legislature, as well as discussion about local authority regarding housing.

Dr. Ligon:

Dr. Ligon reported that the Board had held a joint meeting with the Planning Commission, and all comments were presented to the Berkeley Group, with the next joint meeting on December 17. She added that there were a few SUPs to be heard tonight.

Mr. Parr:

Mr. Parr stated that the Emergency Services Council meeting was canceled this month.

Mr. Parr reported that at the VACo conference, he attended a session on childcare and early childhood education which emphasized framing childcare as economic development and a workforce strategy. He said the session highlighted childcare's role in enabling household members, particularly women, to work when quality childcare is accessible—but lack of affordable childcare remains a significant barrier. He said local action was discussed, including non-monetary measures such as adjusting zoning laws and repurposing buildings. He said one moderator from Loudoun County advocated for increased spending and building more housing or adding childcare centers to new developments, but these solutions were not realistic for Nelson County. Mr. Parr reported that the session also suggested partnering with the Chamber of Commerce and establishing private-public partnerships. He noted that the session stressed childcare's importance.

Mr. Parr stated that over the past 12 months, there has been a 30% reduction in the childcare and early childhood education workforce, with many workers and teachers leaving the profession. He said that while increasing pay rates was mentioned, many participants emphasized that job stress, behavioral issues among children, and the lack of discipline and parental involvement were primary causes for attrition—rather than compensation alone. He stated that from a public school perspective, regulatory pressures force localities to prioritize non-educational metrics such as seat counts over classroom discipline and effective learning, which negatively impacts educators' mental health. Mr. Parr reported attending another session with Mr. Rutherford on conflict resolution and managing public comments at Board meetings, noting the importance of consistently enforcing rules for public comment such as adhering to the three-minute time limit, and that free speech protections apply regardless of content.

Dr. Ligon asked what number they used in terms of “affordable” childcare.

Mr. Parr responded that they used a percentage of household income, which he viewed as a high percentage, but the federal guidelines are higher than the state, which uses a lower number to qualify for assistance. He noted that he would have to look back to see what the percentage was, but reiterated that it was high.

Mr. Reed:

Mr. Reed said he attended the VACO budget presentation, as previously mentioned by Mr. Rutherford. He stated he also participated in a presentation on artificial intelligence led by a Dominion Energy representative and Loudoun County Board of Supervisors Vice Chair Mike Turner. Mr. Reed reported that Mr. Turner has become a leading authority on data centers, having studied the issue extensively over the past four years, and he recommended the Loudoun County website for Mr. Turner's white paper. He said the presentation mirrored one delivered to the Energy, Environment, and Land Use Committee, which he also attended. Mr. Reed stated he attended meetings of the Education Committee and the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee.

Mr. Reed reported that across all committees, there was consensus that the numerous budget-related bills vetoed by the Governor are likely to become short-term legislative priorities and may pass quickly in the new year. Mr.

Reed suggested reviewing which bills were vetoed last year to anticipate what may advance early next year. He said he attended a Regional Food System Resilience Committee meeting organized by Virginia Tech and the Cooperative Extension Service. Mr. Reed stated he will serve on the Virginia Cooperative Extension Leadership Council. He commented that he found the session informative, as it focused on establishing regional food system priorities.

Mr. Reed reported that campaigning and engaging with constituents occupied most of his time during the past month. He said that speaking with residents while canvassing provided valuable insights. Additionally, he said that he, Mr. Rutherford, and Mr. Parr attended the grand opening of the Bank of the James in Nellysford. He reported that the new branch is staffed by local employees and appears poised to benefit the community economically. Mr. Reed expressed appreciation to the bank for investing in the area.

B. Appointments

Ms. Spivey reviewed the following appointments:

(1) New Vacancies/Expiring Seats & New Applicants :					
Board/Commission	Term Expiring	Term & Limit Y/N	Incumbent	Re-appointment	Applicant(s)
N.C. Library Committee - South District	6/30/2025	4 year term/No limits	Jean B. Holliday	N	Deborah Turel
N.C. Social Services Advisory Board - new Board		Staggered Terms/2 term limit			Sue Woodson - Central Laura Wert - East Katherine Baron-Stump - South Mary Cunningham - North Emma Wardlaw - West Jennifer Blodgett - Out of County
Board of Equalization	12/30/2026	1 Year Term/No Term limit			R. Carlton Ballowe James Clinton Bibb Thomas Nelson Jr.
(2) Existing Vacancies:					
Board/Commission	Term Expiration	Term & Limit Y/N	Incumbent	Re-appointment	Applicant(s)
Board of Zoning Appeals - alternate	3/30/2025	5 year term/No limits	Mary Cunningham	N	Advertising
Thomas Jefferson Area Community Criminal Justice Board	6/30/2026	3 years/2 term limit	Mark Stapleton	N - resigned	Advertising
Ag & Forestal District Advisory Committee - landowner	5/13/2027	4 year term/3 term limit	Mary Cunningham	N - resigned	Advertising

Ms. Spivey indicated that they had received an application from Kate Rutherford for the Social Services Advisory Board. She also reported that they had not received any new applications for the Board of Equalization, and she also suggested that it may be good to have a couple more people appointed to that Board. She noted that they should ideally have the Board of Equalization appointment by the next month. She confirmed that all three applicants had previously served on that Board.

Mr. Rutherford said he would suggest for the DSS Board that they have a chance to speak to these individuals in a one-on-one setup because the Board knows what has happened and what needs to be done in the future in terms of expectations.

Dr. Ligon said they had learned a lot over the last few months about social services boards and just how the state had it set up—and you are only as good as what is reported to you. She said her hope was that they could meet these individuals to share the County’s vision for this but also assess their ability to critically think and actually really care about what is going on, so they can see what qualities the applicants possess, beyond what is written on paper.

Mr. Rutherford said his vision of what that would look like is a subcommittee structure, then at least by January as applications reveal themselves, that subcommittee could report to the Board. Dr. Ligon agreed.

Mr. Reed said a subcommittee only makes sense to him if it has full representation from the Board because they should all be part of that process. He said he was comfortable with the applications they have, and he did not see any that raised any red flags, nor did he see the need for interviews by a committee. He asked Ms. McGarry what her thoughts were on the timeline to appoint a board. Ms. McGarry commented that she thought the State’s expectation was for this to be done as soon as possible. She noted that interviews would be held the following week for the DSS director position and commented that she did not know if the Board of Supervisors wanted the director’s input on the appointments. Mr. Reed emphasized that diversity on the panel is important, and they are not looking for a one-size-fits all board.

Mr. Parr agreed that they may not need to have official interviews of candidates but did think they as Board members should do their due diligence and have conversations with the candidates. He emphasized that they owe it to the community and the rest of the DSS employees to make sure they vet all the individuals. He said

there has also been some thought in the community that they were not ready to make this step quite yet because of the CIP, and he has had conversations with individuals who intended to apply and were just waiting for that process to end. He said now that it has officially ended and they are moving into the next phase, they would see some additional applications.

Nelson County Library Advisory Committee

Dr. Ligon moved to **appoint Deborah Turel** as the South District representative on the Nelson County Library Committee and Mr. Parr seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by roll call vote (4–0).

The Board agreed to discuss the other appointments as more applications were received.

The Board agreed to continue the Board of Equalization and Social Services Advisory Board appointments to the December meeting, and the Supervisors agreed to talk with the candidates from their respective districts before the next meeting.

C. Correspondence

Ms. McGarry reported that Commonwealth Attorney Rutherford requested a new ADA-accessible door for the Commonwealth Attorney's office to the outside that has a ramp at the entrance, buttons that would allow the door to open automatically, remote buttons to permit the door to be unlocked by people in the office, and a two-way communications system to facilitate admitting visitors to the office after they have been identified. She said the total for both of those items was about \$22,000 from a year ago, adding that the security issues are a serious concern.

Mr. Parr stated that the door is easily accessible to the public without going through security, and the ADA button is needed. He said he originally thought they were doing something that would no longer be necessary once the Commonwealth Attorney's office was relocated, but what they are contemplating will be appropriate for the next occupant of that space—so it is not like they are investing money in something that is going to be obsolete. He recommended moving forward with the modifications as requested.

The Board agreed and gave Ms. McGarry direction to proceed.

D. Directives

Mr. Rutherford asked that staff correspond with Tommy Harvey's family in preparing a resolution to honor his 41 years of service to the community. He also suggested that they try to get all Board members who have served during his tenure to attend.

Ms. McGarry agreed to work on the recognition, confirming with the Board that this was slated for December.

Mr. Rutherford reported that he had done some research at the VACo conference about the Board of Supervisors certification, and the modules looked really helpful. He said he had spoken with some of the County officials in Brunswick, and a lot of them had found it to be beneficial. He said he was hoping to do it this year and suggested that the new Supervisor also participate..

Mr. Reed said he had done one supervisor training at the VACo office about two years ago, and the person organizing this for VACo would let them know as soon as the dates were released.

Mr. Rutherford stated that the course is offered by VACo, and is 70% virtual, 30% in-person, with each section broken into modules. He said the first set is budgeting and finance, the next block is planning and zoning, the third block is leadership, conflict resolution, etc.

The Board took a brief recess.

VII. CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO §2.2-3711 (A)

Mr. Rutherford moved that that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors convene in closed session to discuss the following as permitted by Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711 (A)(7) – Consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members pertaining to actual litigation, where such consultation or briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the public body – Litigation pertaining to the Region 2000 Services Authority; and 2.2-3711 (A)(8) – Consultation with legal counsel

employed or retained by a public body regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel. Nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to permit the closure of a meeting merely because an attorney representing the public body is in attendance or is consulted on a matter.

Mr. Parr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote.

Supervisors conducted the closed session and upon its conclusion, Mr. Rutherford moved to reconvene in public session. Mr. Parr seconded the motion, and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

Upon reconvening in public session, Mr. Rutherford moved that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors certify that, in the closed session just concluded, nothing was discussed except the matter or matters specifically identified in the motion to convene in closed session and lawfully permitted to be discussed under the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act cited in that motion. Mr. Parr seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS (AS PRESENTED)

The Board had no other business to discuss.

IX. ADJOURN & CONTINUE – EVENING SESSION AT 7PM

At 4:39 p.m., Mr. Rutherford moved to adjourn and reconvene at 7:00 p.m. and Mr. Parr seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the meeting adjourned.

EVENING SESSION 7:00 P.M. – NELSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Reed called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with four (4) Supervisors present to establish a quorum. Mr. Harvey was absent.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Battery Energy Storage System Siting Agreements – Colleen and Piney River (R2025-79). Consideration of two (2) siting agreements, one with Piney River VA BESS 1, LLC and one with Colleen VA BESS 1, LLC, for two (2) 4MW battery energy storage systems to be constructed at CVEC substations in Colleen and Piney River. The site plans were approved administratively as by right accessory uses to a public utility, so no special use permit approval is required. These battery energy storage systems will benefit local CVEC customers by keeping rates down during peak usage periods.

Ms. McGarry stated that Gabby Mayer from LightShift Energy would provide a brief presentation.

Ms. Gabby Mayer explained that she was present with Light Shift Energy to discuss the siting agreements for the battery energy storage project, which LightShift Energy is undertaking in partnership with CVEC. She stated that the siting agreement is authorized by the Virginia State Code, requiring the locality and applicant to enter negotiations and sign such an agreement. Ms. Mayer clarified that the agreement is voluntary and is intended to enable the applicant to provide additional funds to the locality, fostering partnership and helping to mitigate potential project impacts.

She noted that once signed, the locality considers the project substantially in accord with the comprehensive plan. Ms. Mayer summarized that each signing agreement includes specific attributes, and both the Colleen and Piney River projects will each have \$8,000 allocated and a \$10,000 charitable donation made to a county-selected organization at the ribbon cutting.

Ms. Mayer added that the signing agreement also covers emergency response training. She emphasized that, in addition to this training, LightShift collaborates with the fire department and emergency response team before developing an emergency response plan. She mentioned working with John Atkins and that he reviewed the

plan in April and is familiar with the project. Ms. Mayer highlighted that this topic had arisen in discussions last month. She concluded by requesting approval from the Board to authorize the County Administrator to sign the agreement and invited questions from the Board and the public.

Mr. Reed asked if the partnership and administrative actions are per site or for both. He clarified that his question was whether it was one single payment, or two payments.

Ms. Mayer responded that it was a single one-time payment per project. Mr. Reed noted that it meant there would be two (2) \$10,000 payments. Ms. Mayer confirmed that was correct.

Ms. McGarry said she had followed up with Craig County and Danville to get their siting agreements, and they are comparable to the ones Nelson has today. She commented that she did not believe those sites were in operation just yet, so those localities could not speak to how well LightShift had held up the terms of the siting agreement on their end.

Mr. Reed opened the public hearing. There being no speakers, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Parr stated that he supports the resolution and wants to ensure the Board has input regarding the charitable donations. It was confirmed that the Board would decide where the donations would go.

Mr. Parr moved to adopt **Resolution R2025-79 – Approval of Battery Energy Storage Siting Agreements** in Colleen and Piney River as presented. Dr. Ligon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the Board unanimously adopted the resolution (4-0) by roll call vote, and the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION R2025-79
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APPROVAL OF BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM
SITING AGREEMENTS IN COLLEEN AND PINEY RIVER

WHEREAS, pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of 15.2-2204 and 15.2-2316.8 of the code of Virginia, 1950 as amended, the Nelson County Board of Supervisors conducted a public hearing on November 13, 2025 to receive public input on two siting agreements, one with Piney River VA BESS 1, LLC, and one with Colleen VA BESS 1, LLC, for two (2) 4MW battery energy storage systems to be constructed at Central Virginia Electric Cooperative “CVEC” substations in Colleen and Piney River; and

WHEREAS, the site plans were approved administratively as by right accessory uses to a public utility, so no special use permit approval is required; and

WHEREAS, these battery energy storage systems will benefit local CVEC customers by keeping rates down during peak usage periods;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors hereby approves the siting agreements with Piney River VA BESS 1, LLC and Colleen VA BESS 1, LLC for the two (2) 4MW battery energy storage systems to be constructed at CVEC substations in Colleen and Piney River, and the County Administrator and County Attorney are hereby authorized to execute all documents related to both siting agreements.

B. Special Use Permit #250278 – Request for Extension of SUP #240239 (Dwelling Units in B-1 Business District).

Consideration of a Special Use Permit application requesting County approval of an extension of an existing approved SUP for dwelling units in the B-1 Business District, located within an existing structure at 622 Front Street in Lovington. The existing SUP was approved by the Board of Supervisors on November 14, 2024. The subject property is further identified as Tax Map Parcel #58B-3-2 and is owned by Alexandra and Jesse Lopez-Low.

Ms. Bishop stated that the request concerns an extension of an already approved special use permit for dwellings on property zoned B-1 business, specifically at 622 Front Street. She said the property is owned by Jesse and Allie Lopez-Low, who recently completed renovations to enable mixed use, consisting of two long-term residential rental units and commercial space on the lower level.

Ms. Bishop stated that the property previously held a special use permit for a dwelling, which expired after over two years of vacancy. She said the Board approved a new special use permit on November 14, 2024, with the condition that short-term rentals are not permitted. She stated the owners are now requesting a one-year

extension of the permit as the units remain unoccupied. Ms. Bishop said the building is currently for sale and that the owners wish to secure residents before the permit expires tomorrow. She stated that the property is mixed use in nature, which is reflected in its B-1 and R-2 zoning in the vicinity.

Ms. Bishop said there are no floodplains or streams present on the property and that it is exempt from minimum off-street parking requirements. She said the property is located in Lovington and designated as a Community Hub by the 2042 Future Land Use Map. Ms. Bishop said the core concepts emphasize regional scale development, redevelopment, and infill in Lovington to protect the rural landscape, enhance community services, stimulate economic growth, and improve quality of life. She said the principal land uses include various housing types, mixed use units, commercial, professional, and office spaces.

Ms. Bishop stated that relevant guidelines emphasize preserving existing structures while permitting mixed uses, supporting diverse housing development, and promoting infill and retrofitting of existing buildings. She said the Planning Commission recommended approval of Special Use Permit 250278, a one-year extension of the previous SUP 240239, for dwelling units in B-1 business, with the existing condition, to the Board of Supervisors. She stated that recent work sessions highlighted support for mixed-use development, infill, and adaptive reuse of structures in the ordinance updates, making it likely that this use will become conforming.

Mr. Reed opened the public hearing. There being no speakers, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Rutherford said the owners had spent a lot of money and time getting this fixed up, and he thought it was appropriate to grant the extension.

Ms. Bishop clarified that the only condition for this SUP was that the applicants not use the building for short-term rentals.

Mr. Rutherford moved to approve **Special Use Permit #250278 – Request for Extension of SUP #240239** as presented. Dr. Ligon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the Board unanimously approved the motion (4-0) by roll call vote.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS (AS PRESENTED)

Ms. McGarry asked if the Piney River rate consideration for December should be on the afternoon agenda, or the evening agenda. The Board agreed to have it on the afternoon agenda.

V. ADJOURN

At 7:13 p.m., Dr. Ligon moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Rutherford seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by roll call vote (4–0) and the meeting adjourned.