

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on June 20, 2007, at 1:00 p.m., in the Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from June 13, 2007.

PRESENT: Mr. Ken C. Boyd, Mr. Lindsay G. Dorrier, Jr., Mr. Dennis S. Rooker, Mr. David Slutzky, Ms. Sally H. Thomas, and Mr. David C. Wyant.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Robert W. Tucker, Jr., County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Director of Community Development, Mark Graham, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Meagan Hoy.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 1:06 p.m., by the Chairman, Mr. Boyd.

Agenda Item No. 2. Closed Session.

At 1:06 p.m., **motion** was offered by Mr. Slutzky that the Board go into closed session pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, under Subsection (1) to discuss an administrative evaluation and under Subsection (7) to consult with legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice relating to two inter-jurisdictional agreements. Mr. Rooker **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Slutzky, and Ms. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 3. Certify Closed Session.

At 2:24 p.m., the Board reconvened into open session, with **motion** by Mr. Slutzky that the Board certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each Board member's knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed session were heard, discussed or considered in the closed session. Mr. Wyant **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Slutzky, and Ms. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No 4. Consent Agenda.

Ms. Thomas **moved** for approval of the items on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Wyant **seconded** the motion, which passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Slutzky, and Ms. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

Item 4.1. FY 2008 Strategic Initiative Adjustment for New Positions in the Department of Social Services.

The Executive Summary states that the Department of Social Services requested eight Strategic Initiatives for consideration during the FY 2008 Budget process. While the request for these additional positions was ranked very high by OMB and the Leadership Council, not all of them could be funded. At the request of the County Executive's Office, the Department re-prioritized the requests over a two year budget cycle (FY 2008 and FY 2009) based on known retirements, the timing of hiring processes and anticipated vacancies. The top priorities for FY 2008 included a child welfare supervisor which was one of two positions funded by the Board in its adopted budget. The request for a child welfare social worker was delayed for reconsideration in the FY 2009 budget cycle.

After evaluating additional information regarding FY 2009 budget projections and changing workload and priorities within the department, the Department of Social Services believes its needs can be better served at this time by hiring a child welfare social worker rather than a child welfare supervisor. Therefore, the Department is requesting that it be allowed to hire a child welfare social worker instead of hiring a child welfare supervisor in FY 2008.

The amount of funding needed for the child welfare social worker position in FY 2008 is approximately \$17,000 less than that needed for the approved child welfare supervisor position. The local dollar reduction would be approximately \$14,314.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the request of the Department of Social Services to hire a child welfare social worker instead of a child welfare supervisor in FY 2008.

By the above recorded vote, the Board approved the request of the Department of Social Services to hire a child welfare social worker instead of a child welfare supervisor in FY 2008.

Agenda Item No. 5. Discussion: Culpeper County, Request to join the Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Center.

Mr. Tucker reported that the request before the Board is a resolution to amend and readopt the service agreement for the Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Commission to include the County of Culpeper as a member jurisdiction. This will also require the approval of the City of Charlottesville, and the Counties of Fluvanna and Greene. He stated that this agreement requires a buy-in from Culpeper in the amount of \$534,702 to be paid over two years or in a lump sum. This payment will provide some savings to other partners. Mr. Tucker said that he is recommending approval.

Mr. Rooker **moved** to adopt the proposed Resolution to Amend Service Agreement – Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Commission. Mr. Wyant **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Slutzky, and Ms. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

(The adopted resolution is set out below:)

**A RESOLUTION
TO AMEND AND READOPT THE SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR
THE BLUE RIDGE JUVENILE DETENTION COMMISSION
TO ACCEPT AND INCLUDE THE COUNTY OF CULPEPER AS
A MEMBER JURISDICTION**

WHEREAS, the Counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna and Greene and the City of Charlottesville (the Original Member Jurisdictions have previously created the Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Commission (“BRJDC” or the “Commission) and adopted an agreement dated July 1, 1999 (the “Service Agreement”) that established their respective rights and obligations regarding the juvenile detention center financed, constructed and operated by BRJDC; and

WHEREAS, the County of Culpeper wishes to become a Member Jurisdiction of BRJDC, by agreeing to make certain initial payments, and by adopting the Service Agreement and agreeing to be bound by its terms and conditions; and

WHEREAS, the Original Member Jurisdictions wish to amend the Service Agreement to accept and include the County of Culpeper as a Member Jurisdiction of BRJDC, to indicate the terms and conditions under which that will occur, and to make other changes made necessary by Culpeper’s membership; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has recommended approval of Culpeper’s membership by the Original Member Jurisdictions and concurs with the amendments to the Service Agreement; now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Commission, the Boards of Supervisors of Albemarle, Fluvanna and Greene Counties and the Council of the City of Charlottesville that:

I. The Service Agreement is amended by adding the following section:

Section 2.4 Addition of Culpeper as Member. The County of Culpeper shall become a participating Member Jurisdiction, effective July 1, 2007, or the earliest date thereafter that the Commission, the governing bodies of the Original Member Jurisdictions and the Board of Supervisors of Culpeper County all have approved the Service Agreement, as amended to include Culpeper County. Culpeper’s continued membership shall be contingent upon the occurrence of all of the following:

- (a) Approval by the holder of BRJDC’s outstanding bonds of the change in Commission membership, as required by the applicable bond documents, which approval the Commission agrees diligently to pursue.
- (b) Payment by Culpeper County to BRJDC of a one-time, non-refundable “buy-in” amount of Five Hundred Thirty-Four Thousand Seven Hundred Two Dollars (\$534,702.00). Four Hundred Twenty Six Thousand Six Hundred Ninety Six Dollars (\$426,696.00) of such amount shall be paid not later than thirty days after approval of the amended Service Agreement by the Commission and all of the Member Jurisdictions. The remaining One Hundred Eight Thousand Six Dollars (\$108,006.00) shall be paid not later than two years after such approval date, with interest at five percent (5%) per annum calculated on the unpaid balance to the date of payment. The Commission shall establish a separate fund for future expansion and renovation of the detention facility and shall deposit such payments from Culpeper in that fund, to be held and invested along with any additional amounts the Commission may identify for such purposes.

- (c) Reimbursement by Culpeper County of expenses for professional services incurred by BRJDC in connection with the addition of Culpeper as a Member Jurisdiction, not to exceed Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000.00).
- II. The following Sections of the Service Agreement are amended and readopted as shown.

Section 3.10 Majority Required for Commission Decisions. All actions of the Commission may be taken by a majority of all members' votes, however, that the members representing Albemarle and Charlottesville, or their alternates voting in the absence of their principal members, shall each have an additional vote. If there is a tie after the casting of such additional votes, the subject motion or proposal shall fail.

Section 9.2 Notices. Any notice or other communication under or in connection with this Agreement shall be in writing, and shall be effective when delivered in person or sent in the United States mail, postage prepaid, to the following persons or addresses or to such other persons and addresses as any of such persons may from time to time specify in writing.

If to Culpeper County:
County Administrator
County of Culpeper
302 N. Main Street
Culpeper, VA 22701

- III. All other provisions of the Service Agreement shall remain in force without change. After approval of the foregoing amendments, the Commission and each of the Member Jurisdictions authorizes its chief administrative official to execute a new copy of the Service Agreement incorporating the amendments.

And be it Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Culpeper County that:

1. The Board approves and agrees to be bound by the Service Agreement, including the foregoing amendments, and authorizes its County Administrator to execute it on behalf of the County.
2. The Board agrees to appropriate sufficient funds to make the "buy-in" payment and expense reimbursement set forth in Section 2.4 of the amended Service Agreement.
3. In accordance with the appointments made by the other Member Jurisdictions, the Board appoints Frank T. Bossio, County Administrator, as its member of the Commission, and _____, as alternate member, for terms concurrent with their employment by the County.

Agenda Item No. 6. **Work Session:** Proffer Policy.

Mr. Graham reported that the work session today is to seek the Board's input on the cash proffer policy and make any recommendations. He noted that the Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee provided a recommendation to the Board on this in February that would cover five areas: transportation, schools, libraries, parks, and public safety. Mr. Graham said that this would cover the capital costs in the CIP budget, the Strategic Plan, and the Master Plan, but it does not address operational expenses. He noted that it does include a proffer calculation methodology and starting proffer values, which the Board accepted; staff directed staff to work on a cash proffer policy.

Mr. Graham said that the Board had one change: using six percent of the property tax applied to capital improvements rather than the originally recommended ten percent. He noted that they also gave some direction to have it apply to all market-rate units but exclude affordable housing units and would also give credit for lands and infrastructure offered in lieu of cash. Mr. Graham stated that it would also give credit for contributions that would reduce infrastructure needs; donated land would be credited at County-assessed values with improvements credited at the County's cost to construct. He noted that there would be an inflation factor for monies paid at a later date using the Marshall-Swift index.

Mr. Graham said that the impacts are being grouped in two categories: those that the proffer policy is attempting to address and other impacts such as local road improvements and environmental. He noted that staff considers the cash proffer policy as something to weigh along with all the other issues. Mr. Graham said that there were remaining policy questions from May including appropriate credits, recognition of special considerations, and a credit calculation methodology. He mentioned that staff recommends for appropriate credits that staff should seek to satisfy the cash proffer policy independent of other rezoning considerations and not by balancing other benefits against it.

Mr. Graham noted that rezoning benefits that do not address those elements in the CIP, Strategic Plan, or Master Plan should not be considered when balancing the cash proffer policy but would be considered as part of the overall rezoning. He presented an example of Rivanna Village with a park being proposed and whether or not that park was already recommended.

Mr. Boyd asked about the case of a school site proffered, such as that with Biscuit Run, if an alternate site was offered in a location within close proximity.

Mr. Graham replied that staff would verify that the school site proffered satisfied the need for a southern elementary school as identified in the CIP, and at that point it would count as a credit in the evaluation of a rezoning.

Mr. Graham explained that the special conditions include instances such as no density increase or a small density increase, such as Belvedere. He said that staff concluded that they would apply the policy to those units above what could be done by-right, and if the rezoning is already approved for 700 units those should not be considered if an amended rezoning was being considered.

Mr. Rooker asked if this would apply to rural area property being rezoned to the Neighborhood Model, giving the example of Biscuit Run if they were to come forward with a plan for a development that was the same or close to what could be developed by-right. He emphasized the importance of clarifying what the percentage increase over by-right should be in order to give them credit.

Mr. Slutzky expressed concern that the Board might encourage a developer to develop by-right.

Ms. Thomas added that it might make them put a minimum number of units on a parcel.

Mr. Davis commented that if a rezoning is just to deal with form rather than density then the cash proffer would not necessarily apply. He said that it is going to be a judgment call really, on a case by case basis, probably, as to whether or not the rezoning is about form or if the rezoning is about density.

Mr. Graham agreed, adding that staff recognizes that with some of the properties that come in for rezoning there is a difference between theoretical rezoning and what they can really put on a piece of property.

Mr. Slutzky asked which of the two would be accepted.

Mr. Graham replied that staff will have to get into what is realistic for a specific piece of property, and their focus is on those parcels that have an actual change in zoning.

Mr. Rooker commented that with Biscuit Run, the developers have essentially taken credit for all possible bonuses.

Mr. Graham said that staff is aware of that as well, noting that building some units might require exceptions such as critical slopes waivers.

Mr. Slutzky stated that it is important to figure it out regardless of how complex it is so that applicants have some understanding of the basis for evaluation.

Mr. Davis noted that Chesterfield applies the policy to all lots in a rezoning as that is the cleanest way to do it. He added that Albemarle staff has more concern about the form of development.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that the rezoning needs to be evaluated on changes in density, and the policy would apply to every unit.

Mr. Graham stated that all market rate units would be part of the consideration.

Ms. Thomas suggested using terms such as "negligible increase in density" and "significant increase in design" are what the Board seems to be seeking.

Mr. Boyd said that he was under the impression that the Board was going to further discuss this item today, adding that he would likely support an "across the board" form of development credit in the instance of Neighborhood Model developments.

Mr. Rooker responded that that form is required by the Subdivision Ordinance anyway, and he is concerned about giving cash credits for things that are of subjective value. He said that he agrees with the concept of impact fees, but the State has not given the County that authority. Mr. Rooker emphasized that the point of this exercise is to offset impacts to infrastructure.

Mr. Slutzky commented that while there are costs to the developer for Neighborhood Model developments, there are also great advantages for them such as a more marketable product. He said that he did not know if the Board should be giving credits for compliance with the ordinance. Mr. Slutzky expressed concern of giving adequate credit, though, to alleviate the possibility of further building in the rural areas.

Mr. Rooker cited the Avinity development as an example, stating that the County effectively allowed an increase in density of 13 times the existing. He noted the value created was huge. Mr. Rooker also noted that that developer quickly came forward and met the cash proffers the Board requested, but there is still a whole lot of value over and above the cash proffers being created by the rezoning. He said that citizens expect the County to recapture some of that increased value to help pay for infrastructure that will be required to be paid for by taxes.

Mr. Slutzky noted that Mr. Boyd has not been supportive of one major factor that could be used to discourage growth in the rural area, downzoning, and he also supported the tax decrease.

Mr. Boyd replied that downzoning is essentially taking away property rights. He also said that he is not convinced that the Neighborhood Model form is necessarily more marketable.

Mr. Rooker noted that the Board has been encouraging having a mix of available housing types. He also emphasized that the numbers they arrived at were a compromise, and they ultimately came to an agreement.

Ms. Thomas commented that the reason she advocated for a higher number was that they were constrained to only picking up existing CIP items, and she also assumed that there would be negotiations with each development when other proffers were made.

Mr. Dorrier noted that with North Pointe, the Board deemed the contributions to highway renovations to be as important as cash proffers.

Mr. Rooker replied that some of those items would be credited to the developers as proffers.

Mr. Davis said that under State law, unless the developer proposes otherwise, the proffer can not be collected until the time of the building permit for each individual unit, and the developer for single-family houses might not be paying that at all. He added that for proffers that have an amount attached to each unit, they are probably going to get paid at the building permit stage.

Mr. Graham said that with smaller infill developments, there is an existing house on there that would remain in place, and the policy should only be applied to those new lots. He also said that it is important to consider areas of focus for the CIP as part of overall considerations and not as part of the cash proffer policy.

Mr. Slutzky said that he felt the priority zones were a bad idea when they were presented, and it does not matter when the CIP items are realized.

Mr. Rooker stated that it is up to the Board when CIP items are funded and that is a separate issue from the cash proffer policy.

Mr. Graham noted that the priority areas would still be weighed but not as part of the proffer discussion.

Mr. Graham said that with regard to calculation methodology, land would be credited at the County's assessed value for the specific land proffered. He stated that the improvement calculations would be based on estimates of what it would cost the County to build them and would follow a consistent process. Mr. Graham said that if there are differences with the applicant, the County will try to come to agreement but that might not always be possible.

Mr. Graham concluded by saying the impacts to staff would hopefully be minimal and could actually have a net benefit to staff time and involvement. He emphasized that the credit should only be allowed where the developer is addressing the infrastructure anticipated by the cash proffer policy.

Mr. Rooker commended staff on their focus on the remaining issues, noting that Attachment C explains cash proffer guidelines in more detail.

Mr. Davis said that there would be some tinkering with the Comprehensive Plan so that it is clear there is an expectation that new development will offset capital and infrastructure costs. He stated that the Board would be asked to adopt an amendment to the plan as an addendum. Mr. Davis said that staff would finalize the CPA language, and then it would be advertised as a public hearing for the Planning Commission. He said that the Commission would make a recommendation to the Board for another public hearing.

Ms. Thomas noted that there has been very positive response to the web page regarding this item.

Mr. Davis commented that this is just a step to bring this item to public hearing.

Ms. Thomas emphasized the importance of bringing out what they would not approve regardless of public input.

Mr. Slutzky said that he would like to clarify the credits for affordable units, whether a cash contribution would be accepted in lieu of actual units.

Mr. Rooker replied that this policy does not propose giving cash credits against proffers for providing affordable units, but it suggests that there would be no cash proffers paid on affordable units.

Mr. Graham added that the cash proffer policy does apply to market rate units.

Mr. Slutzky also commented that using the CPI index would not be appropriate, and Marshall and Swift would make more sense.

Mr. Rooker agreed.

Mr. Davis said that by State law they must choose one or the other, and staff recommends Marshall and Swift.

Mr. Slutzky commented that he does not know why the County would want to limit things to a specific geographic domain regarding proffered land for school sites and parks. He said that he was not sure what the benefit is.

Mr. Davis responded that this attempts to capture the reasonableness of the proffer that addresses the impacts of the development. He said that some are County-wide but others pertain to the area around the development.

Mr. Slutzky suggested that the notion of geographic domain be removed, and staff should bring that out as concerns.

Ms. Thomas emphasized that this pertains to cash proffers and not land.

Mr. Davis commented that the developers usually want the proffers to be close to their development, such as roads and schools. He noted that it is not possible to capture every circumstance that is going to be presented to the Board. Mr. Davis further noted that in Chesterfield, the Board applies the policy on a case by case basis through reasonable analysis.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that they are trying to create a reasonable proffer policy, and he would like to err on the side of having something in place that is legally defensible.

Mr. Graham pointed out that the role of the County in transit up to now has been operational expense rather than capital.

At this time, Mr. Rooker **moved** to approve the resolution of intent as presented in Attachment D. Mr. Wyant **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Slutzky, and Ms. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

(The adopted resolution is set out below:)

RESOLUTION OF INTENT

WHEREAS, the Board directed the County's Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee (FIAC) to analyze the fiscal impacts of development on the County's public facilities and infrastructure and make recommendations as to the appropriate cash proffers to offset these impacts; and

WHEREAS, the Board accepted the cash proffer methodology recommended by the FIAC to calculate the impacts of residential development resulting from rezonings on May 2, 2007 on a per dwelling unit basis; and

WHEREAS, it was the consensus of the Board at its work session on May 9, 2007 that, with the exception of affordable housing, there is an expectation that all new rezonings that include residential development will pay for the equivalent of their full impact as determined by the cash proffer methodology and as implemented pursuant to a cash proffer policy; and

WHEREAS, such a policy can best be implemented through amendment to the County's Comprehensive Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT for purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good planning practices, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby adopts a resolution of intent to amend the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan as deemed necessary in order to achieve the purposes described herein; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Albemarle County Planning Commission shall expeditiously hold a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan amendment proposed by this resolution of intent and forward its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Graham asked if the Board felt the need for another work session.

Mr. Slutzky said that he would like one.

Mr. Rooker commented that he does not understand why a work session would be necessary before the public hearing, but perhaps one would be needed after issues are raised in the hearing.

Mr. Graham stated that the Planning Commission would likely move this along quickly to get it back to the Board.

Agenda Item No. 7. Other Matters From the Board not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Boyd commented that over the past five years, the City and County have been in negotiations regarding the funding agreement for the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA). He noted that the City has withheld its contribution fee to the RSWA, estimated at \$3 million including fee, interest, and penalty. Mr. Boyd said that the County has covered the costs, and he believes a compromise is necessary in order to move forward. He stated that the County is willing to fund future deficits associated with their budget based on 70 percent paid by the County and 30 percent paid by the City so that the RSWA can continue services. Mr. Boyd noted that the County will be requesting that the RSWA develop a strategic plan regarding future funding sources including the possibility of a service charge to each household for services provided including recycling, household hazard waste collection, amnesty days at the landfill, environmental protection, and administrative costs. He said that the County is willing to make an attempt to reach an agreement as citizens value these services.

Ms. Thomas stated that Charlottesville's Sister City and Albemarle's Sister County from Italy would be visiting this area at the end of June including the mayor, city council members, and county officials. She said that this relationship started in 1976 at their suggestion as one of their citizens was a friend of Thomas Jefferson's. Ms. Thomas said that she would like a resolution acknowledging the relationship and welcoming them.

At this time, Ms. Thomas **moved** for approval of creating this resolution. Mr. Rooker **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Slutzky, and Ms. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

(The adopted resolution is set out below:)

Resolution

Two hundred thirty three years ago, a friendship started between two great men. We still celebrate that relationship between Filippo Mazzei and Thomas Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson of Albemarle County and Filippo Mazzei from Poggio a Caiano met in 1773. Apparently, Jefferson intercepted Mazzei's plans to settle elsewhere in Virginia and persuaded him to become his neighbor, near Monticello.

We're proud to remember that Filippo Mazzei became an Albemarle County resident, and that he became deeply involved in helping our country fight for its independence.

Filippo Mazzei left Albemarle in 1785 when he returned to Europe; but his vineyard, the place-names, including "Poggio" Creek, and the descendents of his farm workers have remained throughout all those years.

In the 20th century, at the suggestion of leaders in the communities of Poggio a Caiano and Prato, we mutually established a permanent twin-community relationship for the purposes of cultural association and the exchange of international goodwill; and

In 1976 and 1977 official visits to and from Italy sealed this proposal with a pact of friendship between the twin communities; and

In the 1980's a lively exchange of high school students involved many families and expanded the horizons of young people in our communities; and

In the 1990's an exchange of visitors took place between the communities, with many homes and hearts being opened in both; and

In 2001, Monticello High School musicians took their music from Albemarle County to Poggio a Caiano and Prato, welcomed and assisted by many of your citizens and organizations. Our young soccer players have visited every summer since then. Business people and artists have had exchanges in recent years.

In 2002, prompted by the visit of two Members of the Council of the Province of Prato, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors enthusiastically voted to welcome the Province of Prato into Albemarle County's twin-communities relationship, since that province was not in existence at the inception of our relationship

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, on behalf of all the citizens of this community, that we do hereby express our friendship, our appreciation for the historic, cultural, and human relations that tie our communities together, and our hope for increasingly frequent contacts with our Italian twin communities; and we commemorate the friendship that began 233 years ago and the 30 years of a more recent relationship that we treasure and hope will endure for at least another 233 years.

*Presented to: Silvano Gelli, Mayor of Poggio a Caiano
Angelo Formichella, Head Councilor for Cultural Affairs, Poggio a Caiano
Salvatore Conte, City Councilor Poggio a Caiano
Salvatore Pirronello, City Councilor Poggio a Caiano
Roberto Rosati, Head Councilor for Tourism, Provincia di Prato
Alberto Peruzzini, Director of the Tourism Agency for the Provincia di Prato*

Ms. Thomas noted that at 5:00 p.m. on July 3rd there would be a reception in the City's transit center for the visitors.

Agenda Item No. 8. Adjourn.

At 3:40 p.m., there being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

Chairman

Approved by Board

Date: 10/03/2007

Initials: EWJ
