

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on September 8, 2017, at 8:30 a.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from September 6, 2017.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer, Mr. Rick Randolph, and Mr. Brad Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Interim County Executive, Doug Walker, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m., by the Chair, Ms. McKeel.

Agenda Item No. 2. Closed Meeting.

At 8:33 a.m., Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board go into a Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection (7) [as of July 1, 2017, this should be (8)], to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice pertaining to the terms and conditions of a proposed employment contract. Ms. Palmer **seconded** the motion.

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

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill and Ms. Mallek.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 3. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 9:02 a.m., Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board of Supervisors certify by a recorded vote that, to the best of each Supervisor'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 meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill and Ms. Mallek.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 4. Call Back to Order. The meeting was called back to order at 9:05 a.m., by the Chair, Ms. McKeel.

Agenda Item No. 5. Welcome.

Ms. McKeel welcomed everyone and introduced the staff present, including the security officer, Officer Snodgrass.

Agenda Item No. 6. Agenda Review.

Mr. Walker stated that staff would review the status of implementation of strategic priorities in detail, noting they had received a number of updates in recent months, including a project management discipline and real-time status report. He said at the end of the meeting, staff will provide status reports on some of the initiatives in progress, and the Board and staff are seeking to align things prior to entering the next cycle of financial planning. Mr. Walker stated that they will be using the principles of priority-based budgeting as they develop resource plans in advance of the next cycle, which will include both the two-year and five-year budgeting process.

Ms. Kristy Shifflett reviewed the agenda for the meeting, stating that there is some clarity needed before the strategic planning groups get together and start to prepare resource plans and move further along with projects. She said the groups have prepared presentations today to ask specific questions about the intentions of priorities and to ensure alignment, and will start with the more straightforward projects that have not yet been presented to the Board. Ms. Shifflett stated that they will go into levels of service for the priority of revitalizing aging urban neighborhoods, with three projects to be discussed, then will move into the environmental compliance and stewardship priority.

Agenda Item No. 7. Review of FY 17-19 Strategic Plan.

- Revitalize Aging Urban Neighborhoods
 - Southwood (clarity)

- Neighborhood Level Needs (clarity)
- Public Works Levels of Service (clarity)

- Further development/direction priorities
 - Environmental Stewardship (clarity)

- Redevelop Rio/Route 29 Intersection Area
 - Small Area Plan (status update)

- At Risk 4 Year Olds (status update)
- Family Support (status update)
- Pantops Master Plan Including Rivanna River Corridor Plan (status update)

Southwood

Ms. Meghan Yaniglos, Principal Planner, addressed the Board and stated that she will discuss Southwood, with three expectations she will elaborate on, as well as some questions for the Board: prioritization on elements desired as listed within the resolution, input on the summer as designated in Southwood's comprehensive plan, and feedback on the desire to reduce the time required for zoning.

Ms. Shifflett mentioned that the Board has a worksheet before them that calls out the questions each project team has prepared.

Ms. Yaniglos explained that staff has been working with Habitat for Humanity and their consultant, BRW Architects, regularly to develop an action plan for Southwood. She stated that Habitat's goal and process for the redevelopment is very resident-driven, and they are currently finalizing a concept plan and draft action plan. Ms. Yaniglos said that as staff has continued to meet with them, they have found they need further guidance in coordinating all of their goals: Habitat's goal of resident-driven decision making and input at all levels, the County's strategic plan, the resolution for the partnership with Habitat, and the Comp Plan goals. She stated that staff is seeking clarity on some of the elements.

Ms. Yaniglos reported that the Southwood comp plan designates the area as urban density residential, with the center along Old Lynchburg Road. She said the plan states that Southwood should be a mixed-use, mixed-income community, and retail service area should be provided for the neighborhood, a neighborhood center, but not bigger. Ms. Yaniglos stated that the strategic plan stipulates adoption of an action plan with a private non-profit partner, for both affordable and business uses. She noted that she had included some key portions of the resolution for the partnership with Habitat, stating that part of supporting the project would include consideration of targeted investments in public infrastructure, including but not limited to roads, trails, parkland for public benefit, and innovative land use development strategies supported by the comp plan; and strategic investments are intended to result in significant returns, including but not limited to high quality affordable housing units, strong employment opportunities, increased tax base, and reduction in demand for County services.

Ms. Yaniglos presented three questions to the Board: if the County were to provide investment in Southwood, how would the Board prioritize the returns stated in the resolution? What type of center does the Board envision at Southwood: neighborhood service, community, or destination? Can the Board confirm that they desire reduced review timelines for rezoning applications, as well as the type of rezoning envisioned for the site?

Ms. Palmer asked what she means by "reduction in County services." Ms. Yaniglos responded that when the resolution was written, it was intended to mean police, social services, and fire/rescue.

Mr. Walker explained that all four outcomes or goals are important, but the action plan and collaboration with Southwood and Habitat would require prioritization in the event they cannot all be accomplished at once. He stated that the reduction in County services is related to the significant proportion of services delivered to that small community, and the expectation of redevelopment was that fewer police and fire personnel, zoning enforcement officers, and social services workers, would need to be sent in, as the quality of the community should be improved overall. Mr. Walker said that optimally they should be able to balance all of these, but prioritization would require Board guidance.

Ms. Mallek said it would be a by-product if they are successful with the others, and in her notes she listed high quality affordable housing units as the number one priority for the 400 families and 1,500 current residents. She said they should be the beneficiaries and be able to figure out what they would like their neighborhood to be, and not have someone from outside impose a rigid structure on them that would cause the project to fail. She stated the County has learned enough about failure with other projects in other places not to replicate them. Ms. Mallek said she is very impressed with the appreciative inquiry that is underway and the engagement of so many families, which alone would reduce the need for County services. She said she rated additional employment opportunities as three because employment opportunities need to be for the residents, many of whom already own businesses, and that would blossom once the basic structure starts, block by block. She emphasized the need for public transit and access to jobs.

Mr. Walker interjected that this is exactly the type of input staff is seeking.

Ms. Mallek continued that an increased tax base may be a by-product of the other two successes, and she has rated this as four in priority. She said she would be very concerned if there was an outside effort to make the project conform to some planning rules on a piece of paper. She indicated that neither County officials nor residents have the background or sufficient information about what type of neighborhood or community service is needed, so this needs to evolve and she is not prepared to make a decision now.

Mr. Randolph stated that the terms are value laden and sound neutral from a governmental standpoint, but are actually loaded with significance. He said the goal of reduction in County services was a negatively stated goal, which he would flip to address increased economic self-sufficiency, and that would likely carry a reduction in County services with it. He said the goal of an increased tax base does not speak to him, though they would be looking at a more diversified tax base in this location with the objective of growth in small businesses, particularly along Old Lynchburg Road, leading to growth in the tax base. He said the properties themselves, no longer being trailers, would increase in value and diversify the tax base. He expressed hope that some of the new employment opportunities would be locally based without the need for public transportation or automobile to get to work. Mr. Randolph described the term "high quality" in high quality affordable housing units as an extremely value-laden term that could have multiple interpretations. He said he would flip this around and say "organically developed appropriate affordable housing units."

Mr. Randolph said the community needs to develop organically to the lay of the land. He said that two Planning Commissioners, two Supervisors, and Habitat for Humanity held a discussion two days earlier about bringing in a landscape architect to fit the housing units into the topography. He agreed with Ms. Mallek that the project would be organic and evolve inconsistently, in stages, as different residents would want different types of units, with the challenge to determine where to group them and whether it would be in a mixed configuration. He added that they should not ask residents to fit in to the County's governmental box. Mr. Randolph emphasized this would be a beta test for affordable housing, and they should allow for the formulation of a plan that works with the neighborhood and then come to the Board to see how this would work within the configuration of topography, history, and culture in this location. He emphasized they have the opportunity to create a project that would be nationally recognized and would need every element of creativity and imagination on the County side to meet the community halfway.

Mr. Walker emphasized that a primary reason for the resolution that was brought before the Board last August was to acknowledge that this was intended to be a collaborative approach rather than a typical one where a developer presents a plan for approval. He indicated that staff seeks to understand how they could work in a collaborative way, as this is outside of the normal way of doing development.

Ms. Mallek asked if the best process moving forward would be a process of rezoning, with the first part not having detail and allowing development block by block.

Mr. Sheffield added that the Board should realize this was a planning process that begins at a 30,000 foot level at which point staff teases their thoughts and imagination. He said it would be important for residents to be able to access the jobs they are seeking, and suggested they try to analyze whether this results in a reduction in the use of County services. He stated that residents, particularly the younger ones, are looking for a sense of belonging and sense of place and encouraged the creation of a community center that fosters this.

Mr. Dill, addressing the goal of high quality affordable housing, suggested the definition of "affordable" not be in terms of how much has to be subsidized, but to look at ideas that are happening around the country that make housing affordable due to energy efficiency with solar panels, as well as gardens so that people can grow some of their own food, and internet connections so they can have a home-based business and sell things online. He expressed the view that a home designed to be smaller could make it more affordable than having subsidies and agreed with the idea to track the use of services to determine what does and does not work. He cautioned that they should avoid viewing Southwood as a separate community as if looking at it in a bubble, and they should look to integrate it into the community as a whole.

Addressing Mr. Dill's statements, Mr. Randolph said he thought Mr. Sheffield's suggestion to track the use of services is not to put them under the microscope, but to measure improvements of outcomes in order to encourage other communities to undertake similar projects.

(Note: Mr. Sheffield left the meeting at 9:34 a.m.)

Ms. Palmer stated that to her, health, safety, and welfare are most important. She said she reads the goal of reduction in County services as meaning that residents would be safer, and she expressed her preference for making safety the focus of this goal because they want residents to feel safe in their neighborhoods. She placed affordable housing at the top of her list and expressed agreement with everything else fellow Supervisors have said.

Mr. Randolph said the Sunset Trailer Park, that was renovated in Charlottesville by Habitat for Humanity to a participant-based community, saw a significant drop in the number of calls to police. He expressed support for keeping these types of statistics so they could demonstrate success.

Ms. McKeel said the goal of affordable housing is critical and at the beginning of the process, she did not see an increase in the tax base as a goal but to provide residents with affordable housing. She

expects reduction in the use of services and a safer community to be outcomes if they do what they are saying they would.

Ms. Yaniglos attempted to summarize the comments made by Supervisors. She said she has heard a lot about focusing on the wants and needs of Southwood residents and to have a flexible rezoning process. She presented photos of some different types of local neighborhood centers and asked for feedback regarding size and scale, and asked whether the Board has a vision for a center or whether it should be Habitat and resident driven.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that users of The Boys and Girls Club prefer to not have people from the outside come to shop in their neighborhood. She noted there are areas along Old Lynchburg Road that are less desirable for housing and asked if there is an area along this road that could be suitable for a commercial hub that could serve as a place for employment or to attract a County business to relocate in order to grow. She indicated that they should not set strict zoning rules and allow flexibility by stepping out of the way and letting business evolve.

Ms. Yaniglos asked how much of the bubble area should be designated for these types of uses. Ms. Mallek said she is not ready to make this decision or impose anything from the outside.

Mr. Randolph used the adjective "prescriptive" to describe what he has been hearing, noting that the site already has a center consisting of a community center, School Board office, and Habitat for Humanity office. He said that rather than prescribing a center that fits a preordained concept of a commercial business services center, they should let the residents determine this. He said there could potentially be a strip mall along Old Lynchburg Road with a variety of businesses, and then have a Boys and Girls Club, expanded School Board office, and Habitat office within the community.

(Note: Mr. Sheffield returned to the meeting at 9:45 a.m.)

Mr. Dill suggested they have a café and some commercial businesses.

Ms. Yaniglos asked if they want to allow all of the uses. Mr. Dill replied that he thinks so.

Ms. Mallek suggested R & D Flex Commercial, noting that they could potentially have a commercial development along Old Lynchburg Road.

Ms. Palmer replied that there are serious infrastructure issues in that area and she would like to have a future discussion about this.

Ms. McKeel told Ms. Yaniglos that she does not understand her questions, stating that the Board wants flexibility and adaptation to allow the community to evolve and determine what it wants.

Ms. Yaniglos responded that this is what staff is looking for and expressed satisfaction with the direction provided by the Board. She said they are looking at using the most innovative and creative use of their current zoning ordinance and districts, and trying to determine which kind to rezone to in order to allow the most flexibility. Ms. Yaniglos stated that as they put together an action plan, it would be good to know if the direction they are taking using the current ordinance is the correct direction or if the Board prefers they create something brand new for Southwood.

Mr. Sheffield asked if this would require an amendment to the comprehensive plan. Ms. Yaniglos replied that it is designated as urban density residential, and what they have discussed so far would fit within that zoning. She said there would be a rezoning from the current R2.

Mr. Kamptner asked what types of zoning districts they are considering. Ms. Yaniglos said they have discussed C1 along Old Lynchburg Road, commercial with a special use permit for R15 residential, with the rest of the property to be R15, strictly residential. She said they have also talked about a planned residential district that would require a detailed plan, which they are trying to avoid.

Mr. Kamptner asked if R15 provides the development with any flexibility. Ms. Yaniglos replied they could apply for special use permits for other uses that are not strictly residential and they could identify these uses as they work through.

Ms. Mallek asked for the number of residents right now and assumes there is high density. Ms. Yaniglos said R15 contains a bonus provision, one of which is for affordable housing.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that one of the goals of existing residents is to have room to live and have extended family members living nearby. She said the community is entrepreneurial and she does not want the County to dictate how the community would develop over time. She said R15 with small business would be fine for her.

Mr. Randolph suggested they approach the project with the degree of creativity and imagination they are bringing to Rio/29 and consider the use of form-based code, performance measures, and creative ways to allow flexibility and adaptation.

Ms. Yaniglos emphasized this is a longer process and requires more resources than what they are currently attempting with the current ordinance.

Neighborhood Level Needs

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, next presented. He said that revitalizing aging neighborhoods is one of the Board's open-ended strategies, with the goal of increased support for planning efforts and improvement actions to address neighborhood-level needs by January 2019. He said he would examine current efforts, define expectations of success, and make sure they are on track. Mr. Graham stated that staff is following Board policy by looking at the comprehensive plan and presented a slide that included the comprehensive plan implementation goal, as well as several indicators of success from the implementation chapter of the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Graham indicated there are two parts to their strategy, with the first being to increase support for planning efforts. He said they recognize their efforts are a means to an end and need to understand where planning efforts limit success. He expressed that they would do this through refinement and prioritization of neighborhood needs and prompt identification of emerging issues. Mr. Graham reviewed the second part of the two-part strategy, which was to improve actions to address neighborhood-level needs such as infrastructure, service, and partnerships. He recognized that partnership needs create a new resource demand on staff time. He presented a slide with a list of successes and possibilities with additional resources. Under successes, he mentioned the comprehensive plan update, which includes the implementation chapter, master plans adopted for development areas, Community Advisory Committees (CACs) that have been supporting implementation of master plans, strengthened partnerships such as Southwood, funding such as NIFI being provided for neighborhood needs, and the hiring of a neighborhood planner.

Under possibilities with additional resources, he reviewed several potential efforts, the first being acceleration of the master plan and updates such as the Pantops Master Plan. Mr. Graham said the second was refinement of neighborhood expectations and priorities, for which he said they are in the process of conducting an inventory of infrastructure and services and conducting a gap analysis to determine which of these needs they should focus on. He listed the need for expanding partnerships as third, with the fourth possibility to expand funding for neighborhood improvements.

Mr. Randolph asked if it would be helpful to put more emphasis in planning formulation on the applicants and, at the same time, get better clarity from the Board for direction of the implementation process earlier. He commented that this could avoid belaboring staff with a series of meetings. Mr. Graham replied that this involved the Board's expectations and said if the Board feels they are falling short of expectations, they should probably put more in resources on the front end. He said staff does not want the Board to feel staff has let them down, so they are seeking clarity as to whether they are on track. His next slide presented was entitled, "Where Do We Stand?" and it included two sub-headings: are current planning efforts meeting expectations, and are the implementation actions meeting expectations?

Ms. Palmer asked if they are talking about master plans, such as Rio, Hydraulic, and Southwood, or going over everything. Mr. Graham replied that it is pretty open ended, and today they are conducting a check-in to see if they are on track.

Ms. Mallek said the list of possibilities has helped her figure out the next step. She said she recognizes the Board has made many updating demands on staff over the past year and expects many of the things staff has been working on to be wrapping up over the next six months, and she is looking beyond these in her thinking.

Mr. Graham reminded the Board that they are beginning the FY19 budget cycle, which limits their resources to address other issues. He expressed that if the Board would like more emphasis on issues listed under "possibilities," then additional staff would be required.

Ms. Palmer said there is a plethora of projects coming in along Old Lynchburg Road Extended and Sunset, with a need for sidewalks to connect them. She recognized the amount of time required for the County planner to work with developers to make this work, and she asked if Mr. Graham believes he already has enough staff to address this, not only in this area but in other areas of the County. She emphasized the importance of addressing sidewalk issues early in the process before things are written in stone and is too late to change.

Mr. Graham replied that they do have the resources to address this issue in the Old Lynchburg Road area, but not if they are to expand this to other areas.

Mr. Walker added that there is a need to address the County's resources for transportation planning, which they should see during conversations involving the budget process.

Mr. Randolph said it sounds like it would be helpful if the Board would provide objective criteria for neighborhood improvements to be able to prioritize them on an annual basis, so staff and citizens would know which projects are most compelling. He added that the one-time use of NIFI funds in FY16 has raised expectations in the CACs which, in some cases, have developed laundry lists of costly projects. He said they would need clarification from the Board regarding this, including a review of NIFI, and whether it would be a permanent, ongoing, County program or would it be consistent with original parameters that it is a one-year, surplus-related program, otherwise they would be eating into the CIP. He used an analogy of ants biting into a piece of cheese to describe the potential eating away at NIFI funds by the CACs.

Ms. Mallek said the NIFI program has shown that each of the magisterial districts have a laundry list of projects, of which most have come out of the master plan. She said that older neighborhoods were built without sidewalks during the 40s and 50s and, with more recent development, they were negatively impacted by pedestrian traffic. She said they have discovered that installing sidewalks is astronomically expensive. Ms. Mallek expressed hope that the NIFI program has led to more community involvement and discussion, as well as groups doing things themselves.

Ms. Palmer stated that they have to realize the timing of when developments go in, as they could save money with better planning of connections, and she would like timing to become one of the priorities.

Mr. Graham said that what he is hearing is to have a special focus on identifying and prioritizing infrastructure needs.

Mr. Randolph said he would add planning to this.

Mr. Graham acknowledged the recognition that the NIFI process has identified that communities have a lot of unrecognized needs, and asked for feedback about whether implementation actions are meeting expectations.

Ms. Mallek responded that out of many ideas, a few would be really great, and essential ones with the necessity of prioritizing health and safety needs should be first. She said that based on the budget the Board has provided to staff, they are doing a very good job.

Mr. Graham said the implementation actions relate back to working closely with the development community and potential partners, a garden club being an example of how neighborhoods could be more self-supporting and less reliant on the County for resources.

Mr. Randolph commented that sidewalks have become a compelling imperative, and it may be time for the County to create a public works department that is involved with things like sidewalk construction so they can analyze if they are better off using the private or public sector. He said the crazy quilt pattern the County has is embarrassing, and residents should be able to access bus stops in a safe fashion with a paved surface.

Mr. Sheffield said they need to remember that the County will need money to invest in infrastructure, with the potential for another bond referendum as it is the most effective and efficient way to raise money, noting that community buy-in is important. He recognizes the complexity of this because projects vary in size and scope, and they need to be prepared for opportunities that arise. He stated that a tiered approach that allows them to categorize projects should be used to address funding.

Ms. Palmer said they should be looking at services.

Mr. Graham summarized the feedback, which indicated that staff is probably not quite meeting expectations, though the Board has provided guidance as to how to focus their efforts.

Ms. McKeel expressed that it would be necessary to create a structure in ordinances to protect residents in denser, older neighborhoods in an effort to maintain quality of life.

Mr. Graham said he is hearing that they should look at property maintenance.

Ms. Mallek reminded them that they had planned to revisit the issue of blight and the enforcement ability of staff.

Mr. Sheffield praised staff and said Supervisors have competing expectations, so it would not be fair to say that staff is not meeting expectations.

Public Works Levels of Service

Mr. Trevor Henry, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services, presented and introduced Mr. Michael Freitas, Chief of Public Works. Mr. Henry emphasized that public works is a division, not a department. He presented a slide listing three expectations from this discussion: clarity of service, input to FY19 budget and five-year planning process, and concurrence on FY18 implementation recommendations. He said that he hopes to understand the Board's expectations and leave the discussion with a plan to meet these, and he reviewed the agenda for the discussion.

Mr. Henry reviewed strategic plan initiatives related to public works, with the first being revitalization of aging urban neighborhoods. He said their goals are: by January 2019 to work with partners to increase efforts to address the aesthetic appearance of entrance corridors and high visibility urban public spaces; and by January 2019 to increase efforts to improve deteriorating physical conditions in the County's aging urban core areas. He next reviewed additional strategic initiatives: by January 2019 to redevelop Rio/Route 29 intersection area by leveraging existing and planned public investment to enhance place making; by April 2019 to have staff develop technologies and procedures to map storm water infrastructure not already mapped and commence mapping throughout the County; to determine desired level of service fees for water resource protection programs; and identify and implement permanent funding sources to support those service levels. Mr. Henry's next slide listed dates of key

events in the process. He reviewed some of the key dates, including the July 7 brainstorming session with staff across multiple divisions and August 11 leadership council briefing.

Mr. Henry said he will review current coverage and provided a list and map of 12 urban area entrance corridors that are within the current scope of work. He stated that they have a small maintenance staff that works on facilities and grounds, limited to minor maintenance because they contract out for the big maintenance. Mr. Henry said they do the majority of work between April and October. He said the recently completed projects of Rio grade-separated interchange and 29/Berkmar widening are under a three-year warranty with VDOT for maintenance tasks, such as mowing.

Ms. Palmer asked who does the sidewalk maintenance along Berkmar Drive where all the grass is growing, adding that it is important to have sidewalks that are inviting and can be seen in order to get people to use them. Mr. Henry replied that VDOT does this.

Mr. Henry next reviewed areas of concern: medians and ramps in the entrance corridors, overgrown trees and weeds along sidewalks, sidewalk disrepair, litter, and aging infrastructure. He presented photos of some problem areas, including Commonwealth Drive, which he said has weed overgrowth and is the responsibility of VDOT. He said the County can take responsibility for this if it is willing to bear the costs. Mr. Henry reviewed ideas that came out of the brainstorming session which include redefining entrance corridors as "gateway routes." He summarized other ideas of including urban areas, as development areas, and considering branding for County wayfinding signs. He reviewed additional ideas resulting from the brainstorming session, including a suggestion to focus on pedestrian and bicycle access in the urban and redevelopment areas and to focus on automobile access in the rural areas.

Mr. Randolph asked that they include bicycle access as an area of focus in rural areas and ensure state standards are met.

Ms. Palmer added that she receives many emails from cyclists about hazards at Old Lynchburg Road where it goes from two lanes to one.

Mr. Henry next reviewed potential future expansions of service with near-term scope enhancements that can use contractors to perform the work. He said the cost of mowing beyond current coverage would be \$2,700/year per mile. He stated that they have an idea of the costs of flower bed installation, as the landscape bed at the Fontaine exit off the 250 Bypass cost \$15,045 to construct and \$958/year to maintain. Mr. Henry noted that one area could be to extend the area of service in the area of the 29N widening/Berkmar Extended. He said in March they met with the VDOT program manager for pollinating and learned a lot about this unique program, which improves water quality and soil retention as well as several other benefits he listed on a slide.

Ms. Mallek interjected that a soil and water conservation district may be a source of funding.

Mr. Henry reviewed what he learned about pollinators during his meeting with the VDOT program manager, stating that pollinators contribute \$24B to the U.S. economy and they believe there are some areas along gateways and off and on ramps for these plants.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that the master naturalist at Ivy Creek is required to volunteer 40 hours per year to stay active and could be a source of expertise, along with the Natural Heritage Committee. She said she thinks they would be very excited to participate.

Mr. Henry continued with additional potential expanded levels of service, stating that they are in the process of finalizing a memorandum of understanding with the jail trustee program for weekend litter clean up.

Ms. Palmer said the local raptor population is becoming decimated as a result of people throwing trash along the road, which attracts rodents, and suggested they consider ways to educate the public.

Ms. Mallek said an apple core is biodegradable but attracts the hawk, which could then be hit by a car.

Mr. Randolph suggested they put wildflowers in medians, stating that a cost-effective way to attract bees is to plant clover. He noted that fertilizers with weed control eliminates clover, which has reduced the habitat for honeybees. He said the clover would have to be mowed about once a month, but would regenerate.

Mr. Henry reviewed additional potential areas of expansion: gutter pan cleaning, signage, installation of benches, trash cans, bike racks, drinking fountains, sidewalk maintenance, and pedestrian lighting. His next slide presented a list of low, medium, and high complexity maintenance tasks, as well as the costs. He indicated that if they wish to expand coverage, they should first conduct an assessment of what is already being done in order to create a baseline that would help with planning.

Ms. Palmer asked if the County would receive a credit or other work if they are to take over some of the work currently being performed by VDOT. Mr. Henry responded that he is not aware of any return of funding from VDOT.

Mr. Michael Freitas added that they do not get reimbursed for any mowing or landscaping work the County has taken over from VDOT, adding that VDOT used to regularly cut grass along medians and cut back service and then eliminated service, which the County now takes care of.

Mr. Henry recommended that they implement some lower complexity programs in FY19 and said he would like to find funding to conduct neighborhood inventories. He said they should try to work closely with VDOT and seek an agreement with them.

Ms. Mallek noted that the County does not have enabling authority to require landowners to shovel snow nor to mow their property and asked if any states or counties have the ability to require this. She said that when there is a safety issue, landowners should be responsible for making sure their property is clear when in a public right-of-way.

Mr. Kamptner offered to get back to Ms. Mallek on this question.

Mr. Dill noted that the second largest County entrance corridor is Route 250 coming from Richmond and they do not have a County welcome sign, whereas they have a beautiful welcome sign at the border with Nelson County.

Ms. McKeel expressed concern over old, rotting signs along Georgetown, Barracks, and Hydraulic Roads, which may be VDOT signs. She said they should be replaced with good, solid, metal stakes and asked if they can reach an agreement with VDOT to replace the signs, with the contingency that the County would assume some additional maintenance responsibility.

Ms. Mallek said she is not interested in trading in that way, and said they should call VDOT to take care of this.

Mr. Henry next presented photos of a work crew consisting of environmental services and grounds staff that recently spent two days at a cost of \$3K to fix a drainage issue next to Northside Library. He showed before and after photos and said this is an example of smaller projects they have the ability to do with current resources.

Mr. Henry reviewed costs of hiring additional staff were they to expand scope, stating that he estimates the need for a .75 full-time employee at Grade 10 for oversight, even if work is contracted, and if the complexity of enhancements necessitates additional staff with specific horticulture expertise to manage the program, this would require a full-time employee at Grade 13 (\$38,727). He said they should eventually conduct an analysis to determine the break-even level of hiring additional staff versus contracting the work.

Mr. Dill asked what Mr. Henry's sense of this is. Mr. Henry replied that this would depend on the volume of work.

Mr. Henry presented a slide of proposed next steps for FY18 through FY20 and reviewed the steps: FY18 – Fund and complete Neighborhood Inventory, execute currently funded levels of service for litter and mowing program, test pollinator bed; FY19 – Assess litter clean-up program and consider potential expansion, expanded off/on ramp maintenance, define additional program/service levels based on the neighborhood inventory; FY20 – Assess increased level of service from FY19, implement expanded public works program (pollinator, mowing, pruning, etc.)

He asked for feedback from Supervisors as to whether staff is on the right track. Ms. Mallek replied affirmatively and asked that he clearly define things they could or could not do with volunteers. She asked that once the neighborhood inventory assessment is formulated that he share this with the Board.

Mr. Randolph suggested they have source separation for recyclables and trash with an effort to educate people, adding that it is likely that if they improve recycling they would also reduce littering.

Noting that she and Mr. Henry are on the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board, Ms. Palmer informed Supervisors that the RSWA is formulating a public education plan that would likely come before the Board to request funding.

Ms. McKeel emphasized that it would be important to include the schools in anti-littering education efforts.

Mr. Walker interjected that he does not see a reference to gateway amenities, such as signage and plantings, in Mr. Henry's list of next steps, which he said may be of interest to the Board.

Mr. Henry replied that these are under the category that requires further planning, so he was not able to place a budget number, but staff could add this if the Board desires.

Mr. Randolph noted that the bridge over the James River at Scottsville has a "Welcome to Scottsville" sign but not an Albemarle sign, and he suggested they look at all of their quadrants so that people entering the County would know they are in this county.

Ms. Mallek suggested that it be simple and pretty with the County seal.

Mr. Randolph told Mr. Henry that it is clear the Board supports this.

Addressing Ms. Mallek's earlier question about enabling authority for removal of vegetation and snow, Mr. Kamptner said the counties with this authority are within Northern Virginia Planning District 8: Arlington, Fairfax, and Loudoun. He said service districts also have the authority to require snow and vegetation removal.

Mr. Henry encouraged Supervisors to contact his office when they notice issues so that staff can address them.

(Note: At 11:17 a.m., Ms. McKeel announced that she would leave the meeting as she is about to become a grandparent, but expects to return. She noted that Mr. Dill would lead the meeting. She then left the meeting.

(Recess: At 11:18 a.m., the Board recessed, and then reconvened at 11:31 a.m. When the Board returned, Mr. Dill assumed the role of Chair. Mr. Sheffield did not return to the meeting.)

Environmental Stewardship

Mr. Trevor Henry reminded them that the Board passed a resolution on climate action on September 6, adding that the big takeaway was the Climate Action Plan Process. He presented a chart of five milestones in this process through July 2018, noting that the stakeholder/advisory panel would get together this fall and work through a recommendation of what the plan might be.

Mr. Henry reviewed potential FY19 funding the Board might wish to approve while the Climate Action Plan is developed. He invited Mr. Andy Lowe to speak on this portion of the presentation.

Mr. Andy Lowe, Environmental Compliance Manager, stated that the first program he would review is the Local Energy Alliance Program (LEAP), which he explained works with local residents and commercial building owners on their energy footprint. He said the City and County have provided funding in the past through a grant process with Southeastern Energy Alliance. He said an Energy Block Grant enabled the County to fund energy audits from 2010 – 2012 and that Charlottesville is still involved with LEAP for City residents and commercial buildings. He provided an estimated annual funding range of \$75 thousand to \$100 thousand. He explained that LEAP partners with Better World Betty's Better Business Challenge to obtain private grants to engage business and commercial building owners on reducing utility bills and waste. Mr. Lowe said they use the assistance of interns from the University of Virginia and that minimal staff time is required. He said there is an a la carte menu of programs that they can select from. He mentioned a third potential program they could undertake, if the Board provides funding, is to expand recycling beyond the McIntire, County Office Building, and 5th Street facilities to include fire stations and public libraries, and to include comingled containers and an increased number of recyclable items, at a cost to be determined.

Ms. Palmer mentioned some composting efforts at schools and asked Mr. Lowe if this is district wide.

Mr. Lowe said it must be a pilot program and they are recycling cardboard.

Ms. Palmer asked if they are using Rivanna's paper sort and cardboard. Mr. Lowe replied that they are with their solo collection, which was part of the MOU with Rivanna. He said the new contract would have the contractor use the paper sort.

Mr. Randolph encouraged them to think of this as concentric rings starting with the 5th Street and County Office Building facilities and expanding to fire stations, courts, and libraries and then to schools and partnerships, such as the airport and RSWA. He said they need to keep growing the recycling program within County facilities and then encourage businesses to partner with the County, with the goal of reducing the waste sent to the landfill in Chesterfield.

Ms. Mallek recalled that in 2009-2010, she was contacted by two fire stations in the Whitehall District with a request for a mixed-use container to be available to local residents. She said the contractor indicated he would charge for hauling but not for tipping, but the County was not able to get this through the budget. She said this was an example of the readily available partnerships they could form.

Ms. Palmer reminded Supervisors that this is part of the RSWA's strategic planning and that Crozet would be a wonderful place to start.

Mr. Dill suggested that Supervisors provide feedback to Mr. Lowe's presentation.

Ms. Mallek indicated she supports the implementation of a program with the credit union to offer low interest loans to those of moderate and low income for home weatherization, which she said would be a very low cost to the County. She said when they had this program in the past, an owner of a large apartment complex undertook weatherization measures and a beer distributor installed solar panels on its trucks to power the lift gates, which allowed them to expand delivery routes as the previously used batteries had limited life.

Ms. Shifflett reviewed the list of priority updates that would be presented: Redevelop Rio/Route 29 Small Area Plan, At Risk 4-Year Olds, Family Support, Pantops Master Plan, and Rivanna River Corridor Plan. She said they will provide updates on the current status and plans for the two and five-year fiscal plans.

Small Area Plan

Ms. Rachel Falkenstein, Senior Planner, said she will provide an update on the timeline and completion dates for interim project phases, with the timeline consisting of three phases: Vision, Design, and Implementation. She said they are in the middle of Phase 2 and are refining the original design concept by working with three independent consultants on transportation modeling, economic analysis, and design. She noted that feedback received from the Board and Planning Commission at an August 2017 work session included a desire for more detail of the design and ways to incorporate a unique character for the area. Ms. Falkenstein said staff would look at ways to make public spaces more unique. She indicated the projected completion date of Phase 2 is December 2017, and staff is proposing to change the interim Phase 2 step and bring a final urban design and implementation plan before the Board in December. She indicated they expect to have a draft ordinance prepared as scheduled by May 2018 and cautioned that property owner buy-in would be important for the plans success. She concluded and invited questions and comments.

Mr. Walker explained they had intended to have an update to the Board in October, but would combine the October and December milestones for the December presentation, which he feels would result in a better product.

Ms. Mallek expressed hope that the process allows for early adopters in the landowner category and that it includes those who are eager to participate, and not have those who are least interested delay the process.

Ms. Falkenstein confirmed this and said they are in discussions right now with a property owner.

At-Risk Four-Year-Olds

Ms. Mary Stebbins, Assistant Director of Albemarle County Social Services, reviewed the first strategic initiative: by December 2017, increase the physical capacity for educational opportunities for at-risk four-year-olds through an expansion of Woodbrook Elementary and collaboration with local agencies and other non-profit/private providers and foundations. She said they have used all available VPI funding, filled all 158 Bright Stars class spaces, and placed 18 kids in private preschools in collaboration with The United Way and Ready Kids through the Early Education Task Force. She expected there would be three additional classrooms once the Woodbrook expansion is completed, at which time they hope to move the 18 kids in private programs into a Bright Stars classroom. Ms. Stebbins said they would submit a resource capacity request to Albemarle County Department of Social Services to fund an additional pre-K classroom in FY18.

Mr. Randolph asked for an estimate of the cost savings that would result from moving VPI slots internally to the School Division. Ms. Stebbins said there should be no cost reduction.

Mr. Randolph said he expects private school expense to be more than public school expense.

Ms. Stebbins responded that they get partial funding from the state. She said they would ask for an additional teacher, aide, family coordinator, equipment, and a classroom.

Mr. Walker interjected that current VPI expansion dollars do not require a local match through this initiative, though they normally do. He said the cost of a pre-K class in the past has been around \$110K, even with VPI state resources.

Ms. Stebbins expressed hope that they could open the new classroom next August.

Mr. Randolph asked if the parents of children that are dispersed to private pre-K programs are pleased that they would be together in one location. Ms. Stebbins replied that she thinks it is helpful, as the schools are closer and there is transportation and additional support that families appreciate.

Ms. Palmer recalled a recent newspaper article about Charlottesville schools not being able to fill their spaces, and she asked if the County is working with them and if they have a backlog.

Ms. Stebbins replied that VPI funding does not allow them to send Albemarle kids to Charlottesville and vice-versa. She said the County has a wait list and those kids are now in the private placements.

Ms. Mallek asked if there are any kids in the rural area who are not participating, noting that many local churches have preschool programs and offer scholarships to lower income families. Ms. Stebbins replied that part of their charge is to determine how many children across the County are not participating, and said that most of the waitlist is composed of children from the urban ring.

Mr. Dill asked if there has been any discussion about future programs for three-year-olds. Ms. Stebbins replied that the task force is currently taking this on as they develop a vision. She said they are also looking at home visits for zero to five-year-olds. She said the literature shows that learning starts at birth, and the earlier they can develop literacy, social, and emotional development skills, the better off kids would be.

Mr. Dill commented that the program for zero to five-year-olds seems interesting.

Family Support

Ms. Stebbins reviewed this strategic initiative: by January 2019, increase support for family support programs, including developing more robust partnerships with entities, including Region Ten. She said the initiative is two-pronged, with the first being the partnership with Region Ten as it relates to family support and foster care prevention, and the second prong being a family finding pilot. She described the relationship with Region Ten as robust and said the County is unique in terms of serving children with significant needs, particularly with mental health. She said that Region Ten provides case management of parental placements and foster care prevention services, noting that this partnership allows parents to make placements for residential care which previously would have required the County to take the child into foster care to make the placement. She added that this allows County social services to focus on abuse and neglect cases, with Region Ten focusing on mental health needs. She said the CSA Coordinator assists Region Ten staff in managing the FAPT process, applying for Medicaid after the child has been in placement for 30 days, and referring the family to DCSE for child support.

Ms. Stebbins reviewed the second prong of foster care prevention, which consists of the family support and family preservation programs. She said that family support is located in the schools, and family preservation provides ongoing child protective services. She stated that it is critical to serve families whose children are at risk of abuse and neglect to the ultimate goal of foster care prevention, adding that a primary component is to bolster the natural supports that families have within their own communities. Ms. Stebbins explained that social services has developed a family finding pilot, with a goal of preventing children and youth from entering foster care, as well as reducing CSA costs by encouraging the notion of families supporting their own. She said they were awarded funds to hire a temporary family finding position to implement and evaluate the success of the program.

Mr. Randolph asked if the program is successful whether they would look to supplement it with additional social workers in the future who could do in home visits and provide needed guidance and support.

Ms. Stebbins said they are using existing foster care prevention workers because they are already connected to these families, and the temporary family finding staff member is assisting in providing resources. She indicated that whether additional staff would be needed would depend on how this program develops.

Mr. Randolph asked if the social workers involved hold master in social work degrees. Ms. Stebbins responded that some do and some do not.

Mr. Randolph said he applauds the prevention component of the program, but encourages a therapeutic component consisting primarily of those with MSW and who are trained in that model of operation. He said the combination of prevention and therapy is the best way to alleviate these kinds of problems.

Ms. Stebbins agreed that clinical expertise is very helpful and emphasized that they already partner with Region Ten, the Women's Initiative, and other local agencies to provide therapeutic support.

Ms. Mallek commented that it is very important to have someone who is an advocate for the child.

Ms. Stebbins said the family finding pilot proposal was approved in the spring and the new hire started August 28. She said they would submit a resource capacity request for a permanent, full-time employee, as they believe it would have an impact on families, foster care reductions, and CSA cost reductions.

Mr. Walker added that the Women's Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Center is a related initiative through Region Ten, but is not directly related with strategic priorities, and asked Ms. Stebbins if she could provide a progress update. He noted that a benefit to the County is that it would also reduce CSA costs.

Ms. Stebbins responded that she does not know where it is in the process. She remarked that many of the cases they see involve substance abuse and the purpose of the program is to maintain families while supporting the mother and strengthening family bonds.

Mr. Randolph asked if opioids have replaced other substances or added an additional challenge. Ms. Stebbins replied that Child Protective Services has to keep up to date with a changing environment.

Mr. Randolph asked her to comment on how police are trained to address issues related to opioids and irrational behavior caused by them. Ms. Stebbins replied that she cannot comment on police training, but said that Child Protective Services works closely with them.

Mr. Dill asked Mr. Walker if there are issues related to strategic planning that the Board needs to push or to let go of.

Mr. Walker replied that the specific opportunity related to today's conversation is with respect to initiatives that have already been launched and are supported in the current budget. He said that to the extent they have implications for the upcoming fiscal planning cycle for FY19, this feedback from the Board enables staff to understand how to proceed in making resource requests. He referred to the 0-5 program mentioned by Mr. Dill earlier and said that staff would expect this to be part of the Board's next iteration of vision and planning in the summer of 2018. He described how he saw the process with planning, prioritizing and then implementing.

Mr. Dill said it seems that environmental and social services issues would most likely be affected by federal or state budget cuts and asked if this could lead to gaps in strategic planning.

Mr. Walker agreed that they are vulnerable to changes in circumstances and could monitor and be aware of them, and then come before the Board if they believe there would be an impact.

Mr. Dill asked Ms. Stebbins if there is a buzz in social services about health insurance. Ms. Stebbins replied that she is not aware of a buzz.

Mr. Randolph commented that across the board there is no predictability in this administration, which has been said by both conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats, and the lack of clarity is disconcerting.

Mr. Walker commented that they know they are in an environment of uncertainty, which will sharpen their focus more than they would otherwise.

Ms. Shifflett commented on how proud the County is of the Department of Social Services to try something new and find this program and to lower costs.

Pantops Master Plan Including Rivanna River Corridor Plan

Mr. Graham stated that he will present on two plans, with recommendations for the Rivanna River Corridor Plan being incorporated into the Pantops Master Plan. He said the plan was last updated in 2008 and noted that the Board initiates the master planning process, which staff typically tries to do every five years. He said the Rivanna River Corridor Plan was a new recommendation within the 2015 comprehensive plan, which allowed both the City and County to recognize the river as a resource. He presented a project timeline for the Pantops Master Plan, consisting of five milestones: a January 2018 kickoff representing Milestone 1; the first half of the year would be devoted to obtaining public input, representing Milestone 2; by fall 2018 he said they expect to have prioritizations and develop a recommendation with input from the Planning Commission, representing Milestone 3. He stated that staff expects to present recommendations for Board review in early 2019, representing Milestone 4; by March 2019, there would be adoption of the master plan, completing Milestone 5.

Mr. Randolph asked if they would use the Pantops CAC as the primary vehicle by which to absorb community input.

Mr. Graham confirmed that they already are and reminded him that CACs are responsible for implementation of master plans because they have the most expertise in terms of neighborhood concerns, and are always included as an integral part.

Mr. Graham next reviewed the Rivanna River Corridor Plan, which he said is just now kicking off with Phase 1 - reconnaissance and scoping. He said they will obtain all the data both communities have, as well as from other sources, in terms of natural resources and what they need to focus on. He reviewed Phase 2 – the concept plan. He said that work groups under the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission would form a concept and work with the Board and City Council. He indicated that Phase 3 would be the formulation of a detailed plan. Mr. Graham presented a slide with a project timeline. He said they have just signed a memorandum of agreement with the Planning District Commission for Phase 1. He said that by next spring they should have recommendations, which would then lead to Phase 2 beginning next summer with a concept plan developed by next fall. He said the Board and Planning Commission would review and accept the plan by summer 2019, which would then begin Phase 3.

Mr. Randolph recommended they use the Pantops 16 Fire Station, expected to be completed by summer of 2018, as there would be an empty bay that could serve as a meeting place. He commented that this would help put the station on the map for the community.

Mr. Randolph asked if Charlottesville is as invested in the Rivanna River Corridor planning process as the County. Mr. Graham replied that on a staff level, the enthusiasm is definitely there.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that the City's seats on the Rivanna River Basin Commission have been empty for a while, and she hopes they will appoint representatives soon.

Mr. Dill noted that Planning Commissioner, Ms. Daphne Spain, and he are using GIS mapping to get records of parcel numbers and names of property owners. He said that Cal Morris, the new Chair of

the CAC, would be leading the master plan update. Mr. Dill stated that the County/City arrangement at Darden Towe Park is an opportunity to get things going. He said they have identified that the County owns a small amount of land along the river, and a person who owns a large property along the river has expressed potential interest in working out an arrangement to have a park along the river, developing a portion that is set back from the river. He said the recent opening of Riverside Village represented the first commercial area that has a portion facing the river.

Ms. Mallek reminded everyone of the September 30 all day river festival, which will feature music and the opportunity to float your canoe or kayak on the river, and she also mentioned the river conference to be held on September 29. She expressed hope that representatives from the CAC will attend.

Agenda Item No. 8. Wrap-up, Next Steps.

Ms. Shifflett described the preceding presentations as project management across all of the priorities with status updates and timelines. She expressed hope that the Board is comfortable with the effort going on across all the priorities and emphasized that the milestones would be continuously updated and refreshed. She presented a timeline of next steps: September – Project teams develop a resource plan; October – Staff develops Two-Year Balanced Plan within the Five-Year Plan; November – Board of Supervisors work session on Two-Year Balanced Plan; December – Board of Supervisors work session to approve a Two-Year Balanced Plan within Five-Year Plan and strategic plan project update.

Ms. Palmer reminded the Board that broadband is one of their strategic priorities, and the County now has an authority, with the first grant programs to be rolled out soon. She said other priorities would require matching funds, and she spoke with Mike Culp the previous day, who informed her that the best way to go about this is to seek matches in increments of \$25 thousand. She asked if there is something for this in the budget for the upcoming year.

Mr. Walker replied that this is good to know and staff will follow up with Mr. Culp, the Project Manager. He said the projects are all team oriented, and the Office of Management and Budget can serve as an extra set of eyes and ears to be mindful in watching if money has been identified when these resource requests come forward.

Ms. Palmer asked how they will work out the solid waste issue with the RSWA for upcoming projects in the next fiscal year. Mr. Walker responded that he does not know, although Mr. Henry may have some insight. He said both the RWSA and RSWA are engaging in their strategic plan process, which he assumes will include some identification of next steps related to solid waste and materials management recycling aspects of that relationship. Mr. Walker stated that he does not know how this will play out, and acknowledged that Mr. Henry is indicating that he does not know either.

Ms. Mallek said the contract focuses on construction and they agreed to work out how to do this later.

Ms. Palmer said they will need to address this in the next budget season as construction will be completed by October, at the latest.

Mr. Walker said they have 22 priorities and have not reviewed them all at this work session, but they are all being actively managed and will be reflected in the ongoing updates to be provided in the project management system.

Ms. Mallek expressed a preference for reviewing the projects in small chunks at a time to allow more time for discussion, rather than reviewing them all at once.

Ms. Shifflett referred to the second tier of priorities and said that in the reports, they could articulate what current efforts are. She welcomed feedback from Supervisors as to which projects should have enhanced efforts or be changed.

Mr. Dill asked for an update on the project management program.

Ms. Shifflett said they have been working with staff across many departments to expand their project management discipline across the organization, and instead of being looked at as an extra layer of work, it should be used to manage and assist their work. She noted that this allows staff to communicate better with the Board and change the workload. Ms. Shifflett stated that Supervisors would be able to see hourly updates from the organization, an enhancement from what they had before, which required them to go out and hold meetings. She noted that information is now automatically fed into the report.

Mr. Dill commented that from what they have seen so far, it looks fantastic as a way to track what is going on or just to check on things.

Mr. Walker said that Ms. Shifflett's role as the implementer of the system is different from the expectations of the project managers to actually manage the projects, as she is a resource for them and has done a lot of heavy lifting. He stated that project management is a discipline and the tool enhances the process of project management, and indicated they are pleased with how it is working.

Ms. Shifflett stated that the support and endorsement from leadership across the board has impacted the work they see today.

Recess. At 12:39 p.m., the Board recessed, and then reconvened at 1:32 p.m., with Mr. Sheffield and Ms. McKeel present.

Agenda Item No. 9. Closed Meeting.

At 1:33 p.m., Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board go into a Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, under Subsection (1), to discuss and consider the appointment of a county executive. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek.

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

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill and Ms. Mallek.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 10. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 1:36 p.m., the Board reconvened into open meeting, and Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board of Supervisors certify by a recorded vote that, to the best of each Supervisor'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 meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion.

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

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill and Ms. Mallek.
NAYS: None.

NonAgenda. Mr. Dill **moved** to adopt the following resolution to appoint the County Executive:

**RESOLUTION
APPOINTING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia (the "Board"), that Jeff Richardson ("Richardson") is hereby appointed the County Executive for the County of Albemarle, Virginia pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-509, and this appointment shall be effective on and after November 6, 2017; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Richardson shall serve as County Executive at the pleasure of the Board and for an indefinite tenure pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-510; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Richardson shall have the statutory powers and duties set forth in Section 15.2-516 of the *Code of Virginia* (1950), as amended, and any other powers and duties set forth in any other sections of the *Code of Virginia* (1950), as amended; the powers and duties delegated or imposed by the Albemarle County Code or a duly adopted motion, resolution, or uncodified ordinance of the Board; and the power and duty to develop and recommend personnel and other policies and revisions to the Board; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board hereby approves the County Executive Employment Agreement between the Board and Richardson and authorizes the Chair to execute the Agreement on behalf of the Board once it has been approved as to form by the County Attorney.

The **motion** was seconded by Mr. Sheffield.

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

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill and Ms. Mallek.
NAYS: None.

**COUNTY EXECUTIVE
EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT**

THIS AGREEMENT is made this 8th day of September, 2017 by and between the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, hereinafter "Employer" and Jeff Richardson, hereinafter "Employee."

RECITALS

R-1 Employer is in need of the services of a person possessing the skills and ability required to be the County Executive; and

- R-2** Employee, through education and experience, possesses the requisite skills to perform these duties; and
- R-3** Employer desires, therefore, to engage the services of Employee as County Executive under the direction of the Employer, pursuant to the authority vested in Employer by Section 15.2-509 of the *Code of Virginia* (1950), as amended; and
- R-4** The parties acknowledge that Employee is a member of the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) and that Employee is subject to the ICMA Code of Ethics, but the provisions of that Code are in no way incorporated into this Agreement.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

For reasons set forth above and in consideration of the mutual promises of the parties, Employer and Employees agree as follows:

1. Employment

Employer employs Employee as the County Executive of Albemarle County, and Employee accepts and agrees to this employment under the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

2. Terms of Employment

Employee's terms of employment with Employer are as follows:

- A. *Initial Term.* Employee's term of employment pursuant to this Agreement shall begin on November 6, 2017. This Agreement shall remain in full force from the date of this Agreement until Employer terminates Employee, Employee is deemed terminated, or Employee resigns, as provided in this Agreement.
- B. *Exclusive Employment.* At all times, Employee shall be in the exclusive employ of Employer and devote all of his working time, attention, knowledge, and skills solely to the interests of Employer. Employer shall be entitled to all of the benefits arising from or incident to all work, services, and advice of Employee. The term *working time* does not include any time while Employee is on annual leave.
- C. *Performance.* Employee shall diligently exercise his powers and perform his duties established in Section 3 in a professional manner, in good faith, and according to the ICMA Code of Ethics (although the Code of Ethics is not incorporated into this Agreement).
- D. *Right of Employer to Balance Its Needs With Employee's Professional Development.* Employer reserves the right to determine whether Employee is devoting the appropriate amount of time to professional development and may review and direct Employee to balance the amount of time deemed necessary for his professional development against the other needs of Employer.
- E. *County Residence Required.* Employee shall establish within 90 days after the date of this Agreement and thereafter maintain a permanent residence in Albemarle County. *Permanent residence* means Employee's purchase or lease of a residential dwelling unit and the occupancy of that dwelling no less than 75% of the time during an average work week while in the active employment of the County.
- F. *End of Employment by Termination or Resignation.* Employee's employment by Employer may end as follows:
1. *Right of Employer to Terminate.* The Employee acknowledges that, pursuant to Section 15.2-510 of the *Code of Virginia* (1950), as amended, he may be removed at the pleasure of Employer. The right of Employer to terminate includes the right to do so if Employee is permanently disabled or is otherwise unable to perform his duties because of sickness, accident, injury, mental incapacity, or health for a period of 12 successive weeks. Employer's action to terminate Employee shall be by the affirmative vote of a majority of those members of Employer present and voting in an open meeting.
 2. *Other Acts When Employee Deemed Terminated.* Employee is deemed terminated in the following circumstances:
 - a. *Employee's Resignation at Request of Employer.* If Employee resigns following a closed meeting of Employer at which a majority of the members present request in writing that he resign, then Employee shall be deemed terminated on the date of the Board's request for purposes of Section 8.

- b. *Employer's Failure to Comply with Terms of Agreement; Deemed Terminated at Option of Employee.* If Employer fails to comply with any provision of this Agreement that benefits Employee, the matter is not resolved within 30 days after written notice from Employee requesting Employer to comply is received by Employer and the County Attorney, and after a closed meeting discussion between Employer and Employee the matter remains unresolved, then Employee may, at his option, be deemed terminated on the date of the closed meeting discussion for purposes of Section 8. This subsection does not apply if Employee expressly consents to Employer's noncompliance.
 - c. *Employer Reduces Compensation and Benefits; Deemed Terminated at Option of Employee.* If Employer reduces Employee's compensation or other financial benefits in a greater percentage than a corresponding reduction for all other management level employees of Employer, or for a reason not related to budget reductions caused by the adverse fiscal circumstances of the County, then Employee may, at his option, be deemed terminated on the effective date of the reduction for purposes of Section 8.
3. *Right of Employee to Resign.* Employee may resign at any time, provided that he gives written notice to Employer at least 45 days prior to the effective date of the resignation, unless Employer and Employee agree to a different effective date.
- G. *Employee's Rights and Benefits if Employer Terminates Employee, Employee is Deemed Terminated, or Employee Resigns at the Request of Employer.* If Employer terminates Employee, Employee is deemed terminated, or Employee resigns at the request of Employer, Employee's rights to benefits and compensation shall be governed under Section 8.
- H. *Governing Law.* This Agreement and the employment of Employee shall be subject to all applicable provisions of the *Code of Virginia* (1950).

3. Powers and Duties of Employee

Employee shall exercise the following powers and perform the following duties:

- A. *Statutory Powers and Duties.* The statutory powers and duties set forth in Section 15.2-516 of the *Code of Virginia* (1950), as amended, and any other powers and duties set forth in any other sections of the *Code of Virginia* (1950), as amended.
- B. *Powers and Duties Imposed by Ordinance or Other Action of the Employer.* The powers and duties delegated or imposed: (i) by the Albemarle County Code; or (ii) a duly adopted motion, resolution, or uncodified ordinance of Employer.
- C. *Developing and Recommending Policies.* Developing and recommending personnel and other policies and revisions to the Board of Supervisors for its approval.

4. Compensation

Employer shall pay and contribute the following as compensation to Employee:

- A. *Salary.* Employer shall pay Employee, and Employee shall accept from Employer, an annual base salary of \$217,000, payable in installments as provided for County employees generally.
 - 1. *Increase Based on Market Adjustment for the Position.* If Employer determines that, following Employee's annual performance evaluation, Employee's performance is satisfactory, Employer may consider increasing Employee's annual base salary. Employer may submit to Employer before September 30 of each year a survey of the market for comparable positions and localities to assist Employer's decision to consider a market adjustment to Employee's annual base salary.
 - 2. *Increase Based on Cost of Living Adjustment for All County Employees.* In addition or in the alternative to the increase provided in Section 4(A)(1), in the event that all full-time County staff receive a cost of living pay adjustment during the fiscal year, Employee shall receive the same cost of living adjustment, provided Employer determines that Employee's performance is satisfactory.
- B. *Deferred Compensation.* Employer shall contribute annually an amount equal to 10% of the amount of the Employee's annual base salary in effect at that time, payable in installments as provided for County employees' salaries, to an eligible deferred

compensation program selected by the Employee. This contribution may be applied to the County's deferred compensation program (Internal Revenue Code § 457) and as a voluntary contribution to the defined contribution component (Internal Revenue Code § 401(a)) of the Hybrid Retirement Plan under the Virginia Retirement System.

- C. *Vehicle Allowance.* Employer agrees to provide the Employee an annual motor vehicle allowance of \$6,300, payable in installments as provided for County employees' salaries, for a motor vehicle that shall be used by Employee for County-related business and may also be used by Employee for personal use.
- D. *Life Insurance.* Employer agrees to provide an additional term life insurance policy for Employee that pays a benefit equal to one year of Employee's annual base salary, payable in installments as provided for County employees' salaries. The insurer shall be a life insurance company providing supplemental term life insurance policies to County employees through the Virginia Retirement System.

5. Benefits

Employer shall provide the following benefits to Employee:

- A. *Virginia Retirement System.* Employee shall be enrolled in the Hybrid Retirement Plan under the Virginia Retirement System. The Employer will contribute the Employer's portion and the Employee will contribute the Employee's portion as provided under the Hybrid Retirement Plan.
- B. *Leave.* Upon commencing employment:
 - 1. *Annual Leave.* Employee shall be credited with 20 hours of accrued annual leave and 20 hours of accrued sick leave. In addition, Employee shall accrue annual leave at the rate an employee with 25 years or more of consecutive employment with the County would accrue.
 - 2. *All Other Forms of Leave.* Employee shall be entitled to and accrue all other forms of leave at the rate provided to full-time permanent County employees under the County's Personnel Policy Manual.
- C. *Long Term Disability.* Employee will receive long-term disability insurance provided by the Hybrid Retirement Plan under the Virginia Retirement System.
- D. *Other Benefits.* Employer shall provide to Employee all other benefits that are provided to all full-time permanent County employees under the County's Personnel Policy Manual. These benefits include, but are not limited to, medical insurance, dental insurance, and the Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program (VERIP) when Employee meets VERIP eligibility requirements. In addition, after completing five years of continuous service, Employee remains eligible to participate in the medical insurance plan upon termination by paying the full premium amount until age 65 or until Employee is eligible for medical insurance with another employer. This Agreement shall be subject to all applicable provisions of the *Code of Virginia* (1950), as amended, the Albemarle County Code, and any policies adopted from time to time by Employer, including the provisions of County Personnel Policy Manual, relating to leave, retirement, and life insurance contributions, holidays, and other benefits not specifically addressed in this Agreement.

6. Dues, Memberships, Education, and Meetings

Employer shall budget and pay the following for Employee:

- A. *Dues and Subscriptions in Associations and Organizations.* Employer shall budget and pay for the professional dues and subscriptions of Employee necessary for his continuation and full participation in national, regional, state, and local associations and organizations necessary and desirable for his continued professional participation, growth, and advancement, and for the good of Employer.
- B. *Travel Expenses.* Employer shall budget for and pay the travel and subsistence expenses of Employee for professional and official travel, meetings, and occasions adequate to continue the professional development of Employee and to adequately pursue necessary official and other functions for Employer, including but not limited to the annual conference of national, regional, state and local government groups and committees thereof which Employee serves as a member.
- C. *Professional Development Expenses.* Employer shall budget and pay for the travel and subsistence expenses of Employee's degree courses, institutes, and seminars that are necessary for his professional development and for the good of Employer.

7. Performance Evaluations

Employer and Employee shall participate in performance evaluations as follows:

- A. *Annual Performance Evaluation.* Employer shall conduct an annual performance evaluation of Employee on or before October 31 of each year that this Agreement is in effect. The evaluation shall be in accordance with the specific criteria developed jointly by Employer and Employee. The criteria may be changed from time to time by Employer, in consultation with Employee. Employer shall provide Employee with a written summary of the Employer's evaluation of Employee's performance and provide Employee an adequate opportunity to discuss the evaluation.
- B. *Employee's Annual Goals and Objectives.* Employer shall annually establish goals and performance objectives which it determines necessary for the County's proper operation and Employee's attainment of his written policy objectives.
- C. *Interim Performance Evaluations.* Employer and Employee shall meet to discuss Employee's performance if either Employer or Employee requests to meet for that purpose.

8. Compensation and Benefits Upon Severance

If Employer terminates Employee pursuant to Section 2(F)(1), or Employee is deemed terminated pursuant to Section 2(F)(2) (collectively, "severance"), the following apply:

- A. *Compensation and Health Insurance Benefits.* Employer shall pay for the continuation of all compensation provided in Sections 4(A) and (B), and medical and dental insurance benefits provided in Section 5(D), for the current month in which the severance occurs, and for 9 additional months, payable in installments as provided for County employees' salaries.
- B. *Accrued Leave.* Employer shall compensate Employee for all annual leave credited and earned up to the date of severance as provided in the County's Personnel Policy Manual.
- C. *Exception for Termination for Cause or Voluntary Resignation.* If Employer terminates Employee for cause or if Employee voluntarily resigns, Employer shall have no obligation to compensate Employee under Sections 8(A) and (B) and shall be obligated to compensate Employee for work performed and accrued unused annual leave, and provide other compensation and benefits only up to the date of termination or voluntary resignation as provided in the County's Personnel Policy Manual. If Employee was terminated because Employee is permanently disabled or is otherwise unable to perform his duties because of sickness, accident, injury, mental incapacity or health for a period of 12 successive weeks as provided under Section 2(F)(1), Employer shall pay Employee for 25% of all unused accrued sick leave earned up to the date of termination. *Cause* exists for Employer to terminate Employee under this subsection if Employee is convicted of any illegal act involving personal gain to him or which causes damage to the reputation of the County or Employer, his conviction of a felony, an act of willful negligence, or his commission of any act which involves moral turpitude.

9. Moving and Relocation Expenses

Employer shall reimburse Employee for the following moving and relocation expenses:

- A. *Expenses for Travel for Meetings with County Officials Before Beginning Employment.* Employer shall reimburse Employee for the cost of hotels and meals, plus vehicle mileage, to travel from Shelby, North Carolina to Albemarle County prior Employee's first day of work for Employer to meet with County officials. To obtain reimbursement for hotels and meals, Employee shall submit to Employer receipts for all hotel and meal expenses to be reimbursed. To obtain reimbursement for vehicle mileage, Employee shall submit odometer readings. Employer will reimburse Employee for vehicle mileage at the approved County rate in effect at the time of travel.
- B. *Moving Expenses.* Employer shall reimburse Employee for the cost of moving himself and his family from Shelby, North Carolina to Albemarle County. Eligible moving expenses are packing, moving, storing during the moving process, unpacking, and insuring Employee's family's personal belongings. To obtain reimbursement for moving expenses, Employee shall obtain cost quotations from 3 moving companies and submit these quotations to Employer. Employer's representative and Employee shall consult and select the moving company. The total reimbursement by Employer to Employee under this subsection shall not exceed \$10,000.
- C. *Interim Housing Supplement.* Employer shall pay Employee an interim housing supplement of \$1,500 per month, payable in monthly installments, for up to 9 months beginning November 2017 or the month in which Employee closes on the purchase of a residence, whichever occurs first. The total payment by Employer to Employee under this subsection shall not exceed \$13,500.

10. Other Terms and Conditions

The following terms and conditions apply:

- A. *Liability Insurance.* Employer shall provide full liability insurance, in an amount at least equal to that provided for the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors and its individual members, to cover Employee against any loss from tort, professional liability claim, demand, or other legal action, whether groundless or otherwise, arising out of an alleged act or omission occurring in the performance of Employee's duties as County Executive, unless the act or omission occurring in the performance of Employee's duties involved willful or wanton conduct.
- B. *Bonds.* Employer shall pay the full cost of any fidelity or other bonds required of Employee under any law, including any County ordinance.
- C. *Amendments.* Any amendment to this Agreement shall be mutually agreed upon, stated in writing, and executed by Employer and Employee.
- D. *Failure to Enforce Not a Waiver.* The failure of either Employer or Employee to enforce, or to delay in enforcing, any term or condition of this Agreement, shall not be deemed to be a waiver of that party's right to enforce the term or condition.
- E. *Severability.* The terms and conditions of this Agreement are severable. In the event any term or condition is held to be invalid by any competent court, this Agreement shall be interpreted as if the invalid term or condition was not part of the Agreement.
- F. *Notices.* Any notice required by this Agreement to be provided to Employer shall be in writing and delivered to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of Albemarle, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia, 22902. Any notice required by this Agreement to be provided to Employee shall be in writing and delivered to Employee at his permanent residence.
- H. *Nonappropriation.* The financial obligations of Employer under this Agreement are subject to, and dependent upon, appropriations being made from time to time by Employer.
- I. *Entire Agreement.* This Agreement is the entire agreement between the parties. There are no inducements, promises, terms, conditions, or obligations made or entered into by either Employer or Employee other than those contained in this Agreement.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors has caused this Agreement to be signed and executed on its behalf by its Chair and the Employee has signed and executed this Agreement, both in duplicate, the day and year first above written.

SIGNATURES ARE ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE

ALBEMARLE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Diantha McKeel, Chair
Albemarle County Board of Supervisors

Jeff Richardson

Agenda Item No. 11. Adjourn to September 13, 2017, 3:30 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 1:39 p.m., Ms. McKeel adjourned the Board to September 13, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in Lane Auditorium.

Chairman

Approved by Board

Date 11/01/2017

Initials CKB