

A regular day meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on April 3, 2019, at 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeff Richardson, 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 1:00 p.m., by the Chair, Mr. Gallaway.

Agenda Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.
Agenda Item No. 3. Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Ms. McKeel **moved** that the Board adopt the final agenda. 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. Dill, Mr. Gallaway and Ms. Mallek.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 5. Brief Announcements by Board Members.

Mr. Gallaway introduced the presiding security officers, Lt. Teri Walls and Officer Jason Freishtat, and County staff at the dais.

Mr. Randolph announced that Piedmont Virginia Community College has been cited nationally as the top community college in the United States for service on behalf and to veterans. He commended PVCC President Frank Friedman and his staff.

Mr. Randolph remarked that he often receives emails from constituents about the buildup of trash along highways in the County. He said that County citizen support is needed for not throwing trash out of automobiles and to ensure that trash haulers properly attach required coverings while taking trash to the recycling center at Zion Crossroads. He said that these are both critical needs that are out there and he would urge anyone that sees trash being thrown out to call 911 with the license plate number, as it was a violation of Virginia law to throw trash from a moving vehicles and it costs the state and County money to clean it up.

Ms. McKeel added that last year the Jail Board reappropriated additional funds to continue utilizing the services of inmates to pick up trash. She recounted how she recently assisted the Adopt-A-Highway Program with litter pick up along Barracks Road and the Bypass ramps, and they collected 17 bags of litter from just a three-block stretch as well as car parts, plastic pails, and other items. She described the litter in the community as being "appalling."

Ms. Palmer agreed with her fellow Board members assessments and remarked that she has often witnessed debris blowing out of the back of pickup trucks. She noted that the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) was conducting an educational campaign directed at those who bring materials to the Ivy Recycling Center.

Ms. McKeel said she called the police last week on a hauler who was transporting branches and tree debris and did not have a cover. She said the police officer informed her the hauler was not in violation and remarked that the problem was usually not with professional haulers but with mom and pop businesses.

Ms. McKeel recalled anti-littering campaigns in the schools and suggested that they partner with the schools on something similar.

Ms. Palmer and Mr. Randolph agreed with Ms. McKeel's suggestion to involve the schools.

Ms. Palmer announced that the Cove Garden Ruritans would host a town hall for her and School Board Member Graham Paige on April 4, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. She said they would discuss the budget, broadband, and anything else constituents' desires.

Ms. Palmer announced that North Garden Farmers Market would open soon, would be located at Albemarle Cider Works this year, and she would have dates and times at the April 10 Board of Supervisors meeting.

Ms. Mallek noted that there has been discussion in Crozet, particularly with the Crozet trails crew, about allowing dogs to be off leash on the trails and greenways. She said that Parks and Recreation have conducted an evaluation and concluded that since trails and greenways are part of the parks system that users must follow the parks' rules that require dogs to be leashed, unless it was within one of the dog parks. She said that a new brochure would be issued by the Police Department and our Animal Protection Officers that would clarify things.

Agenda Item No. 6a. Proclamations and Recognitions: Proclamation Recognizing April 2019 as National County Government Month:

Mr. Randolph read and **moved** to adopt the following Proclamation declaring the month of April 2019 National County Government Month:

NATIONAL COUNTY GOVERNMENT MONTH

WHEREAS, the nation's 3,069 counties serving more than 300 million Americans provide essential services to create healthy, safe and vibrant communities; and

WHEREAS, Albemarle County's continuing commitment to "connecting the unconnected," this year's theme, is demonstrated through efforts to deliver people-centered services for all our residents – demonstrated through the development of the County's first Equity Profile, which will kick off of the community engagement phase beginning this month; and

WHEREAS, Albemarle County and all counties take pride in their responsibility to protect and enhance the health, welfare, and safety of all of its residents effectively and efficiently; and

WHEREAS, to remain healthy, vibrant and safe, America's counties provide public health, justice, safety, infrastructure, transportation, technology, environmental stewardship and economic services that play a key role in everything from residents' daily commutes to emergency response; and

WHEREAS, each year since 1991 the National Association of Counties has encouraged counties across the country to actively promote their own programs and services to the public they serve.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, do hereby proclaim

April 1 through April 30, 2019
as
National County Government Month

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. Dill, Mr. Gallaway and Ms. Mallek.

NAYS: None.

Ms. Siri Russell, Director of the Office of Equity and Inclusion, accepted the recognition. She thanked the Board and remarked that her office was excited to see that the Virginia Association of Counties (VACO's) theme aligns with the work the County was already doing, serves to strengthen the County's platform, and highlights their ongoing commitment to elevating equity in service.

Agenda Item No. 7. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Ms. Barbara Cruickshank, resident of Earlysville, addressed the Board. She presented the Board with a letter written by Dr. Deborah Davis, an epidemiologist, scientist, and founder of the Environmental Health Trust. She said that Dr. Davis has been a speaker at the Miller Center and is very highly regarded. She said Dr. Davis discussed the effects of radio frequency radiation on human health and in the letter expressed that cell towers should not be placed on school grounds as they expose children to extremely high levels of radiofrequency radiation. She said that symptoms of electromagnetic hypersensitivity include headaches, mood disorders, anxiety, depression, nose bleeds, dizziness, sleep interruptions, and more. Ms. Cruickshank said she personally knows because she developed hypersensitivity several years ago. She invited the Board to comment on the letter. She said the World Health Organization, because of the radiation exposures that we now have, is calling electromagnetic sensitivity an emerging global public health threat and declared it to be a carcinogen. She said that a March 2019 issue of *Newsweek* included an article about an elementary school in the Ripon Unified School District in California that has had four students develop cancer, and parents are asking the school to decommission a cell tower on the property. She expressed concern with the increase to 5G and asked that the Board not vote to add additional cell towers on school property.

Ms. Janie Pudhorodsky, resident of the Rio District, Co-President of IMPACT, and a member of the Church of the Incarnation, addressed the Board. She reminded the Board that her organization supports affordable housing, especially for seniors, and has called for the construction of 150 units for County residents age 65+ at 50% of AMI and below by the year 2023. She said they support creation of a permanent affordable housing fund with monies allocated annually to allow for a wide range of strategies to begin to make a difference with those who struggle for housing. She said IMPACT has shared the Center for Community Change's Affordable Housing Trust Fund's project research and materials with Board members. She noted that the County's housing needs assessment has affirmed IMPACT's research and proposals, which includes a finding that 4,145 County families below the 50% AMI struggle to keep roofs over their heads and that seniors in both the urban and rural areas are struggling. She said that, as of December, only 28 homes are available to families at 50% and below AMI. She noted that the housing needs assessment recommends increasing the number of affordable rental units and fully accessible units for seniors and to examine the creation of a permanent housing fund and methods for capitalizing a fund. She invited Supervisors to attend IMPACT's Nehemiah Action meeting on April 11 at 6:30 p.m. and expect that over 1,000 would attend. She urged the Board to attend to follow through on these needs and the recommendations they are hearing from staff.

Ms. Deborah Van Erzel, Chief Administrative Officer of the University of Virginia Foundation and Director of Marketing for the University of Virginia Research Park, addressed the Board. She recognized that the Board would hold a work session on transportation this afternoon. She said the Foundation is in the process of extending a road through the Research Park to Airport Road and there is a small section that takes a driver off Berkmar into Hollymead Town Center. She said that this connection to Airport Road would make a great connection into the Research Park, facilitate more economic development within the designated growth area and enable the Foundation to be more efficient with transportation through the 29 North corridor. She said the Foundation partners in a shuttle that transports people from the Research Park to the University grounds, and they would like that to be more robust and be connected to Hollymead Town Center. She stated that small piece of road did not rate highly in the Smart Scale application process and asked the County to make this a priority as this connection would allow the 1,500 workers in the Research Park to access amenities. She noted that she also serves as President of the Albemarle Housing Improvement Program and asked the Board to not forget the rehabilitation side of affordable housing to preserve existing housing stock, help people preserve the wealth they have in their homes, and preserve neighborhoods. She recognized others in the audience whom she said would be able to speak to this.

Ms. Sheila Herlihy, Board member of IMPACT (Interfaith Movement Promoting Action by Congregations Together) and an employee of The Church of the Incarnation in the Rio Hill District, addressed the Board. She stated that there are many County residents who struggle to get by as they pay an inordinate percentage of their incomes for housing. She noted that the housing needs analysis will support and affirm all of the issues she has been observing on the ground for years. She said IMPACT discovered that over 2,800 senior households in the County are burdened by the cost of housing, and 933 of these households pay over half of their income for housing. Ms. Herlihy invited Supervisors to attend the Nehemiah Action on April 11 at Martin Luther King Performing Arts Center to affirm their leadership in this area. She expressed support for an affordable housing fund in the County and noted that these are recognized as a national best practice, could leverage 8.5 times the money contributed and represents a better strategy compared to the piecemeal way that has been used in the past.

Mr. Sean Tubbs, of the Piedmont Environmental Council, addressed the Board and said he would comment on two agenda items. He described the housing needs analysis to be presented later in the meeting as being very thorough and said that coupled with the metrics in the Planning Commission's annual report would provide a baseline going forward to measure whether the increase in supply would address the affordability crisis and will more units translate into cheaper housing. He said that is a question that should be tracked in order to inform policy as we continue to update the policy. He noted that Community Development was putting together a capacity analysis and that keeping this data was going to be crucial as we go forward because growth is happening. He recognized that the Planning Commission recently approved three infill projects, with one of them representing the idea of the bonus density provision, which he supports. He suggested that the County track the number of units that were kept or made affordable as a result of this, as this was one way to expand affordability and the terms and the length of time units remain affordable. He stated that denser development requires additional transportation choices, and he commended the Transportation Priorities Report that would be presented to the Board. He added that he was pleased Kevin McDermott was taking the metrics from Smart Scale and applying them to the rankings. He commended the Board's leadership in regional transit and noted that he has a bus pass and does his part to reduce single-occupancy vehicle driving.

Mr. Neil Williamson, President of the Free Enterprise Forum, addressed the Board. He said the Free Enterprise Forum is a privately funded organization focused on issues of public policy in Charlottesville and surrounding localities. He said they are proud to have been engaged in the drafting of the chapter on biodiversity of the Comprehensive Plan, though they continue to see this chapter out of sync with the balance of the Comprehensive Plan. He said the chapter reads more like a college-level term paper, including footnotes, than a locality's Comprehensive Plan. He said the biodiversity chapter's desire for large, unfragmented habitats is in direct opposition to the affordable housing summary to be presented by Dr. Pethia, which notes that large lot subdivision exacerbates the issue of rural housing affordability. He agrees that habitat fragmentation could occur with parcelization, though many

subdivisions have been designed to maintain habitat, thereby protecting the environment and property rights. He said the document contains a fundamental question about comprehensive planning which was whether a Comprehensive Plan should guide or direct. He suggested that given the Board's position that its actions cannot encumber future boards that guidance was a better choice. The Free Enterprise Forum proposes the rewriting of Strategy 4L whose objective currently reads "retain a position for a County staff member with expertise in conservation biology." He suggested that this was a directive that could be better expressed as "ensure adequate and appropriate resources to implement the Action Plan for Biodiversity", as this language was much more aligned with the County's discussion in other areas, especially public safety. He expressed hope that the Board would consider a specific discussion on Strategy 4D, Preserve Existing Vegetation in Areas Shown as Parks and Green Space on Development Area Master Plans. He stated that in recent months we have witnessed public perception of private property as parks and green space in Pantops and unless Albemarle is prepared to purchase such parcels, The Free Enterprise Forum hopes the Board would carefully consider the language that suggests it control usage of such private property.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

Ms. Mallek **moved** that the Board approve the consent agenda. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Palmer. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Item No. 8.1. FY 19 Appropriations.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that Virginia Code §15.2-2507 provides that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget; provided, however, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The Code section applies to all County funds, i.e., General Fund, Capital Funds, E911, School Self-Sustaining, etc.

The total change to the FY 19 budget due to the appropriations itemized in Attachment A is \$1,472,025.00. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the amount of the cumulative appropriations does not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget. Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) to approve the appropriations for local government and school projects and programs as described in Attachment A.

| | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Appropriation #2019077 | | \$66,000.00 |
| Source: | ECC Fund Balance | \$ 66,000.00 |

The Emergency Communication Center (ECC) requests that the County, acting as fiscal agent for the ECC, appropriate funding from the ECC fund balance to provide \$65,000 for elevator repairs and \$1,000 for an employee recognition ceremony.

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation #2019078 | | \$0.00 |
| Source: | Economic Development Fund | \$ (11,750.00) |
| | Economic Development Authority | \$ 11,750.00 |

*This appropriation does not increase or decrease the total County budget.

This request is to amend appropriations #2019016 and #2019021, which re-appropriated funding for the Economic Development Authority and Economic Development Fund and were approved by the Board of Supervisors at its August 1, 2018 meeting. This appropriation reallocates \$11,750.00 from the Economic Development Fund to the Economic Development Authority to reconcile the fund where expenditures will take place for the Virginia Jobs Investment Program (VJIP) funding match for Perrone Robotics.

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------|
| Appropriation #2019079 | | \$0.00 |
| Source: | School Capital Projects* \$1,201,200.00 | |

*This appropriation does not increase or decrease the total County budget.

This request is to appropriate \$500,000.00 from the Woodbrook Addition, Modernization, & Renovation capital project and \$701,200.00 from the Learning Space Modernization capital project with an available balance of \$701,200.00 for a total appropriated budget of \$1,201,200.00 for First Grade classroom furniture in all elementary schools. Compared to the original scope of the Learning Space Modernization capital project, this increases the number of classrooms addressed. This does not increase the total County budget, and does not require a change in total borrowed funds.

| | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Appropriation #2019080 | | \$1,406,025.00 |
| Source: | General Fund School Reserve Fund | \$ 1,387,020.00 |
| | State Revenue | \$ 19,005.00 |

This request is to appropriate the following School Division appropriation request approved by the School Board on February 14:

- This request is to re-appropriate \$502,270.00 in General Fund School Reserve Fund balance from FY 18 to FY 19 to complete projects previously approved by the School Board on March 8, 2018 as a one-time Project Funding request. The projects were classroom furnishings, Center One costs, and the classroom interior and exterior window shades. These projects were started but not completed in the prior fiscal year, and although the projects cross fiscal years, they continue to be one-time expenditures.

This request is to appropriate the following School Division appropriation request approved by the School Board on February 28:

- This request is to appropriate \$884,750.00 in General Fund School Reserve Fund balance to support one-time funding items discussed by the School Board February 14, 2019 as part of the School Division's 2nd Quarter Financial Report. On February 28, 2019, the School Division approved the following projects to begin and be completed during the current fiscal year: \$100,000.00 for the library catalog system, \$115,000.00 for computers for high school specialty labs, \$109,750.00 for the security camera system, \$280,000.00 for the K-2 digital learning initiative for first grade devices, \$30,000.00 for enhancing school entrances with panic buttons, and \$250,000.00 for the mobile classroom set-up at Brownsville Elementary School.
- This request is to appropriate \$5,000.00 in State revenue from the Virginia Department of Education for the Algebra Readiness program to provide mathematics intervention services to middle school students who are at risk of failing.
- This request is to appropriate \$14,005.00 in State revenue from the Virginia Department of Education for a Project Graduation grant awarded to Albemarle County Public Schools to provide remedial instruction for students who received passing grades for standard credit-bearing courses but failed the required SOL assessment needed to verify credits to complete their diploma requirements. Courses supported are Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, English: Reading, English: Writing, Science, and History.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following Resolution to approve the appropriations for local government and school projects and programs:

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
 ADDITIONAL FY 19 APPROPRIATIONS**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors:

- 1) That Appropriations #2019077, #2019078, #2019079 and #2019080 are approved; and
- 2) That the appropriations referenced in Paragraph #1, above, are subject to the provisions set forth in the Annual Resolution of Appropriations of the County of Albemarle for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2019.

**COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION SUMMARY**

| APP# | ACCOUNT | AMOUNT | DESCRIPTION |
|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 2019077 | 3-4100-51000-351000-510100-9999 | 66,000.00 | SA2019077 ECC FB: Elevator and Employee Rec. Ceremony |
| 2019077 | 4-4100-31040-435600-332100-1003 | 65,000.00 | SA2019077 Elevator |
| 2019077 | 4-4100-31040-435600-382040-1003 | 1,000.00 | SA2019077 Employee Recognition Ceremony |
| 2019078 | 4-1820-81050-481050-950029-1008 | -11,750.00 | SA2019078 Correction to #2019016 and #2019021 - VJIP Incentive |
| 2019078 | 4-1820-93010-493010-930222-1008 | 11,750.00 | SA2019078 Correction to #2019016 and #2019021 - VJIP Incentive |
| 2019078 | 3-6850-51000-351000-512000-9999 | 11,750.00 | SA2019078 Correction to #2019016 and #2019021 - VJIP Incentive |
| 2019078 | 4-6850-91095-491095-950029-1008 | 11,750.00 | SA2019078 Correction to #2019016 and #2019021 - VJIP Incentive |
| 2019079 | 4-9000-69983-466730-999999-6112 | -500,000.00 | SA2019079 Woodbrook to LSM 1st grade furniture |
| 2019079 | 4-9000-69983-466732-800605-6599 | -543,173.00 | SA2019079 LSM to LSM 1st grade furniture |
| 2019079 | 4-9000-69983-466732-800200-6599 | 1,043,173.00 | SA2019079 LSM 1st grade furniture |
| 2019080 | 3-1005-51000-351000-510100-9999 | 502,270.00 | SA2019080 Carry forward 17-18 One-Time projects |
| 2019080 | 3-2000-51000-351000-510109-9999 | 502,270.00 | SA2019080 Carry forward 17-18 One-Time projects |
| 2019080 | 4-2000-62433-464600-800200- | 502,270.00 | SA2019080 Carry forward 17-18 One- |

| | | | |
|---------|---------------------------------|--------------|---|
| | 6599 | | Time projects |
| 2019080 | 4-1005-93010-493010-930000-9999 | 502,270.00 | SA2019080 Carry forward 17-18 One-Time projects |
| 2019080 | 3-1005-51000-351000-510100-9999 | 884,750.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time Sch Reserve Fund Balance |
| 2019080 | 3-2000-51000-351000-510109-9999 | 884,750.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time Transfer Sch Reserve Fund Balance |
| 2019080 | 3-3907-63907-351000-510109-6599 | 504,750.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time School Operating Fund Transfer to Fund 3907 |
| 2019080 | 4-2000-62114-461320-800712-6502 | 100,000.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time Library Catalog System |
| 2019080 | 4-3907-63907-468300-800700-6599 | 115,000.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time Computers for High School Specialty Labs |
| 2019080 | 4-3907-63907-468200-800733-6599 | 109,750.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time Security Camera System |
| 2019080 | 4-3907-63907-468300-800700-6599 | 280,000.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time K-2 Digital Learning Initiative: 1st Grade Devices |
| 2019080 | 4-2000-62433-464600-800200-6599 | 30,000.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time Enhance School Entrances with Panic Buttons |
| 2019080 | 4-2000-62433-462420-540200-6102 | 250,000.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time Brownsville Mobile Classroom Set-up |
| 2019080 | 4-2000-62115-493010-939999-6503 | 504,750.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time School Operating Fund Transfer to Fund 3907 |
| 2019080 | 4-1005-93010-493010-930000-9999 | 884,750.00 | SA2019080 18-19 One-Time Sch Reserve Fund Balance Transfer |
| 2019080 | 3-3217-63217-324000-240296-6599 | 14,005.00 | SA2019080 Project Graduation |
| 2019080 | 4-3217-63217-461101-132100-6530 | 12,076.17 | SA2019080 Project Graduation |
| 2019080 | 4-3217-63217-461101-210000-6530 | 923.83 | SA2019080 Project Graduation |
| 2019080 | 4-3217-63217-461101-601300-6530 | 1,005.00 | SA2019080 Project Graduation |
| 2019080 | 3-3152-63152-324000-240405-6599 | 5,000.00 | SA2019080 Algebra Readiness |
| 2019080 | 4-3152-63152-463333-132100-6530 | 4,644.68 | SA2019080 Algebra Readiness |
| 2019080 | 4-3152-63152-463333-210000-6530 | 355.32 | SA2019080 Algebra Readiness |
| | | | |
| TOTAL | | 6,751,090.00 | |

Item No. 8.2. Request to JAUNT to Form a Subsidiary.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the Board of Supervisors and the Economic Development Authority determined the Autonomous Vehicle program (the "Project") will promote economic development as it may enable Perrone Robotics to expand its business and further anchor its headquarters in Albemarle County. The Board also determined the Project may inform staff about impacts to long-term plans, such as the Comprehensive Plan, the Capital Improvement Plan, as well as the future built environment in the County's Development Areas.

Perrone Robotics and JAUNT have been working in concert with Albemarle County to operate the Project in Crozet with a professional safety-trained driver on board supplied by JAUNT. The County Attorney's Office was asked to research the formation of a Public Service Corporation (PSC) to oversee the Project and could not find the practical legal authority for Albemarle County to create such an entity. Therefore, staff recommends that the Board authorize the County Executive to request that JAUNT form a subsidiary, or another appropriate entity, to provide project oversight (see Attachment A).

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following Resolution of Support authorizing the County Executive to request that JAUNT form a subsidiary to oversee the Autonomous Vehicle Pilot in Crozet and authorized the County Executive to prepare and sign a letter to the CEO of JAUNT requesting JAUNT to pursue a subsidiary, or other appropriate entity, that could provide project oversight:

RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT JAUNT CREATING A SUBSIDIARY TO OVERSEE THE AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE PILOT IN CROZET

WHEREAS, the Board finds it is in the best interest of the County to support an Automated Driving System (ADS) Autonomous Vehicle Pilot in Crozet to gather significant data to inform rulemaking, foster collaboration amongst agencies, local government and private partners; and test the safe integration of ADS on neighboring roads.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby

authorizes this resolution as a request for JAUNT to create a subsidiary or other appropriate entity to oversee this pilot program, and authorizes the County Executive to prepare and sign a letter to the CEO of JAUNT requesting JAUNT to pursue a subsidiary, or other appropriate entity, that could provide project oversight.

Item No. 8.3. County Transportation Planner Quarterly Report, ***was received for information.***

Item No. 8.4. Natural Heritage Committee Annual Report, ***was received for information.***

Item No. 8.5. 2018 Annual Report of the Board of Zoning Appeals, ***was received for information.***

Item No. 8.6. Board-to-Board, March 2019, a monthly report from the Albemarle County School Board to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, ***was received for information.***

Agenda Item No. 9. **Work Session:** Update on Regional Housing Needs Assessment and Next Steps.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that in December 2018, Albemarle County entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission for the completion of a regional housing needs assessment. The scope of work for this assessment includes a review of housing market conditions, the need for market-rate and affordable housing, and the issues and barriers that are inhibiting the market's ability to provide affordable housing options.

The results of the analyses are presented at a regional level, as well as for Albemarle County. The report also identifies distinctions between housing needs in the County's Development Areas and those in our more rural communities. The report is in the final editing phase with an anticipated release in early April. However, as these edits are not related to the research findings, staff believe this is an appropriate time to begin discussing the data and our proposed work plan to address housing needs in our communities.

A review of the data indicates increases in housing costs are impacting both homeowners and renters. Approximately 20 percent of all homeowners and 34 percent of renter households are estimated to be paying more than the officially recognized affordable housing expenditure of 30 percent of monthly income. While the County's lowest-income residents are particularly burdened by high housing costs, higher income households are feeling financially pinched, particularly households whose incomes fall between 60 percent and 80 percent of the local area median income of \$89,600 per year.

The report identifies a number of factors leading to the housing supply-demand mismatch including constraints in the region's housing stock and a prevalence of low-wage, part-time jobs in the service and tourism sectors. As the total number of households paying more than the recommended 30 percent of income towards housing in Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville is expected to increase from 10,700 (2,589 homeowners and 9,820 renters) to 14,850 (2,930 homeowners and 11,920 renters) by the year 2040, staff believe it is important to begin work on updating our housing policy. To begin that updating process, staff is seeking guidance from the Board of Supervisors on setting housing priorities, recommendations for which are outlined in the 'Next Steps' section of Attachment A.

Additionally, staff is asking for guidance on the Board of Supervisors' preferred process for completing the update itself. Attachment A presents two paths that process can take. The first is through a Board appointed housing committee. Staff believes this approach will require much more time and a housing committee may be more appropriate for the implementation of the updated policy.

Alternatively, the policy update could be completed via a staff-led process similar to the process used for development of recent small area plans. Staff believes this approach will more quickly lead to implementation of an updated policy. Both processes have positive and negative characteristics associated with the breadth of community representation, costs associated with the work, and time to completion. Again, the pros and cons of each method are outlined in Attachment A.

There is no direct budgetary impact specifically related to this information.

Staff recommends the Board receive the information provided in the presentation and Attachment A, then direct staff to:

1. Provide a Resolution of Intent (ROI) to the Planning Commission for initiating an update of the County's Affordable Housing Policy, using this assessment as guidance for this update; and
 2. Include with this proposed ROI, an outline of a staff led process that assures community engagement is adequately addressed.
-

Ms. Stacy Pethia, Housing Planner, presented. She invited Mr. Chip Boyles to give an update of the ongoing process as the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) commissioned the report and will lead the development of a regional housing strategy.

Mr. Chip Boyles, Executive Director of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, addressed the Board. He thanked the County for its participation in the regional housing analysis, the regional housing strategic plan, and the newly created regional housing partnership. He noted that the County's data in the report to be presented by Ms. Pethia was a component of the regional housing study where the TJPDC was looking at several local jurisdictions, beginning with Albemarle but also Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa and Nelson to look at housing in a regional way, with Albemarle being distinctive in that it has both rural and urban components. He indicated that the report was largely complete except for finalization of the executive summary, and it would be shared with TJPDC and the regional jurisdictions with the data to be used to begin working with citizens and stakeholders to identify gaps, needs, and priorities with the local jurisdictions. He explained that the group would then look for regional housing opportunities that meet the goals, wants, and resources of each of the individual jurisdictions. He invited the Board to attend the regional housing summit to be held on April 19 at the Omni Hotel, which was designed for decision makers and stakeholders to get a comprehensive understanding of the issue, to include transportation, the job force, and equity.

Ms. Pethia stated that the regional housing needs assessment covers a wide variety of data such as population, household demographics, and economic data. She said today's focus would be on the housing needs within the County. She said the housing needs assessment identified the number of renter and owner households that pay more than 30% of their incomes for housing, as well as those who live in substandard housing, which was identified as being households without complete plumbing facilities. She noted that the median area income for a family of four was \$89,600 and more than half of County households has income above the median income, including 64% of homeowners and 36% of renters. She stated that 9.5% of households have incomes between 81%–100% of area median income, and typically do not qualify for housing assistance, and it was important to pay attention to them. She said that there are 5,660 rental households, representing 34% of all renters, that pay more than 30% of income for housing and are considered to be cost-burdened – and 91% of the cost-burdened have incomes below 30% of area median income. She said that 52% of these households are severely cost-burdened, as they pay more than 50% of their income towards housing costs. She characterized extremely low-income households as those with an income of 50% AMI or less and noted that 77% of renters with incomes at or below this level pay more than 30% of their income towards housing.

Ms. Pethia next focused on homeowners, noting that high-cost burdens are often due to rising property taxes and increased maintenance costs as their homes age. She said that 58% of homeowners with incomes at or below 80% of AMI pay more than half their incomes for housing. At the lowest end of the income spectrum, more than 75% of homeowners experience severe housing cost burdens. She said Albemarle County has the third highest housing costs within Planning District 10 and ranks fifth in the percentage of cost-burdened homeowner households. She said the report identified 2.5 pages of issues that affect the cost of housing, including a supply/demand mismatch; the approaching end of affordability periods for units built with low-income tax credits; zoning regulations with minimum parking or minimum lot size requirements; a lack of resources and programs to assist those with incomes of 60%–100% of AMI; and lack of public transit or efficient transit in many areas.

Ms. Pethia said she has developed a list of recommendations from the report for consideration as priorities, which takes the County's resources into consideration. She stated that households with AMI of 30% or less are best served through public housing and housing choice voucher programs. Her recommendations are as follows:

- 1) increase the number of multi-family rental units that serve households with incomes between 30%–60% of AMI through increased low-income housing tax credits in projects, increase the number of affordable rental units for households with residents age 55+, increase the number of fully accessible rental units.
- 2) support the construction of permanent supportive units for the homeless or those with disabilities who are unable to live completely independently but who could do well with onsite supportive services.
- 3) to address workforce housing needs, increase housing options for households with incomes between 61%–100% of AMI and investigate the feasibility of providing housing for County teachers and other school staff.
- 4) work to preserve existing affordable housing by examining methods for preserving expiring use properties or those with expiring affordability terms as well as preserve market rate affordable properties.
- 5) continue real estate tax relief to income qualifying senior and disabled homeowners and examine the feasibility of expanding the program to include non-senior homeowners as Charlottesville does through its CHAP program.
- 6) to support affordable homeownership opportunities, examine methods for ensuring long-term affordability of for-sale units.
- 7) adjust regulatory issues by identifying state enabling legislation related to affordable housing that the County may use.
- 8) update the County housing policy to support the development of a housing strategy that would help the County meet any housing goals in the policy, and
- 9) examine the feasibility of a permanent housing fund and outside funding sources.

Ms. Pethia stated that she was in process of creating a white paper to identify all affordable housing-related state enabling legislation to identify tools and mechanisms, through which they could meet the County's goals identified by an updated housing policy, which would form the basis for a housing strategy or implementation plan. She requested Board direction for updating the housing policy. She stated that there are two ways to go. She said the first would be to put together a standing housing advisory committee, though she acknowledged this could take time and they could have competing interests in the same room, which would make it difficult to reach a consensus. She said that a second option would be a staff-led process similar to that used to develop the small area plans, which she feels would be a more fluid process and would enable her to identify the needs of individual communities, and it could be a faster process.

Ms. Palmer asked Ms. Pethia to elaborate on how they are defining substandard housing. Ms. Pethia responded that the report defines it as those that lack complete plumbing facilities as well as kitchen facilities.

Ms. Palmer remarked that there are many seniors in the rural areas who are no longer able to conduct maintenance on their homes and she assumes this was underreported. Ms. Pethia agreed.

Ms. McKeel added that the report was missing those with older homes in the urban ring that have bathrooms but are falling into disrepair. Ms. Pethia confirmed this and added the importance of groups such as the Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP).

Ms. Mallek asked what the sources of information for the report came from. Ms. Pethia explained that the consultant relied on census data and data from other sources.

Mr. Randolph pointed out that the report took a broad-brushed look, and it was up to the Board to deliberate and consult with Ms. Pethia to determine how to implement it. He characterized the study as being the most detailed, specific, and thorough that he has seen since serving the County on the Planning Commission. He remarked that the Board chose to take on Southwood because it was a specific affordable housing project and they used it as a beta test to determine what does and does not work and learn through the process. Subsequent to the Board's engagement with Southwood and prior to this report, PVCC and Ridge Schuyler came up with Orange Dot #3 and combined with the opportunity zones promoted by TJPDC, the County would focus on specific geographic locations where property and affordable housing was most significant, according to that report. He stated that this approach would allow the County to do case studies and comprehensively marshal resources across the board through the use of small area plans that focuses on housing, transportation, job needs, and economic development.

Mr. Randolph said the report identifies workforce housing, which the Board has not really contemplated, and it allows the Board to bring IMPACT's focus into the discussion. He stated that resources are limited, and the Board needs to target them to where they are most likely to be successful. He recounted that he has served on committees that, because they were staff led, got things done faster, while in other cases, they have had a broader brush committee, such as with solid waste, breweries, cideries, and farm wineries, etc. whereby they were able to develop a consensus. He said affordable housing was a challenging policy question for communities across the country because nobody has yet gotten it right. He said the County could receive community input, address community needs and wants, and save the taxpayers money without the process being unnecessarily slowed down. He stated that instead of thinking about the speed of the process, they should focus on building consensus so that residents in the rural areas of the County could understand why. Mr. Randolph acknowledged that there was a risk of special interest advocacy, though they could work around this. He recalled that staff has primarily controlled the issue of stormwater and the County had problems as a result of this. He said they could get representation of diverse communities on the Housing Advisory Committee, which could accomplish a lot as the Solid Waste Committee did if it was well run and focused. He praised Ms. Pethia for the pioneering work and for starting a meaningful conversation.

Mr. Dill remarked that when considering the establishment of a housing fund, they could go in the direction of a small fund that helps people in emergency situations or a much larger one of \$1 million that looks for opportunities to partner with private developers, analogous to the Economic Development Fund. He asked Ms. Pethia for her opinion. Ms. Pethia responded that there were many options, though she looks at the housing fund as a way to support larger projects. She said that the primary purposes of Charlottesville's fund were to support AHIP's homeownership rehabilitation project, low-income housing tax credit developments and the rental assistance program. She said one of the important aspects of a housing fund was the importance of setting priorities at the front end. She noted that the City of Richmond's fund specifically assisted homeowners with rehabilitation projects and developers to purchase and rehabilitate vacant homes to put them back into use. Arlington County's fund was used to support multi-family rental housing development. She noted Fairfax County used some of its fund to support their affordable dwelling unit program by purchasing units from developers to keep them affordable for a longer period and make sure they go to income-qualifying people. She said the priorities could change over time as the Board decides to focus on specific areas.

Ms. Palmer remarked that AHIP money could be moved to the housing fund. She recounted how the Board held discussions for several years before it got to the point where they allocated funding to the Economic Development Fund. She wondered if it makes sense to launch this program on the staff side to get it going, with the Board having discussions, and then revisit the committee formation after knowing more about how it should be structured. She asked Ms. Pethia for her thoughts on timing and alternative timing. Ms. Pethia responded that either way works, and the makeup of the committee was an important

part. She said the committee was important at the implementation phase and once a policy and list of strategies are developed, the committee monitors progress and keeps them on their toes and accountable – and they could measure what does and does not work and make recommendations for changing the policy or strategies.

Ms. McKeel remarked that the use of the term staff-led may take people down a road she does not intend. She noted that the community was involved, it was not just staff getting together in a room and presenting something, and maybe it should be called something else. Ms. Pethia clarified that they would go out into the communities, meet with Committee Advisory Committees (CACs), attend town hall meetings, and talk with residents about what their housing needs are to obtain input that would inform policy.

Mr. Randolph suggested they have a hybrid that combines aspects of both, with a process open to public participation early, and to obtain the best consensus possible. He said the policy could be twisted and misinterpreted by those who want to subvert the real intent of the process, as some may be concerned about a sudden economic change of who was living in the neighborhood, dictated by the housing policy.

Ms. Mallek remarked that she would rate the preservation of existing stock as the number one priority, as this presently affects people. She asked when they would have an assessment of the existing housing inventory in the County. She thought an element of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) project was an inventory of housing stock in the County which would then provide the Board with some more valid information. Ms. Pethia responded that the census data indicates the number of units and working with the Albemarle Housing Improvement Program, they could get a good handle on the substandard housing stock. She said she would like to conduct a survey of rental properties of 10+ units to get an idea of where market rate affordable units are located, their condition and price points, which would begin to build a housing inventory, and some areas they could work on preserving. She noted that market rate affordable units are the ones that tend to be sold and flipped into market rate and identifying and keeping an eye on these could enable them to reach out to current owners to potentially work with them to rehab the properties and keep them affordable.

Ms. McKeel referred to the Orange Dot #3 report, which showed the Hydraulic Road/Commonwealth area as having the lowest median family income after Southwood. She noted that this area was a hotspot for police, fire, and rescue. She said the area was in an opportunity zone and the County could do some wonderful things for the people there and leave it affordable.

Ms. Mallek asked for confirmation that there would be another category of smaller, older homes that are way out in the country. She stated that these residents are invisible and do not attend Board meetings, but they have great needs and deserve the right to live out their lives without being disrupted. She expressed hope that the study would obtain valid information on this and support having AHIP work on this issue. She said the White Hall District has 10 enclaves that are dramatically different from each other and from all the other places in the County.

Ms. McKeel remarked that the people they are talking about now are those that never attend meetings and who are busy going to work and raising their children.

Ms. Mallek added that there are four older neighborhoods in Crozet that have the same circumstances, with houses built in the 1920s and 30s, and she would like them to figure out a way to not have these neighborhoods become gentrified and ruined.

Ms. Palmer remarked that she learned that many low-income families do not write wills and some live in houses owned by a deceased person. She asked Ms. Pethia to be aware of this and wondered whether they should talk with Legal Aid to help people get these properties in their name in order to get the help they need.

Ms. McKeel added that they have this problem in Berkeley in the urban ring.

Mr. Gallaway remarked that the Board would be asked to do a resolution of intent to the Planning Commission to initiate an update to the housing policy. He asked Supervisors if they had additional comment about the staff led versus housing advisory committee issue.

Ms. Palmer said she would prefer to begin with the staff led and to have the committee at a later date.

Ms. McKeel expressed agreement with Ms. Palmer, but not have it stated as “staff led”.

Ms. Mallek said she would feel better after the summit and after hearing what the big picture was, as she was not prepared to jump into either of the options nor approve the notice of intent and noted the Board would talk about this again in May.

Mr. Randolph suggested that Ms. Pethia come back before the Board after the summit with a blueprint of what a staff led process would look like in terms of the number of staff and hours required and where they would obtain community input to ensure that all points of view could be incorporated in terms of both a regional and socioeconomic basis. He asked Supervisors for comment.

Ms. McKeel remarked that she was happy to do this, though she was not sure that the summit would provide answers to what Ms. Pethia was trying to get at because it would focus on specific areas.

Mr. Gallaway asked Ms. Pethia for feedback regarding what Supervisors had said. Ms. Pethia responded that she was happy to get together a blueprint and outline a process, after the summit.

Ms. Mallek asked her to speak to her apprehension that the report by the consultant would be discussed and they would determine regional needs. Ms. Pethia responded that the results of the report would be presented during the keynote speech in the morning, with the afternoon session to address housing, and the first session would deal with government involvement and regulatory barriers. She said that Robert Liberty of Portland State University would talk about zoning changes and other programs that Portland was using to adjust affordable housing, and a nonprofit would talk about how local regulations help or hurt their efforts. She said the second session would be about nonprofit housing, and the final session would deal with for-profit involvement in housing.

Mr. Dill said he was fine with the Board taking time to consider policies and what they need to do, though there are plenty of rehabilitation projects they could do with funding. He suggested that they provide support for a voucher program now, as they do not have to wait to see what the recommendations are, and they are in budget discussions.

Mr. Gallaway pointed out that they have put a new housing planner into the budget, and he was fully prepared to approve the resolution of intent and proceed with the staff led process. He supports approving this and start moving. He said the summit would provide them with an opportunity to start looking at the big ramifications, layers, and complexity. He added that he did not need any of the summit information to make this decision. Mr. Gallaway then **moved** to proceed as recommended. Mr. Randolph **seconded** the motion.

Ms. Mallek remarked that workforce housing does not seem to her to be the most important thing, as indicated in the recommendations. She added that she was a bit alarmed that they are moving too fast, which may be her misinterpretation.

Ms. Pethia stated that these are recommendations for priorities, and they can change, but they help get the conversation going.

Ms. Palmer remarked that the information from the Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP) would help inform the priorities list.

Ms. Pethia said she plans to meet with nonprofit stakeholders to learn what their needs are to help set priorities.

Mr. Gallaway then restated his **motion** to direct staff to provide a Resolution of Intent (ROI) to the Planning Commission for initiating an update of the County's Affordable Housing Policy and including with the ROI an outline of a staff led process that assures community engagement is adequately addressed. Mr. Randolph agreed as **second**. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Dill, Mr. Gallaway and Ms. Mallek.

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 10. **Work Session:** Amending the Comprehensive Plan to Incorporate Biodiversity Strategies.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the Biodiversity Action Plan for Albemarle County (BAP) was completed in June 2018. On July 5, 2018, the Board endorsed the BAP and directed staff to begin working with the Planning Commission to amend the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan). On September 4, 2018, the Planning Commission adopted a Resolution of Intent to amend the Comp Plan to incorporate strategies for conserving biodiversity. County staff developed draft revisions for the Comp Plan.

An online survey and one public meeting were conducted to solicit public comment. Two work sessions were held with the Planning Commission to review the proposed revisions, on November 20, 2018 and February 12, 2019. At the more recent of the two work sessions, the Planning Commission approved proceeding to a work session with the Board of Supervisors to review the proposed Comp Plan revisions.

Objective 4 of the Natural Resources chapter of the Comp Plan states: "Protect the biological diversity and ecological integrity of the County in both the Rural Area and Development Areas." Strategy 4a states: "Develop an Action for Biodiversity to protect significant areas of biological importance to the County." Narrative for Strategy 4a includes the statement: "When completed, the action plan should be presented to the Board of Supervisors for adoption into the Comp Plan."

Completing the BAP was the first step in implementing Strategy 4a. County staff is working to complete full implementation of the strategy by amending the Comp Plan.

After Planning Commission adoption of the Resolution of Intent to amend the Comp Plan (Attachment A), staff drafted revisions to the Comp Plan incorporating strategies to conserve biodiversity.

All proposed revisions are under the Objective 4 section of the Natural Resources chapter. In addition to wording changes, several new strategies are proposed (Attachment B). Three maps from the BAP are also proposed to be added.

Staff sought comments from the public about the proposed revisions via an online survey (Attachment C) and a public meeting held on November 29, 2018. Two work sessions with the Planning Commission also allowed public comment as well as review, discussion, and comment from members of the Commission. Attachment D summarized the edits made to the Comp Plan based on public input and Planning Commission comments.

A final draft of proposed revisions is provided for review, in both a "redline" version (Attachment E) and a "clean" version (Attachment F). The current version of the Comp Plan is also provided (Attachment G). The BAP and related materials (Executive Summary, Appendices, maps) are proposed to be included as Reference Documents in the Comp Plan, thus not part of the Comp Plan itself.

There is no budget impact in simply amending the Comp Plan. Future efforts to implement strategies could have budget impacts.

Staff requests confirmation from the Board that proposed Comp Plan revisions are ready for proceeding to a public hearing with the Planning Commission.

Mr. David Hannah, Natural Resources Manager, presented. He noted that he has provided the Board with 10 attachments, and he would make a short presentation of the highlights and leave time for discussion. He noted that the Natural Heritage Committee has been involved with all things related to biodiversity in the County and he encouraged Supervisors to read the Committee's report. He reminded the Board that the current Natural Resources chapter of the Comprehensive Plan has the objective: "Protect the biological diversity and ecological integrity of the County in both the rural and development areas." He said the first strategy under Objective 4a reads: "Develop an action plan for biodiversity to protect significant areas of biological importance in the County."

Mr. Hannah stated that a large part of this was accomplished when they completed the Biodiversity Action Plan in June 2018. He read from the Comprehensive Plan: "When completed, the action plan should be presented to the Board of Supervisors for adoption into the Comprehensive Plan." He next presented a summary of actions they have taken to date. He said the Board endorsed the action plan on July 5; on September 4, the Planning Commission adopted a resolution of intent to amend the Comprehensive Plan; on November 20, a work session with the Planning Commission was held to review the first draft revisions; on November 29, a public meeting was held to solicit public comment, an online survey was available on the County's website for almost three months, and on February 12, 2019, a second work session was held by the Planning Commission to review further revisions. He said he feels that the County has done a good job in gathering public input, as the public meetings were attended by a diverse group of people and they are continuing to receive input from the online survey.

Mr. Hannah stated that these activities resulted in some minor changes, Attachment C, to the first draft, which helps improve the plan. He noted that Attachment D has a summary of public comments and how they were incorporated to revisions of the plan. He said today they would review final revisions and with Board direction would proceed to a public hearing with the Planning Commission, followed by a public hearing with the Board of Supervisors. He said the Biodiversity Action Plan would be a reference document consisting of an executive summary, appendices, and maps, though it would not be a formal part of the Comprehensive Plan itself. He noted that all changes to the Comprehensive Plan made to date are under Objective 4 of the Natural Resources chapter; their aim was to add strategies to the existing chapter that would incorporate conservation of biodiversity, and they tried to retain as many of the existing strategies and as much of the narrative as possible.

Mr. Hannah presented a brief overview of the changes, listed in Attachment B. He said the number of strategies in the Natural Resources chapter increased from 8 to 13, with seven strategies retained and Strategy 4G removed because it was duplicated in the more complete and comprehensive Strategy 2H in the rural areas chapter. He said there were minor changes to the wording of five of the seven strategies that were retained. He presented slides with a list of the six new strategies. He said that 4B was the broadest and most comprehensive of the new strategies and calls for the use or development of tools, strategies, and programs to protect important areas of habitat and lands that connect those important areas of habitat. He said 4C states that County-owned lands, particularly parks, should be a focus in preserving biodiversity. He said that 4E calls for the Acquisition of Conservation Easements (ACE) and Acquisition of Conservation Easements Authority (ACEA) easement programs to be revised to better account for, evaluate, and protect biodiversity. He said that 4F calls for staff to work with other counties and landowners to conserve important sites that have been identified by Natural Heritage Committee; 4H calls for collaboration with other organizations to limit the spread of invasive species; and 4J calls for the enhancement of aquatic and riparian habitat as part of a comprehensive water resources plan. He concluded and invited Board comment, discussion, and questions.

Ms. McKeel asked how many people have participated in the survey. Mr. Hannah responded that there were 34 respondents.

Ms. Palmer encouraged Mr. Hannah to add his own questions to the focus survey put together by Siri Russell to target those who are more representative of the community. Mr. Hannah remarked that this was a great idea and that he would love to speak with Ms. Russell.

Mr. Gallaway asked Mr. Hannah to address feedback received from public comment. Mr. Hannah acknowledged that they received fewer responses than expected, though the respondents demonstrated support for the revisions. He acknowledged one comment that the revisions resembled a college-level research paper with footnotes, and he agrees with this observation, as he has attempted to keep the revisions similar to the style used when the Comprehensive Plan was last revised. He said that going forward, staff would look to have shorter and sweeter plans with narratives included in reference or other documents. He said another comment was that the large areas of habitat they recommend for biodiversity conservation could be inconsistent with providing affordable housing. He said he does not believe this was an accurate observation, as the areas they have identified for preservation are mostly in the rural area.

Ms. Palmer remarked that these areas lack broadband, transportation, etc. that are not ideal for affordable housing.

With reference to another comment, Mr. Hannah read the new Strategy 4D: "Preserve existing vegetation in areas shown as parks and green systems on development area master plans." Mr. Hannah said this was one strategy they did not touch, and it remains as it was before the revisions.

Ms. Mallek remarked that the use of the word "improve" might be better than the word "preserve" if existing vegetation was of poor quality. She said this resonated with her because she has complained for years about the fact that sewer lines go in the greenways and destroys them with cutting of mature trees. Mr. Hannah responded that he would not take issue with this comment, though he does not know that this should result in a modification to the existing strategy.

Mr. Hannah addressed a comment that the new Strategy 4L was more of a directive than guidance. He read the new Strategy 4L: "Retain a position for a County staff member with expertise in conservation biology." He said it basically maintains the existing strategy even though the wording was changed. He recalled that someone suggested they use the phrase "assess the need to retain" rather than "retain," and another suggested the phrase "ensure resources are in place to provide the expertise in conservation biology." He said this came up after the November public meeting, and staff made the decision to keep the current wording; this also went through two work sessions with the Planning Commission and was not changed. He added that he was open to discussion by the Board.

Ms. Mallek remarked that it was incredibly important to not use chemicals to address invasive species and to utilize mechanical means whenever possible. She expressed support to retain the wording in Strategy 4L as she recognizes the importance of having a qualified person in the role.

Mr. Randolph commended Mr. Hannah for his excellent explanation of biodiversity challenges and for the number of illustrations in the text, as these would be utilized by the public, especially middle and high school students. He agrees that it reads a bit like a university paper, but he has tried to be comprehensive in the explanation, which helps those who are not aware of the challenges of biodiversity to understand them. He noted that it has been a national trend to have shorter and more concise Comprehensive Plans. He said the plan clearly identifies and supports the challenge of habitat fragmentation. He asked Mr. Hannah to consider if County land use policies promote habitat fragmentation and which policies could help address habitat fragmentation. He noted that the report was short on goals and long on strategies and he thinks of goals as being what needs to be done broadly in terms of biodiversity. He asked Mr. Hannah to consider what needs to be done on a countywide level. He noted that objectives represent what could be done specifically and the strategy represents how the objectives would be achieved – and he observed that many of the strategies are really goals. He indicated that by clarifying these better, it would assist the Board and Planning Commission in better understanding the intent.

Ms. Mallek remarked that the goal was to not ruin what was already in place, and it was already stated at the beginning of the Natural Resources chapter.

Mr. Randolph added that he thinks his suggestions would make it easier to obtain buy in and support.

Mr. Hannah acknowledged that how to structure and word the plan was a challenge, though there was an overall goal for Chapter 4. He noted that the Biodiversity Action Plan and revisions to the Comprehensive Plan are in response to the current language in the current plan.

Ms. Palmer said she thinks the narrative was good and recalled that Elaine Echols was able to reduce the Comprehensive Plan by volumes several years ago, and she does not see an immediate need to reduce it more. She asked if when the Natural Heritage Committee comments on policy under consideration for change by the Board, it would be available and specifically defined. Mr. Hannah responded that there was no real mechanism or process he was aware of; it was usually issue driven with the Committee weighing in when it wants to. He said the Committee was very interested in the development of Biscuit Run Park, particularly with invasive species.

Ms. Palmer said it would have been valuable to have the input of the Natural Heritage Committee for the recent changes to the open space rules of agricultural-forestal districts, which have been narrowed. She remarked that open space could support biodiversity and the Natural Heritage Committee might have wanted to provide input. Mr. Hannah noted that he was the liaison to the Natural Heritage Committee and informs them, and they inform him on issues that are going forward. He said many on the

committee are naturalists or botanists and are more concerned with doing things on the ground and with education. He noted that Committee meetings are open to the public and held at 5:30 p.m. on the third Thursday of each month, Mr. Dill has attended a couple of them, and he invited other Supervisors to attend.

Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Hannah if he was notified at site review, which was when she generally first finds out about things, as she would like to learn about things beforehand rather than after the fact. She said she would also like to have better identification of stream capability with GIS data and to improve the records. She said that what came to mind when discussing fragmentation and in relation to the changes they are considering for agricultural/forestral access was having adjacency to existing easements of larger things and corridors, as this was a very important aspect that could be a reason why someone would be kept in just as it would be if they were actually making an effort to do some stewardship on the property. She read the goal of the Natural Resources chapter says: "Albemarle's ecosystems and natural resources would be thoughtfully protected and managed in both the rural and development areas to safeguard the quality of life for present and future generations." She added that this said it all and the rest was how they are specifically going to do it.

Ms. McKeel said she thinks this was great work and agrees with Mr. Randolph that the Comprehensive Plan should be shorter. She asked Mr. Hannah for his thoughts and comments about the letter Neil Williamson sent to him about acreage and the sites. Mr. Hannah responded that staff incorporated the information in the two places within the narrative where they broke out the public and private land acreage and how much was under conservation easement.

Mr. Dill said he reads more and more about the world-wide insect Armageddon, soil fertility, and microorganisms, and the importance of a healthy ecosystem, and expressed that he would like to see the educational aspect of biodiversity included in the many factors involved. Mr. Hannah agreed that it was a huge issue that goes well beyond Albemarle County. He noted that they would use neonicotinoids to treat the eastern hemlocks at Biscuit Run in a restricted way so that water quality and adjacent plants are not impacted, though much of the problem was with large scale agriculture in the Midwest. He agreed that education was important and noted that they have been promoting locally native plants, as these support a healthy insect population.

Mr. Gallaway referenced Strategy 4D and remarked that they are not dictating certain things on private properties but are providing guidance to meet goals. He said he has observed applications for developments come forward in the Rio District where there was an appreciation and respect for green spaces and greenways and the message was out there that if one wants a project with connectivity, greenspace, trailways, and things that could augment, what was in existence in this bigger system was clear. He said they ran into trouble with the Rio Area Small Area Plan when they tried to suggest that they were dictating roadways for which it was not their property to dictate and so they suggest what their goals are and allow them to come up with the best plan.

Mr. Gallaway surveyed the Board for consensus that the plan was ready for a public hearing.

Ms. Mallek **moved** that the Board approve the suggested amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and advance it to public hearing with the Planning Commission. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. McKeel.

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

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

Recess. The Board recessed at 3:10 p.m. and reconvened at 3:23 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 11. **Work Session:** 2019 Transportation Priorities Update Work Session.

Mr. Kevin McDermott, Transportation Planner, presented and introduced Transportation Planner Daniel Butch to assist with the presentation. He said this continues the discussion on prioritizing projects and was the first full update of the priority list he put together a couple of years ago. He said they have collected additional data and done a lot more work and are in a much better place than they were two years ago. He explained that projects are recommended through several plans, including comprehensive, master, and small area plans. He stated that both staff time and funding are limited, with funding opportunities arising from the CIP transportation leveraging fund line items and grants. He said the priorities listed helps the County focus time, energy, tracking of projects, and applicability to different grant programs, and they compete well.

Mr. McDermott stated that they created a database with all projects recommended in various plans, and some projects are well-defined while others recommend general improvements along a corridor. He next explained the methodology used, explaining that they use a modified version of the State's Smart Scale methodology because it allows them to comprehensively evaluate different kinds of projects so that they are on equal footing. He listed the factors of land use, safety, congestion, economic development, and accessibility as elements of a good transportation project. He said that he assigns a qualitative score of 0-7 for each project based on quantitative data and described it as a qualitative assessment, noting that the projects are ranked. He explained that there are other considerations

because projects that do not rank highly may offer benefits not captured in the assessment. He urged the Board to look at the list as guidance.

Mr. Daniel Butch presented and explained that land use for each project was scored based on benefits to recent and upcoming residential developments, with the number of units being the primary factor. He said that if a project helps enhance Comprehensive Plan goals such as multi-modal connectivity and serving aging urban neighborhoods or was within development areas or other identified development centers, these are considered land use factors. He explained that projects located within development areas or that serve community resources are rated higher; the data resource utilized was from Community Development's neighborhood tracking. He explained that the safety score for each project was developed from a review of crash data compiled by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), a heat map that shows all reported crashes with crashes assigned points according to severity, and VDOT's top 100 highway safety improvement list.

Mr. Butch stated that Hydraulic Road/Route 29 improvements and Route 29/Plank Road intersection were ranked the highest. He said they also analyzed congestion and developed a congestion score, utilizing the most recent traffic modeling outputs performed by CAMPO for the long-range transportation plan, which was based on the ability to address existing congestion issues with further consideration given to intersections identified as having poor levels of service through submitted traffic impact analysis performed by new developments. He noted that Hydraulic Road/Route 29 scored the highest under these criteria.

Mr. Butch explained that the economic development scoring was developed by a review of recent and upcoming development using non-residential square footage as the data point to which the project would provide benefits, with projects scored by type of improvement and how they would serve the type of development in the vicinity of that project. He said that projects that support economic development zones or sites identified through a site development readiness assessment were ranked higher. He explained that non-residential development data came from Community Development's development tracking, and accessibility scoring was determined by how well a transportation project improved access to jobs, traditionally underserved communities, multi-modal opportunities, bicycle/pedestrian improvements, and improvements on or near a transit route.

Mr. McDermott stated that the Board's packet includes a list of 60 projects; he presented a slide with the 12 that were highest ranked. He stated that Hydraulic/Route 29 improvements were ranked the highest by a number of points and presented a slide with conceptual cost estimates. He said he would review the Berkmar to Lewis & Clark Connector project as an example to demonstrate how the ranking was calculated. He said it was ranked fifth, achieved a total score of 25, was located near the Charlottesville/Albemarle Airport, was near new residential development, included bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and had a land use score of 5 points. He said if there was a nearby pedestrian accident, it fell within a high accident rate location along Route 29, and it would remove a lot of traffic from Route 29, so it resulted in a safety benefit score of 5. He said it has a very poor level of service on Route 29 and since it takes traffic off Route 29, he assigned it a congestion score of 5 points. He said that it scored a 6 for economic development, as there was a lot of proposed economic development in the area and it was close to sites identified in the Site Readiness Report. He said it received a score of 4 for accessibility, as there are jobs in the area and bicycle/ pedestrian amenities were considered. He noted that was why it ended up with a score of 25 points.

Mr. McDermott next reviewed his expectations from this discussion. He asked the Board for feedback on the process and what project(s) they would like to focus on, considering the limited funding available from the upcoming grant cycle which was a transportation alternatives revenue-sharing year. He noted that the CIP has funding for transportation leveraging and some secondary six-year money was available.

Ms. McKeel remarked that they had \$18 million left over with VDOT they may lose if they do not use it and urged that it be used for the Zan Road Bridge over Route 29, which was part of the Route 29 Solutions project. She noted this was a safety, congestion, and accessibility project, which she estimated would cost \$25 million to \$30 million, with the cost to be shared with Charlottesville. She remarked that this bridge would help reduce pedestrian fatalities along Route 29 and would improve traffic flow, and it was supported by Stonefield and Northrup Grumman. Mr. McDermott remarked that they are following the work of Chip Boyles and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and once a decision has been made on how to move forward, they would need some money to contribute to that.

Ms. Mallek added that the MPO would consider the long-range transportation plan at its April meeting, and it includes this project. She agreed with Ms. McKeel that they cannot let the \$18 million get away.

Mr. McDermott next reviewed how Eastern Avenue was assessed. He explained that it obtained a land use score of 7, primarily due to the level of residential development as well as bike/ped facilities. He said they are trying to address pedestrian accidents on Route 250 with a pedestrian crossing, though the area was not one that had a safety concern. He said it scored 4 points for congestion, as the Barnes Lumber traffic impact analysis demonstrated there was peak hour congestion on Crozet Avenue and this project would help that, although overall levels of congestion are not really bad in that area. Regarding economic development, he said there are not a lot of jobs the project would benefit because it was more of a benefit to residential development, but it would be within a tourist zone and earn points for that. In terms of accessibility, he said it received a score of 4 points because there are some jobs in the area and

would provide a connection to some traditionally underserved communities. He said the total score was 21 and it ranked 12th.

Ms. Mallek said she learned from Jakob zumFelde of the MPO that the rankings were based on Smart Scale, which consisted of regional collector-type roads, and were not represented by Eastern Avenue.

Ms. Mallek asked if this was infrastructure on which years of land use decisions and rezonings were based. She said there are two roadways in Crozet that since 1985 have been the basis on which rezonings were granted. She explained that Jarman's Gap Road led to the rezonings of Bargamin, Wayland's Grant, Grayrock I and II, and Old Trail. She said it took 25 years to get this road completed and it was now a spectacular success. She continued that everything east of town was based upon the bridge at Lickinghole Creek being done, which was 500 houses, some of them were rezonings and a few by right.

Ms. Mallek stated that access to fire and rescue from the stations north of the creek to the thousands of residents south of the creek added at least five minutes, and the safety aspect was very important. She noted that it was the only north-south road on the eastern side of town. She said VDOT wants to close the middle north-south roadway of the three for 8,500 people at Route 240 for six months to tear out the bridge and put it back. She said she does not know where people would go with the current 50-car queue at the gateway to Route 240/Route 250 at school arrival and departure times that immobilizes traffic. She stated that fire/rescue responders cannot get through and have to go through Old Trail and Half Mile Branch to get to I-64 to respond to accidents. She added that a lot of development was planned based on the bridge being completed, and she urged that they find funding to leverage its construction.

Mr. Randolph praised Mr. McDermott for following the Smart Scale model in his project scoring and asked what results surprised him. Mr. McDermott responded that the level of non-residential development along Route 250 in Pantops was a bit shocking and led to some projects jumping up. He said the Hydraulic project scored higher than he thought given the frequency of accidents. Ms. Mallek remarked on the danger posed by pedestrians having to cross eight lanes of traffic in that area.

Mr. Randolph asked how the Pantops master planning process informed him to understand the dimension of economic transformation and how it would impact projects in that corridor. Mr. McDermott responded that it did inform him, particularly with the widening, as the master planning process and VDOT contributed to better defining the project and demonstrating how it could address congestion problems.

Ms. Palmer expressed her appreciation for Mr. McDermott's ranking system and asked him if he was aware of the number of new units that has been added in the area south of I-64 between Old Lynchburg Road and Region 10 to Sunset Road Extended. Mr. McDermott stated that the study may not have shown that many new residential units since many of them have been completed. He noted that two projects in that area ranked very highly; the 5th Street Corridor Improvements and the Sunset to Fontaine Connector. He said he would take another look at the residential development.

Ms. Palmer pointed out that a 96-unit apartment complex was under construction across from Region 10 and that Timberland Park Apartments recently opened that was dumping traffic on to Old Lynchburg Road at the same location as Cavalier Crossing. She expressed support for a project that would allow pedestrian safe passage under I-64 to Azalea Park, the City was also interested, and asked for an update on grant funding possibilities. Mr. McDermott responded that the Quality of Life Program would provide some funding to address these issues. He said they have hired a consultant to evaluate the pedestrian projects and are working with the City to see if they could partner on something. He said they expect a preliminary report with a concept and cost estimates from the consultant in about a month.

Ms. Palmer asked if the Quality of Life Program would pay for the actual project under I-64 or just for the planning. Mr. McDermott clarified that the \$6 million approved by the Board for bike/pedestrian projects includes an estimate to construct that full project. He said they have also asked the consultant to investigate leveraging possibilities to be able to expand the project. He said that they would build the sidewalk on Old Lynchburg Road to Azalea Park with the Quality of Life funding in the CIP with the \$6 million, and if they could expand the project with additional funding, it would include the Sunset Bridge and the greenway segment.

Ms. Palmer reiterated her concern over the lack of adequate infrastructure to support all the new residential units in the area. Mr. McDermott remarked that multiple projects for that area to address this were ranked very highly, although the project Ms. Palmer referred to was ranked 31st, which was high considering the small size of it. He added that low-cost, second-tier projects would be good targets for funding.

Mr. Dill asked if projects 2 and 3 represents the Route 250 diverging diamond. Mr. McDermott responded that the diverging diamond was not assessed in this because it was fully funded and moving forward.

Mr. Dill asked Mr. McDermott if he has considered future recreation, such as soccer fields and lighting at Darden-Towe Park and the new hotel going in next to Malloy Ford as part of the traffic flow at Pantops. He added that he expects soccer tournaments to bring out of town guests to the area, which could impact traffic. Mr. McDermott confirmed that the economic development map includes two hotels for

that area. He said he considered access to parks in the land use assessment, and the hotel and Wawa are considered in the economic development analysis.

Ms. Mallek asked if the analysis includes a possibility quotient as there are many improvements, they could do from Pantops to the river; but, if they are not willing to improve the bridge, then there was no point to this. Mr. McDermott responded that it was not reflected in the score, but it has to be reflected in what they decide to focus on.

Ms. McKeel remarked that the report was great and praised the scoring method.

Mr. Gallaway asked about the Pen Park to Rio Road roundabout. He observed that it was ranked both 45th and 52nd and requested clarification. Mr. McDermott clarified that one was Pen Park Lane and the other was Pen Park Road.

Mr. Gallaway asked if economic development was driven by the way the state does it for the Smart Scale. Mr. McDermott acknowledged that the main contributor was done by how the state looks at proposed but unbuilt non-residential square footage, although he factored in areas identified through the Economic Development Plan.

Mr. Gallaway commented that there are many smaller projects that would never score well alone, such as Hilton Heights Road bicycle/pedestrian connectivity, North Town Trail along the John Warner Parkway, and bike lanes that connect to Carrsbrook. He noted as a group they could significantly improve connectivity. He challenged Mr. McDermott to consider some multi-modal connectivity projects as a network and determine if they would score higher when grouped together.

Mr. Gallaway remarked that there are intersections in the Rio Road area that are not working, particularly near Charlottesville Albemarle Technical Education Center (CATEC) and the Senior Center, and development applications are pending that would exacerbate the problem, which includes the Wetzel property of 400+ units, a smaller one next to the Senior Center, and continued development at Belvedere. He said there are likely similar examples of this throughout the County, and if they do not have these on the priority list, they would always be reacting after the problems occur.

Ms. Mallek recalled that in 2002, CATEC and the long-range plan had a big roundabout, which was taken away by two of Mr. Gallaway's predecessors. She said it would have eliminated queuing and was a splendid idea.

Mr. McDermott agreed with Mr. Gallaway's points and said that North Town Trail was ranked 2nd as one project because it covered a large area, while this year he broke it up and the highest segment ranked 16th. He explained that they are studying the situation in Rio with VDOT and they do not have any specific plans at this time, but a corridor study and the master plan update would be great opportunities to define projects.

Mr. Gallaway remarked that by the time plans come into place, there was no place in the priority conversation to plug it in and if rezonings go up and people decide to do by-right development, it would get worse.

Ms. Mallek recalled that when Belvedere was approved, it was part of the North Town Trail and was in the long-range plans for some time. She wondered if the size of projects affects the amount of outside funding. Mr. McDermott commented that different grants address different issues, and they could keep their eyes open for those affecting the larger ones. He said he would take into consideration the comments made by Supervisors, make some adjustments, and come back to the Board for ideas on grants.

Agenda Item No. 12. **Presentation:** Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Quarterly Report.

Mr. Adam Moore, Assistant Resident Engineer, presented. He said he would discuss ongoing programs, the six-year improvement plan, and priority lists for unpaved roads and other six-year secondary funding. He said the Rural Rustic Road Program was ongoing; they would complete two roads this year, Preddy Creek and Keswick Road, and they began work on Dick Woods Road, Patterson Mill Lane, and North Garden Lane. He said they are awaiting response to their question as to whether VDOT must hold a second public hearing on Miller School Road truck restrictions, and they expect to soon have signs posted on site for four weeks requesting comments and feedback.

Mr. Moore reviewed maintenance and operations projects that were not included in the monthly report. He said the Rio Road planters are empty; they plan to drill additional drainage holes in them so they would function as intended. He said that Ridge Road has reopened, and stone work has been completed at Jarman's Gap, and it was now passable from the bottom to the top. He announced that a public hearing was planned for April 17 to review the Route 240 bridge over Lickinghole Creek, and they would seek feedback regarding whether the bridge should be closed completely for six months or have one-way traffic operated by signals for eight months. He noted that construction was planned to begin in Fall 2022, and they hope the Route 240/Route 250 roundabout would be complete by then, for which they expect to schedule a June public hearing. Mr. Moore said they would receive technical proposals on April 23 and price proposals on May 16 and expect to award a contract on June 19 for the design-build bundle.

He continued that a paving schedule would be set soon, and segments are shown on virginiaroads.org under "pavement projects status."

Ms. Palmer asked if Patterson Mill Road would get started in the fall with ditching and repairs of culverts and the rest of the work would be started the following spring. Mr. Moore responded that Rural Rustic Projects normally consist of two parts, with grading, replacement of drainage culverts, and tree limbs cut back in the fall, followed by additional work in the spring.

Ms. Palmer remarked that her understanding was that the project was set to begin last year but VDOT had decided to do all the work in 2019. Mr. Moore explained that some things are dependent on the availability of the local maintenance crew and offered to get an update on this project.

Ms. Mallek noted that work on Dick Woods Road was supposed to begin last year and she was told it would be number one this year. She noted that runoff has carried stone to people's yards, jamming culverts and ruining pastures, and she asked Mr. Moore to see if they could begin this work before 2020.

Ms. Mallek recalled that they had received updates from John Lynch and Joel DeNunzio on the stretch of Earlysville Road where workers quit doing the patching job and they would return to fix the large potholes, which are causing drivers to swerve. Mr. Moore responded that it would be completely patched this year to stabilize it for 12 months, and he expects to see it on the paving schedule for 2020.

Ms. McKeel recalled that a paving project was done on Westminster Street in an urban ring neighborhood in November or early December, and the sealant applied was already breaking down and leaving big patches. She said in addition, the contractor left chunks of old and new paving all over the curb and gutter. She asked if VDOT has a way to address this with the contractor and if the Board could help them legislatively. She recalled that it was a rainy day, the last day of the VDOT contract, and the contractor was in a hurry to get it down. She asked if the County or state could act legislatively to improve VDOT's ability to enforce contracts.

Ms. Mallek asked where the inspector was. Mr. Moore stated that asphalt should not have been put down if the conditions were not right for it to last, noting that there has been discussion about ultra-thin layers of plant mix asphalt, and this may have been what happened.

Mr. Moore next reviewed what he described as two low-cost improvement projects they have planned. He said they would reduce Southbound Route 20 coming out of Charlottesville to one lane through the I-64 interchange so that those exiting the ramp would only have to wait for a gap in northbound traffic, and cars would be able to pull out going left or right and southbound traffic would have its own lane. He said this should reduce queuing along the ramp and improve safety, and it would consist of a mixture of pavement markings and delineator posts. He said the Route 29/Hydraulic Road intersection was a relatively low-cost improvement to safety and operational concerns, with post delineators and curbing similar to what was installed on Rio East at Dunlora, which would bring more visibility to the lane shift for northbound Route 29 traffic. He said that the right lane would no longer offer an option of two lanes to pick, as traffic would be directed into one lane, and right-turning traffic from Hydraulic would have its own free flow lane.

Ms. McKeel asked when this project would happen. Mr. Moore responded that they think it could be done by late summer, provided that funding can be secured. He explained that westbound Hydraulic would have two left turn lanes, two thru lanes, and one right lane. He concluded and invited questions.

Mr. Moore informed the Board that VDOT has expanded its agreement for trash collection by crews of inmates to weekends for a list of specific roads.

Ms. Palmer requested a list of roads with scheduled litter collection times so she could respond to constituent inquiries.

Mr. Randolph thanked VDOT for its work in cleaning up various County roads.

Ms. Mallek requested a future update on the replacement of substandard guardrails where stoppers are failing and killing people.

Ms. Palmer remarked that it was her understanding they were making them taller for SUVs. Mr. Moore confirmed new guardrail standards call for slightly taller guardrails and they are replacing them as they become damaged and as new projects go through. He noted that they do not have the funding to replace all the guardrails.

Agenda Item No. 13. **Presentation:** Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) Quarterly Report.

Mr. Bill Mawyer, Executive Director of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, reported that the RWSA has made a lot of changes at the transfer station, with the fees lowered on January 1. He stated that they started opening on Mondays beginning March 18, with the objective of increasing refuse flow, and are averaging about 71 tons per day, which is more than double the 34 tons per day they had last year. He noted that they had 123 tons on March 25, the second Monday they were open, and 64 tons on Monday, April 1. He said the RWSA Board has agreed with staff's proposal to stop recycling of #3-7 plastics since there was no market for them, and several neighboring counties (Augusta County,

Staunton, Waynesboro and Harrisonburg) have followed suit nor are they going to recycle glass, but to try to use glass as landfill cover at Augusta landfill. He said that SUNOCO in Fishersville have stopped accepting these materials, which led to the change in Augusta County's recycling.

Ms. Palmer remarked that she receives many emails informing her that stuff was piling up on the floor at the transfer station, so she went out on March 30 to investigate and observed a big pile of construction debris. She said Phil McKalips informed her they have been receiving so much solid waste that the trucking company they use does not have enough containers and want to determine the new norm before making adjustments. She added that she also observed debris from fire.

Mr. Mawyer acknowledged that some debris from a fire was brought in, and they had the Crozet Volunteer Fire Department put out some sizzle and smoke. He said there was no damage to the facility. He explained that municipal waste must be cleared promptly, and they save construction debris to the end of the day and have it hauled away by trucks.

Mr. Mawyer next presented an update on the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority and said the new granular activated carbon system was doing great things to enhance drinking water quality. He reviewed a number of ongoing and planned projects. He said as part of the community water supply plan, they are 30% complete on the installation of a 36-foot raw waterline adjacent to the Birdwood property while the golf course was remodeled. They are continuing to acquire easements for the remaining nine miles of the pipeline from the Rivanna Reservoir to the Ragged Mountain Reservoir. He said they are conducting surveys and appraisals and are working with two County property owners to whom they hope to make proposals by the end of May. He said most of the easements they would acquire are with VDOT, the City, Albemarle County Public Schools, and the UVA Foundation, with about nine private property owners they would be involved with over the nine-mile link.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they would enhance the metering system and may add an ultraviolet disinfection system at the Scottsville Water Treatment Plant. He said renovation of the Crozet Water Treatment Plant was underway, including planning for modifications to Beaver Creek Dam to enlarge the spillway to increase capacity to 31 inches of rain per day as required by the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, compared to the current capacity of 15 inches per day. He said the regulations were rewritten as a result of floods in Lynchburg and California that washed out dams. He said they are working on a finished water master plan to strengthen the water system in the Pantops area and through the core of the City, formerly known as the Southern Loop, running from the Observatory Water Treatment Plant to a storage tank at Avon Street. He said the concept was to continue from Avon Street to Pantops, although they now feel they may get more benefit if the waterline was to pass through the University up to Pantops, and they would continue to assess this.

Ms. Palmer remarked that this was for system redundancy, although it may be difficult to get it through Charlottesville with all the private properties.

Mr. Mawyer said they are doing a plan and would meet with the City, and they would see where they could finalize alignment for the pipe.

Ms. McKeel remarked that they have had a lot of rain lately but need to be ready for a drought.

Mr. Mawyer agreed and stated that he learned at a conference he attended the previous week that there have been more significant weather events, such as hurricanes, tornadoes, and floods, in the last 12 years than in any decade before. He said he explained to Charlottesville City Council that they must prepare the system for the long term. He continued that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requires them to conduct a risk and resiliency study plan for the water system as an addition to what the vulnerability assessment requires as a result of the 2001 bioterrorism attack in New York, which has been expanded to take into account resiliency, weather events, and other things. He said they are moving forward with a design for a major renovation of the Observatory and the South Rivanna Water Treatment plants and hope to begin construction late this year or early next year. He said they presented a budget to their Board that proposes \$97 million for the five-year CIP and \$36 million for next year's budget, of which 47% represents debt service payments of \$17 million per year on \$200 million of debt. He stated that this was part of the Authority's operating design.

Ms. Palmer noted that last year's budget was significantly impacted by the heavy rain and replacement of the granular activated carbon system.

Mr. Mawyer noted that next year's budget has \$900,000 for replacement of the GAC filter media, and this would be a recurring item each year.

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. Mawyer to provide the Board with a year-to-year monthly tonnage comparison of waste at the Ivy Transfer Station at a future presentation. He said it would be helpful to know the expected annual cost to rate payers of the projects and debt service he outlined. Mr. Mawyer responded that he would ask Mr. Gary O'Connell to address that question, as the Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) translates the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) costs to the retail rate and they proposed a 9% rate increase to the Service Authority.

Mr. Dill asked what the average interest rate on the debt was. Mr. Mawyer responded that he thinks it was 3% or 4%.

Ms. Mallek thanked Mr. Mawyer for keeping them informed, as it helps to prevent the debacles that happened before he came.

Agenda Item. No. 14. **Presentation:** Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) Quarterly Report.

Mr. Gary O'Connell, Executive Director of the Albemarle County Service Authority, stated that they are in the middle of the budget process and would impose a 9% wholesale rate increase, with about one-half of this passed on to retail customers, and he would report the specifics to the Board in July. He said they are trying to sustain reasonable rate increases to support many projects.

Ms. Palmer mentioned that she met with Mr. O'Connell and the ACSA's Chief Financial Officer, and they reviewed how they use the rate stabilization funds. She said they were very well-organized and have made some great improvements since she served on that Board.

Mr. O'Connell remarked that they adopted a growth paying for growth policy in 2008 or 2009, with revenues from connection fees going to help with debt service related to growth and capacity. He said they sent a survey to customers that was included with their bills and have received 1,200 responses thus far and would follow up with about 100 respondents who wrote in comments. He commented that he was pleased with the 80%–90% of respondents who were very satisfied or satisfied with service. He said they have changed to quarterly newsletters from semi-annual and would also try to include an informational insert each month. He gave examples of the information contained in the inserts such as results of the water quality survey and a notice about the Rivanna Riverfest event.

Mr. O'Connell said there are about 400,000 tests of the water conducted at the plants and on the system, and results are included in the report. He noted that people are discovering that granular activated carbon solves all kinds of unusual treatment issues, including the improvement of water quality and distribution systems and improvement of taste, and it removes manmade and naturally occurring contaminants. He said it provides an added level of treatment for the future protection of drinking water. He recounted that at a presentation at the most recent RWSA Board meeting, staff detailed how granular activated carbon (GAC) has significantly reduced the creation of contaminants throughout the system, in some cases by more than 80%, and he praised the Board for its decision to authorize the use of GAC.

Ms. Mallek remarked that nobody expressed opposition to the extra 1.2 cents per gallon fee to pay for it. She noted that it removed pharmaceuticals and lead.

Ms. Palmer said she would like to get this message out to the community, as many people are still drinking bottled water, not realizing the improvements that have been made, and disseminating this information could lead to a reduction in the number of plastic water bottles.

Mr. Dill asked if they could conduct a comparison test of the County's water with bottled water and then announce the results to the community. Mr. O'Connell remarked that everything was stripped out of bottled water, and then they put things back in to give it flavor.

Mr. O'Connell stated that he would present a CIP project to the Board in July, which would include maps by district. He said they invested about \$55 million over the last 10 years in the developed areas, including Crozet and Scottsville, which has mostly been waterline replacements and sewer rehabilitation, and he projects they would spend an additional \$15 million over the next three years. He noted that most of these investments are in the areas of older neighborhoods, though they recently did a major rehabilitation in Glenmore. He said they have a highly successful community arts program and plan to work with the schools to have students paint and name fire hydrants, which may expand as time goes on. He addressed the Board's concern that roads are torn up for VDOT paving projects and as a result, Joel DeNunzio has become involved and a paving group has been looking at the schedule of upcoming projects to let the ACSA know in advance of areas they need to work in.

Ms. Mallek asked if the new VDOT rules that require ACSA to repave the entire street are a financial burden or part of normal business operations. Mr. O'Connell acknowledged that there was a cost issue, though generally the streets need a lot of work anyway and if they had gone in and cut them up it is probably more desirable for the community to do the work. He added that if ACSA was doing a major waterline replacement, they repave after the work was complete, and it is built into the budget.

Mr. O'Connell added that he received questions from customers about mildew around their toilet bowls and said the ACSA has identified a laboratory that could test the mildew for anything that was dangerous or unsafe and be sure it was not in the water. He said they have placed information on the ACSA website to address this popular topic and that people need to clean their toilets and sinks more regularly.

Ms. McKeel recalled a recent report on the national news about lead in the water at some schools and asked Mr. O'Connell if his office has received any questions from residents. Mr. O'Connell responded that he has not received any inquiries of late. He said the schools recently tested water fountains and found one or two had a lead reservoir, and those situations have been resolved. He said there has been no lead in any of the testing done at the schools.

Ms. Mallek asked if ACSA routinely tests the water at schools. Mr. O'Connell responded that both his staff and school staff have tested the water.

Agenda Item No 15. Closed Meeting.

At 5:10 p.m., Mr. Dill **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 appointments to the Crozet Community Advisory Committee, the Village of Rivanna Community Advisory Committee, the Historic Preservation Committee and the Jefferson Area Board for Aging, for which there are pending vacancies or requests for reappointments;
- under Subsection (6), to discuss and consider the investment of public funds in an affordable housing project in the northern portion of the Scottsville Magisterial District where, if made public initially, would adversely affect the financial interest of the County; and
- under Subsection (7), to consult with legal counsel and briefings by staff members pertaining to litigation between the Board and Global Signal Acquisitions, where consultation or briefing in an open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the County and the Board.

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. Dill, Mr. Gallaway and Ms. Mallek.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: None.

Note: Mr. Dill left the meeting at 5:58 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 16. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 6:00 p.m., Ms. Palmer **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. 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. Gallaway and Ms. Mallek.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Dill.

Agenda Item No. 17. Boards and Commissions: Vacancies and Appointments.

Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board make the following appointments/reappointments:

- **reappoint** Mr. Doug Bates, Ms. Alice Pesch, Mr. Sean Bird, Mr. John McKeon, Mr. Thomas Loach, and Mr. Timothy Kunkle to the Crozet Community Advisory Committee with said terms to expire March 31, 2019.
- **reappoint** Mr. K. Edward Lay and Ms. Betsy Baten to the Historic Preservation Committee with said terms to expire June 4, 2021.
- **reappoint** Mr. Robert Gest, Ms. Susan Friedman, and Mr. Richard Lindsay to the Jefferson Area Board for Aging with said terms to expire March 31, 2021.
- **appoint** Ms. Dottie Martin and Ms. Ann Harrod to the Village of Rivanna Community Advisory Committee with said terms to expire March 31, 2021.
- **appoint** Ms. Sandra Hausman to the Crozet Community Advisory Committee with said terms to expire March 31, 2019.

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. Gallaway and Ms. Mallek.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Dill.

Agenda Item No. 18. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Mr. Tom Eklund, member of IMPACT and resident of Bentivar, addressed the Board. He said that the County's housing needs assessment affirms Interfaith Movement Promoting Action by Congregations Together (IMPACT's) research and proposals. He said that 4,145 County families have incomes below 50% of AMI, many are seniors in both the urban and rural areas and struggle to keep a roof over their heads. He urged the County to increase the number of affordable rental units for seniors age 55+ and other low-income families, increase the number of fully accessible units for seniors, and to examine methods of capitalization, including non-County revenue sources, to create a permanent housing fund. He applauded and thanked the Board for supporting Stacey Pethia's recommendations to get started on

guidelines for a housing fund. He urged the Board to allocate \$1.5 million to start the housing fund, establish an oversight committee, and set guidelines on how to use money from the fund to encourage development of real affordable housing for low-income people with a prioritization of seniors. He invited Supervisors to attend the annual Nehemiah Action on April 11 at 6:30 p.m. at the Martin Luther King Jr. Center, an event that was expected to draw an attendance of more than 1,000. He said Supervisors' attendance would demonstrate leadership and commitment, and he recognized that some of them are passionate about getting more housing in rental for those who struggle with low income. He commented that the County was very affluent and there are many who would support the Board in addressing this problem.

Agenda Item No. 19. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Randolph said the Board received two reports on cell towers and asked members to be cautious about the report's conclusions. He said that one of the report's authors, Deborah Davis, was an acquaintance of his from his work with Scenic Hudson that had addressed a proposed cement plant to be constructed in Beacon, NY. He invited Supervisors to speak with him privately if they have questions about the report.

Ms. Palmer announced that the County has received a Virginia Telecommunications Initiative (VATI) grant for the CVEC Midway fiber to home project, which would enable them to reach residents in some of the most difficult rural areas that lack internet service.

Ms. McKeel said she had a nice discussion this week with the local manager for TING, an Internet Service Provider, and has asked Mr. Richardson to invite her to update the Board.

Ms. Mallek commented that she had substituted on a panel for Environment Virginia and had updated attendees on how the County's recycling program has been affected by the change in markets. She said that one presenter was from packaging manufacturer West Rock, and that person talked about the different phases of packaging. She said another presenter was the Director of the Central Virginia Solid Waste Authority, which represents 21 communities around Chesterfield, and discussed their outreach education marketing, which has a budget of \$200,000 and represents about \$1 per person. She offered to send Supervisors a copy of the presentation.

Ms. Palmer asked if they are still doing single stream. Ms. Mallek responded that they are working on changing things and would have dual stream in some areas and total separation in others, though Chesterfield may be pulling out of the program. She recalled that several years ago, Ms. Palmer had remarked that if they do recycling right at the solid waste center then people would come back, and while some on the Board were skeptical, Ms. Palmer ended up being right.

Mr. Gallaway informed the Board that he attended a meeting of the Rio Community Advisory Committee last week and learned that the wildflower meadow for which the Board allocated funding in December 2017 would finally get underway this fall. He said that one of the main concerns expressed about pocket parks was deer.

Ms. Mallek remarked that they had to determine which plants deer did not like.

Ms. McKeel said that New Zealand solved their deer problem by domesticating the animals.

Agenda Item No. 20. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Richardson reminded the Board and citizens that Albemarle County has contracted with Wingate Appraisal Services to visit properties from February 2019 through July 2019 for the purpose of verifying and updating real estate property data for the 2020 reassessment. He said that Wingate representatives would wear a County identification badge and their vehicles are registered with the Albemarle County Police Department. He said they would take photographs, update exterior property observations including verification of building dimensions and ancillary items, and would not enter dwellings. He noted that property owners received notification letters earlier in the year.

Mr. Richardson informed the Board that several staff and Board members visited JAUNT, a key transportation partner in the community, to attend a garage renovation open house. He praised the great staff and operation of JAUNT.

Mr. Richardson stated that 35 County leaders attended three days of high-performance leadership training at the Rivanna Volunteer Fire Department, and he thanked the volunteers for sharing their facility. He said the trainers were from University of Virginia's (UVA's) Senior Executive Institute and compacted one week of training into three days, which represents approximately 900 hours of staff training time.

Agenda Item No. 21. Closed Meeting.

At 6:18 p.m., Ms. Palmer **moved** that the Board go into closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia:

- under Subsection (6), to discuss and consider the investment of public funds in an affordable housing project in the northern portion of the Scottsville Magisterial District where, if made public initially, would adversely affect the financial interest of the County; and
- under Subsection (7), to consult with legal counsel and briefings by staff members pertaining to litigation between the Board and Global Signal Acquisitions, where consultation or briefing in an open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the County and the Board.

The motion was **seconded** by Ms. McKeel. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Gallaway and Ms. Mallek.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Dill.

Note: Ms. McKeel left the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

Certify Closed Meeting

At 6:52 p.m., Ms. Palmer **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. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Gallaway and Ms. Mallek.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Dill and Ms. McKeel.

Agenda Item No. 22. Adjourn to April 9, 2019, 6:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 6:53 p.m., the Chair adjourned the meeting to April 9, 2019 6:00 p.m. Lane Auditorium.

Chairman

| |
|-------------------|
| Approved by Board |
| Date 11/06/2019 |
| Initials CKB |