

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 1, 2016, at 11:30 a.m., Lewis and Clark Center, Darden Towe Park, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from February 29, 2016.

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

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Thomas C. Foley, County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Jordan, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

CHARLOTTESVILLE CITY COUNCIL PRESENT: Mr. Wes Bellamy, Mr. Bob Fenwick, Ms. Kathy Galvin, Mr. Mike Signer and Ms. Kristin Szakos.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: City Manager, Maurice Jones, City Attorney, Craig Brown and City Clerk, Paige Rice.

The meeting was called to order at 11:45 a.m., by Chair, Ms. Palmer and Mayor Signer.

The following agenda was used as the basis for the meeting:

- a. Overview
- b. Transportation
- c. Education
- d. Environment
- e. Housing
- f. General Discussion

Ms. Palmer stated that she will start with an overview and a recap of what Board and Council have done together over the past few years, then turn it over to Mayor Signer to provide further description of what they are doing. She said with each new Board of Supervisors and City Council, there is always an effort to improve City-County relationships and find new ways to cooperate, and while both entities already cooperate in a lot of ways, they want to do better. Ms. Palmer said that both localities face financial pressures, and regionalization is one of the tools used to reduce those pressures, but the benefits of cooperative ventures go well beyond the financial aspects. She stated that most citizens do not know or care when they cross jurisdictional boundaries to work, school and play, and water, air, public water and sewer go right across the boundaries unimpeded, and economic boundaries do not coincide with political boundaries. Ms. Palmer said that as elected officials, they recognize the boundaries because of their fiscal responsibility to citizens, but also recognize that their futures are interwoven because of their geographic proximity, and a healthy Charlottesville helps keep Albemarle healthy and vice versa.

Ms. Palmer reported the County and City are meeting now to try to find new ways to do regional cooperation, and said they have been working at this over the last two years. She stated that in July 2014, they held a City/County meeting with a mediator, and it was well-organized and productive. Ms. Palmer said the elected bodies chose three different areas to work on: a regional transit authority, the Rivanna River corridor planning study, and the courts project. She stated they broke out into groups with two City Councilors and two Board of Supervisors with appropriate staff and worked on them for the next year, reconvening in September 2015 with a mediator to do an overview of what happened. Ms. Palmer noted that Chip Boyles of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission reviewed the Rivanna River Corridor Study, which had expanded to include many more stakeholders and had become much more involved. She said that Deputy County Executive, Bill Letteri, provided an overview of progress with the courts project, and the group also had an update on the regional transit authority, which morphed into several different things and will be updated for both bodies via a report in November 2016. Ms. Palmer stated that Board and Council also had a lengthy discussion about CATEC and post K-12 education, and small area plans for areas where the two jurisdictions meet such as Barracks Road, Woolen Mills and Avon Street Extended.

Ms. Palmer stated with that background in mind, Board and Council are trying to figure out where to go from here. Ms. Palmer noted that when she, Mayor Signer, Ms. McKeel and Mr. Bellamy sat down to start talking about an agenda for this meeting, they decided not to engage a mediator and instead have Councilors and Supervisors talk directly with one another.

Mayor Signer stated that with new Board and Council members there is potential for a fresh start, and he feels they are on the brink of an era where there could be new levels of cooperation and achievement for both jurisdictions. Mayor Signer stated the idea of regionalism has become a paradigm shift around the country, yielding incredibly good results in areas where there are joint localities, and in this area, there is the unique situation of one jurisdiction being wholly surrounded by another, so the reasons for regionalism are even stronger. He noted he had grown up in Arlington County, where the

Council of Governments had achieved tremendous policy results for a lot of the neighboring jurisdictions in areas such as homeland security and transportation. Mayor Signer stated that regionalism is generally a good idea because efficiencies and higher degrees of results can be achieved for neighboring jurisdictions, especially in policy areas where the areas of concern affect both neighboring populations and spilled over boundaries.

Mayor Signer said there are four areas of focus chosen, which he and Ms. Palmer had discussed extensively with their colleagues, and these are intended to be areas where there is a lot of work ahead but also a lot of problems, so it is not just an emergency or security issue, but there is already a lot happening in terms of cooperation. He stated the four areas are: transit/transportation; redevelopment of housing; education with a focus on pre-K, career and technical education; and the natural environment. Mayor Signer said they had done some research on how regionalism has evolved in other counties, and Ms. Galvin had brought in an authority from Portland, Oregon, which had significant accomplishments in this area over many years. He stated the first step in the process is an agreement between the two entities that is meant to have significant commitments in it, with a memorandum of understanding having a lighter footprint and more voluntary than an actual contract. Mayor Signer noted this will be a good faith effort by both bodies to say they will start to work together in these four areas, and the template in each is almost identical, with a preamble of justification for why the area is good for cooperation, examples of existing cooperation, and a resolution of five areas. He elaborated the resolution includes a designated staff member assigned to promote success; identify potential resources available to both localities; identify and consider potential efficiencies for harmonization; identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction of acting, with or without information-sharing; and identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate.

Mayor Signer commented these are not perfect, but are intended to be a starting point that can grow into terrific things as it is revisited, and feedback is needed as to whether they are right, with this meeting being the first opportunity to look at these documents as being deliverable and having commitment from each of the bodies. He stated that transportation had the most significant committee coming out of the prior summit, so that item should have more time allocated, with the other three items to follow. Mayor Signer emphasized the real question is what to do moving forward coming out of the meeting, and the issues are actions by the two bodies and timeline. He said the simplest approach with actions will be to have a single two on two committee and go forward charged by the two bodies to finalize these based on feedback that arises from their conversations; and the timeline and public engagement piece will also need to be decided upon. Mayor Signer stated that ideally, in 3-6 months they will have another meeting to finalize the areas based on the work of the committees. He noted that Mr. Foley and Mr. Jones have also provided feedback on how this will interact with staff, and he feels confident that they are enthusiastic about working together.

(Note: Mr. Sheffield read the following Transactional Disclosure Statement: "I am employed as Executive Director of JAUNT, a regional public transportation provider owned by the City of Charlottesville and the counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Louisa, Nelson, Buckingham, and Amherst located at 104 Keystone Place, Charlottesville, Virginia 22902, and have a personal interest in JAUNT because I receive an annual salary from JAUNT that exceeds \$5,000 annually." He stated that since JAUNT is a subject of the agenda and could benefit either directly or indirectly, he would recuse himself from the meeting.)

Ms. Szakos asked why he would have to leave, given that this is a public meeting and anyone could attend. Mr. Sheffield responded that it puts him in an uncomfortable position since he is in a decision-making capacity that can impact JAUNT, and his decisions can provide an influence so he prefers to have other JAUNT personnel serve as expertise as needed. He stated that he and Mr. Davis had discussed it and determined that it is probably not a clear conflict, but he has chosen to err on the side of caution.

(Note: Mr. Sheffield left the meeting at 11:58 a.m.)

Mr. Chip Boyles, Executive Director of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, stated that his intent is to provide an overview to provide a foundation for future discussions and educational sessions on funding, budgetary processes and joint operations of JAUNT and CAT. Mr. Boyles referenced a handout he had provided, and commented that this is a chance for the bodies to talk with one another about regional transit opportunities. He stated the MPO is currently engaged in working with a steering committee that will produce a report in November on regional transit opportunities. Mr. Boyles explained this had originated as another review to look at a regional transit authority, but after working with the committee and the PAC Committee with the University, it was determined that a better first step was to look at the operations of JAUNT, CAT, and the University Transit System. He stated the effort is looking for areas of overlap and improvement and will not really be looking at new service lines or capital expenditures, which a previous report had gone into in great detail, and this is more about governance, operations and communications. Mr. Boyles said he does not know the intricate details of JAUNT or CAT, but does have a good understanding of the federal funding system, which is where the TJPDC seems to be receiving questions from public officials regarding the basics of funding public transit. He noted that while both JAUNT and CAT receive funding outside of the urban area and the MPO area, any federal funding spent on transit in the urbanized area has to go through the MPO, which approved it in its long-range transportation plan and then approved it again to send to the state transportation improvement plan, which is the funding mechanism for the Department of Rail and Public Transportation.

Mr. Boyles reported that for both JAUNT and CAT, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 Small Urban Area Funds funds operating and capital costs in an indirect way, and said his handouts have included a flowchart as to how that money is channeled. He explained this funding is for small urban areas, those with less than 200,000 population. He stated the Charlottesville MPO area will grow after the next census, but noted that his staff has already begun looking at population densities and even if the area grows east to Zion's Crossroads and northwest to Stanardsville, they are a long way away from 200,000. Mr. Boyles stated the reason that is important is because under the 5307 funds, 80% of capital costs and 50% of operating costs are picked up by federal sources, but once 200,000 threshold is reached, those percentages decrease drastically. He reported the other source of funding is 5311 Rural Funds coming from the FTA to the state, which in turn will match some of that money, changing from year to year and program to program, but still providing 50% of operating and 80% of administrative, capital and planning expenses. Mr. Boyles emphasized these are net funds, and fares have to be removed from operating expenses prior to calculating the percentage for reimbursement. He stated there are also local funding sources, with funds provided by the two local governments, contracts for other services, and other grant programs.

Mr. Boyles stated that another question the TJPDC often receives is whether the area will get more money for transit due solely to population increases, but the funding is weighted with moving more people in less time for less money, so the more riders per capita, the higher funding streams will be, and it is not as simple as population growth. He said the most important information to be discussed today is the distribution of 5307 and 5311 funding, and noted that UVA transit system does not receive any federal or state funding unless it is specialized grants. Mr. Boyles said that some of the rural funds come to CAT, which in turn reimburses JAUNT for some of its rural services, so the structure can become complicated very quickly. He stated they also have to include local funds from the general funds contributed by the localities and purchase of services or contract fares paid from UVA to CAT for some of the joint service areas providing transportation to students, faculty and staff.

Ms. Szakos asked for clarification that the transit funding stream from CAT to JAUNT is for rural services or for fare transit. Mr. Boyles clarified that it is for urban services, and that is the 5307 Small Urban funds.

Mr. Boyles explained that CAT is a City department responsible to the City Council and City Manager, but JAUNT is a public corporation managed by a board of directors, with all participating governments in the region appointing someone to serve on it, so there is a very different process involved with the organizations' decision-making and budgetary processes. He noted that CAT does have an advisory board appointed by the City of Charlottesville that makes recommendations to the staff of CAT, which brings them up through the decision-making process. Mr. Boyles stated it has become evident in the work being done for the MPO's regional transit operations report that there is a lack of written policies and procedures among all of these departments, including some financial and funding arrangements that do not have updated agreements as to how things are supposed to work, and one of the first recommendations out of the study would be to establish a more formal means of communication and so forth.

Mr. Boyles stated the MPO does an ongoing educational series for transportation issues and has shifted its curriculum around due to some of the questions they have been receiving recently, and said the next series will be on public transit. He said the sessions last about 1.5-2 hours and are held at the TJPDC's Water Street Center, and there will be speakers from DRPT, JAUNT, CAT and UVA to talk about their systems. Mr. Boyles added that the TJPDC also plans to hold a larger comprehensive conference in the fall that will incorporate a myriad of regional community issues, with transportation being one element of that.

Ms. Szakos commented that they often hear about the two different types of funding for CAT, and they both need a little bit different treatment. Mr. Boyles responded that they are funded very differently, and the FTA funds a good portion of capital, but much less for operating.

Mr. Bellamy stated that regarding the CAT budget process, the City takes on a large portion of the responsibility for CAT, which may be because they have more routes, and he would like to know how many County representatives serve on the Citizens Stakeholder Advisory Board.

Ms. McKeel said she has been going as a citizen, and there is one other Albemarle County resident who goes as a user, but her understanding from the bylaws is that there are not stakeholders from the County listed to serve on that committee.

Mr. Bellamy commented they may want to consider having more County representation so that they can have more input into the process, rather than just having CAT expect money from the County, and asked about the logic behind that.

Ms. Szakos stated that because it is a City department with City funds, the relationship with the County has been more along the lines of contract for services rather than government operations.

Ms. Mallek asked how the County population within the urban ring is taken into account for the funding, and how they are included in the decision-making process. Mr. Boyles explained that in the

funding approvals by the state for the urban money, which also includes the urban area of the County as well as the City, takes into account the population in relation to the number of riders in the urban ring, or riders per capita for the urban areas.

Ms. Galvin asked if the residential population is a factor. Mr. Boyles reiterated it is just the ridership taken into account.

Mayor Signer asked Mr. Boyles if he feels that the MOU, as drafted, fits within the scope of what he has described, adding that the reason they had wanted to spend time on transportation is because of the complexity of the structure. Mr. Boyles responded that he has not seen the MOU yet.

Ms. Palmer commented there will definitely need to be some changes made to it.

Ms. Mallek stated she would like to spend more time on the questions related to financial input, as reflected in the 6th bullet.

Ms. McKeel stated that these are very good questions but they cannot all be solved today, and suggested parking questions that need to be answered at a later time, and what they would want to discuss in a later meeting.

Mayor Signer said he could see visiting the funding question raised by Ms. Mallek, and sharpening this for later discussions does not mean they are affirming anything.

Ms. McKeel said they may want to add things to the chart to inform how they might want it coming back as a final copy.

Ms. Szakos commented that she is not sure they have really done due diligence on this item, and they should also hear from staff.

Ms. Palmer said they might also want to say who staff is, and noted that this will go through the MPO and the TJPDC.

Mayor Signer noted that a process going forward could take 4-6 months, and could become specific or stay very general, but at this point they are just raising issues that will go into that process.

Mr. Boyles clarified the study already underway is addressing the bigger picture issues and is not about new busses running to Afton Mountain and so forth.

Mr. Foley said it seems that part of the role for him and Mr. Jones will be to start to work with this in the context of activities already going on so that it fits into the regional efforts already underway.

Ms. Palmer confirmed the report will be coming back to them in November.

Ms. Galvin stated that one thing that has not yet been mentioned is acknowledgement of the relationship between land use and transportation planning, and while they already have cooperation for areas like Hydraulic and 29, it is important to continue to make that link.

(Note: Mr. Sheffield rejoined the meeting at 12:27 p.m.)

Mr. Bellamy stated they had already read through the bulk of the MOU content, and he will be reviewing existing examples of cooperation as well as getting feedback on the resolutions.

Mr. Bellamy listed the examples of cooperation in the areas of: Charlottesville Albemarle Technical Education Center (CATEC); Piedmont Regional Education Partnership Program (PREP); Charlottesville Albemarle Early Education Task Force; UVA Lab School Partnership; Investing In Innovation Grant (i3) \$3.5 million; and Public Education Foundation (PEF). He stated the resolution states that the City Council of Charlottesville and the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County hereby agree to this Memorandum of Understanding directing our respective City Manager and County Executive and their staffs to develop and enact plans to accomplish the following: designate a staff member assigned to promoting success; identify potential available resources available to both localities; identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization; identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction of acting with or without information sharing; and identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate.

Mr. Bellamy stated there has been some discussion among Councilors and Supervisors as to items that constituents in both localities have already expressed interest in; specifically what will happen with CATEC moving forward and a possible merger with PVCC, and what pre-K education will look like in the community and a possible joint merger there, including where that space would be. Mr. Bellamy said that City and County elected officials have already shown that they are willing to work together to devise a plan to do what is best for the area, and he would like to hear further as to the desire and possibilities to collaborate.

Mr. Fenwick asked where things stand now in terms of CATEC. Ms. McKeel responded that CATEC is spending this year implementing its new strategic plan with the new director and principal, with an effort to align curriculum with what is offered at PVCC as well as what they are seeing in terms of workforce development needs. She stated that she had recently attended a meeting with the new Economic Development Director, Faith McClintic, which is a fairly new formal effort for the County. Ms. McClintic commented to her that there are some really great things that she can suggest to Board, Council, and CATEC that will enable CATEC to leap that boundary and enhance the potential of going to PVCC. Ms. McKeel said that it will be interesting to have Ms. McClintic and the City's counterpart, Chris Engel, talk about economic development and how working together can help move CATEC forward to help solve workforce development needs.

Mr. Bellamy agreed that this is a very positive suggestion.

Ms. Galvin asked if this will follow along the format suggested here of having those two staff people follow up, research, and discuss policy based on this direction, then present to the respective bodies. Mr. Bellamy said this was his understanding based on what Ms. McKeel had suggested.

Mayor Signer stated that there is somewhat of an unresolved debate as to how much of the structure they will set up as a Board and Council as part-time governing bodies, versus directing staff to come back and present proposals that are consistent with the typical format of having the bodies consider those plans.

Ms. Galvin emphasized that the Council had already given direction to staff in the area of wanting to create a workforce that is compatible with economic development needs, so the directive from this process is doing it together with the Board.

Ms. Palmer added that it will also need to reflect the process of to how to do it.

Mr. Bellamy stated that one of the items they need to strongly consider is the fact that CATEC is underutilized. They need to think about what they can do collectively in terms of sending directives to staffs and school boards to encourage students to go into the building, because all the plans in the world will not make this work if students do not want to go there, and would be a waste of money. He added that he would hate to see all of this effort put in and have 75 students attend.

Ms. Palmer asked if the CATEC Board is looking strongly at how to get students there, and which programs will attract them. Ms. McKeel stated that CATEC is trying to do this through their strategic plan, and at one point CATEC served about 400 students and now is down to about 200 students. Mr. Bellamy is right in that the school can serve both the City and County in a very positive manner, but they are struggling and need support if that is a choice the localities make.

Mayor Signer asked Mr. Boyles to talk about Go Virginia. Mr. Boyles explained that Go Virginia has overwhelming support from both the House and Senate, including almost full funding, but the project funding will not begin until FY18, which will include workforce development as an eligible project.

Ms. Szakos commented that it has to be regional.

Mr. Boyles confirmed that it does, and said that to be eligible for the funding the state is encouraging partnerships between cities and counties, including partnering with localities outside of the area.

Mr. Bellamy said that he likes Ms. McKeel's suggestion about utilizing economic development staff, and said this can be an add-on to the MOU. He stated that he would like to hear from both bodies as to the interest in pre-K and a possible joint facility.

Mr. Dill stated that he would like to broaden it into the context similar to their discussions on broadband, as there is no one solution to it, so there can possibly be one larger joint facility with some smaller regional privately operated programs in satellite locations like Scottsville. He said they already have pre-K in the area so the idea is to expand it, and just giving a lot of kids a more wholesome environment will help. Mr. Dill emphasized that kids learn in different ways, and while it is great to have fully accredited teachers and facilities, that is not imperative, and providing a lot for a few kids and nothing for many others does not seem like the right approach.

Ms. Szakos said that since Virginia does not have guaranteed public education for pre-K, this is one area for which they can consider vouchers so that kids can go to different preschools, in addition to looking collaboratively at having a facility in the center. He stated that even if they can only participate in the private ones, being able to cross municipal boundaries and funding it in one chunk might be worth discussing.

Mr. Randolph stated it would be helpful to have a recommendation from the respective school superintendents to identify three areas of commonality program-wise, for which they feel there could be increased collaboration that will help drive regional efficiencies, so the community can provide better services for less taxpayer dollars. He stated that he would like for the Board and Council to discuss

whatever the superintendents bring back as prioritized areas of potential, and rather than having Councilors and Supervisors try to engineer it, he would like to hear from school representatives. Mr. Randolph added that the bullet points provided are very aspirational, and taking three areas plus CATEC would be a more productive exercise for the long term.

Mr. Bellamy stated that as a teacher, he would offer that the reason CATEC redesigned the different academies within it was to look at new pathways as a basis for meeting needs, but he is supportive of having the superintendents come in and talk about ways to collaborate.

Ms. McKeel said there are both short and long-term goals at play, as well as connectivity needed among school boards, superintendents, Councilors and Supervisors.

Ms. Szakos stated there has been collaboration for a while with various recommendations brought forth, but since preschool is funded only by localities, not the state, it is different in that it is not part of the school budget.

Mayor Signer asked how this might dovetail with the work of the pre-K task force. Mr. Mike Murphy stated that he and Maurice Jones, along with United Way, will be providing an update from the task force at City Council's March 21st meeting, and stated that the task force is looking at a gap of about 250 children who do not get any formal preschool prior to entering kindergarten. He explained the focus areas are to look at how to leverage resources from the state and local government, and private funders; to examine the quality of pre-K education; and to provide access in an effort to serve as many children as possible, especially at the 4-year-old level. Mr. Murphy stated that discussion on the City side with the superintendent, had talked about equalizing slots for 3 and 4-year-olds, adding the locality does not maximize the dollars it can get from the state, which is based on classroom size and student ratios. He noted the state provides about \$3,000 per student per preschool classroom, but the cost is \$8,000 or \$9,000, and said the numbers of unserved children are about 50 in the City and 200 in the County.

Mr. Bellamy asked if the resolution here would be to create some kind of preschool or CATEC task force. Ms. Palmer responded they may want to wait until the pre-K task force report is presented prior to establishing another body.

Mayor Signer asked if the task force is ongoing or if they will finish up their task and then stand down. Mr. Foley explained that in 2015, both Council and the Board endorsed the task force model and laid out its charge, which would come back to both bodies, and there was both a visioning group and a working group. He stated the task force has made good progress, but did not get as far along as they had hoped because of hard work on a grant that would help fill immediate pre-K slots and take advantage of available funding. Mr. Foley suggested that it might be best to go back and look at the task force charge and determine what is best to bring back to the Board and Council so they are influencing it going forward.

Ms. Szakos suggested adding language to the MOU that they would be considering the recommendations of the task force.

Ms. McKeel said the language of the MOU seems to imply that they are supporting the work of the task force, and perhaps it would be best to wait to hear back from them.

Mr. Foley agreed that this will help the Board and Council make some decisions.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Walker if their work will be coming back in the fall. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, responded that the plan is for the task force to work through spring and summer to take advantage of the grant.

Mr. Foley stated there is a clear understanding that this is tied to the budget processes, and the task force knew they could not get into the current budget cycle but could for FY18, and that is where Board and Council will have the greatest influence. He emphasized the other thing that is important about this is that it is designed to be both a private and public effort, so the business community believes this is important, the United Way is coordinating the public/private effort, and there has also been discussion of foundation funding to help fund the effort in the future. Mr. Foley added the Board and Council should have good information to consider as they lead into the next budget process, and perhaps fall will be the best time to revisit this.

Ms. McKeel commented that the MOU will essentially work in tandem with the task force, with that work already happening now.

Ms. Szakos stated there seems to be strong interest in doing this collaboratively.

Mr. Foley noted the resolution they endorsed is clear that they want to work on it together.

Mr. Fenwick commented that he agrees with Mr. Randolph that this is aspirational and is policy-based, and he is concerned the Board and Council are piling on staff, so it would be helpful to hear from Mr. Jones in addition to Mr. Foley, along with other staff.

Ms. Palmer stated that the item related to the environment is extremely large and comprehensive, and there are some items that have been done, like the Livability Project, as well as some new County initiatives related to solid waste and the improvements at the Ivy transfer station, and City initiatives such as composting. She asked Councilors and Supervisors what additional items they want to address.

Ms. Szakos said she would like to talk about efficiencies of scale.

Ms. Palmer stated that one thing she would like to see is a disposal facility for paint, as there is no place in the County to get rid of it except perhaps for paint stores.

Mr. Fenwick commented that it would keep a lot of it out of the river.

Ms. Palmer said it would be good to have a one-stop place for disposal.

Ms. Galvin stated the third clause in the MOU relates to reduction of greenhouse gasses, which is directly tied to dependency on single-occupancy vehicles and the expansion of a multi-modal transportation system, so they need to be cognizant of the fact that these items are interrelated. She added that none of the items on the list are really related to multi-modal.

Ms. McKeel said the items on the list presented are examples of existing cooperation, and hopefully in the next iteration there would be more of an emphasis on connectivity.

Mayor Signer stated that perhaps they can add language that says "where possible" to find areas with other cooperative ventures.

Ms. Palmer commented that there are a lot of areas in which they can work together, and a lot of things they can do.

Mr. Dill stated there are items they can consider banning, such as Styrofoam and plastic bags, as other communities around the country have done, particularly the banning of certain toxic chemicals and pesticides.

Ms. Palmer noted the County will be forming an advisory committee for solid waste to look at what they can do over the next few years to promote some of these measures, and there can be City residents serving on that. She stated that in 2015, City staff participated with the long-range solid waste advisory committee and were extremely helpful, and Ms. Szakos had also attended some of those meetings.

Mr. Fenwick asked if her suggestion about paint could be rolled into the work of that committee. Ms. Palmer responded that it definitely could be.

Mr. Randolph stated that regarding the Rivanna River corridor planning, the Woolen Mills project has been waiting for sign-off from FEMA and the City, and the interpretation to the developer was that the City could not move forward on it because of global warming. He said he has been trying to find in the County code a statement that provides abdication for that reason, and he would love to have the City's cooperation with a sign-off to move that project forward, as it can serve as an anchor for an entire development corridor down the Rivanna River.

Mr. Jones commented that it is a little more complex than that, and explained that the City had been waiting for information back from the contractor because last year the City's engineers had discovered some numbers that were concerning and shared them with FEMA, which concurred and asked the developer for additional information. He stated the City had received that information on February 11 and had sent it on to FEMA to continue with the review.

Ms. Szakos asked if there is a timeline for that process. Mr. Jones responded that it will be up to FEMA, and said the City had sent a draft of the letter to the developer, and he seems to be fine with it, so the process is back in FEMA's hands.

Ms. Palmer stated the Rivanna River Rafters were originally going to be located in the project with Woolen Mills, but now they are looking for a new site, including Darden Towe, but there are some legal issues with using a public park for a private business, and there may be ways for the City and County to creatively help them move forward.

Mr. Davis stated that the policy is not to allow private businesses in a public park, but that policy can be reviewed.

Ms. Szakos noted that because it is a joint City/County park, they would both need to review it.

Ms. Galvin commented that the fifth bullet relating to site development reviews and environmental assessments ends up being extremely problematic with a process that was going on for more than a year.

Ms. Palmer asked how it is being done now. Ms. Mallek said that County staff did not have a chance to have a discussion about it, and everything was vetoed before they had an opportunity to do anything.

Mr. Jones stated that it was not a matter of vetoing, the City's engineers had a responsibility to review the information and found that the numbers were off, and after bringing it to their attention, FEMA agreed.

Ms. Mallek said that what Ms. Galvin had brought up underscores that it would have been good to bring that to County staff prior to taking it straight to Washington.

Ms. McKeel stated it is about communication, and they, at least, could have notified the County.

Ms. Galvin said it is important to have communication early on.

Ms. Palmer stated that it relates to the bullet "identify and consider potential impacts of each other's jurisdiction when acting with or without information."

Ms. Szakos said that she would add, "where appropriate."

Ms. McKeel noted that this pertains mostly to their border areas.

Ms. McKeel stated there are regulations, particularly in the urban ring, which would be helpful to align, such as the leash law and limitations on signage, so that those rules match between jurisdictions. She said it is very evident in her district, where one thing is legal but across the street it would be illegal.

Mayor Signer said they will move onto the final item and reserve 5-10 minutes at the end to discuss where to go from here and how to operationalize it.

Mr. Bellamy stated that existing examples of City/County cooperation includes use of federal housing vouchers to support tenants at the Crossing; joint comprehensive planning exercises; collaboration of small area planning alongside Hydraulic Road and 29; support of the Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless; support of organizations committed to maintain and expanding affordable housing units; collaboration on the Thomas Jefferson Community Land Trust; and collaboration on HAC.

Ms. Galvin added their work on the regional housing authority.

Mr. Randolph stated that as planning commissioners, he and Kurt Keesecker had worked on the affordable housing statement for "One Community" and agreed that there was a need for regional workforce and affordable housing policy designed to optimize supply to better meet demand and need. He stated that County Housing Director, Ron White, had provided a report on affordable housing in September 2015 that showed over 10 years, there were 1,250 units of affordable housing, indicating an average of 125 per year, with 1,600 people added to the County each year, and said they need to focus in on a regional policy. He stated he would also like to see language added so that the bullet read, "Identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate...to ensure an appropriate range of housing choices for all community members." Mr. Randolph noted that people moving from the City to the County and vice versa really do not care as much about crossing the jurisdictional boundary, as they are looking at housing prices and availability.

Ms. McKeel said this is a great example of an MOU that would connect back to their first one related to multi-modal transportation.

Ms. Galvin noted the RCLCO comprehensive housing study that the City just conducted is filled with information that feeds right into Mr. Randolph's recommendations. She stated the affordable housing language resonated very strongly with her, but she also wants to emphasize the importance of redevelopment over abandonment and neglect, as the major challenge for growth in the City is redevelopment, and she realizes the County is facing it too.

Mayor Signer commented that a lot of the actions seem to be pulling content out of the "whereas" clauses and making them more specific, and he wonders if they want to go more in that direction, where the next draft of the MOU would have specific directives in their policy-making capacity. He noted that their job is to set policy and he does not want to overburden staff.

Ms. Szakos said she will look to them to sign these today in terms of the conceptual nature of the MOUs, and then come back at the end of the year and look at the policies, after staff has had a chance to review everything.

Ms. Palmer commented that they will also need to overlay these with their existing comprehensive plans to see where things align.

Ms. Galvin suggested that Mr. Foley and Mr. Jones flesh these out and give specifics based on what they have heard.

Mr. Dill said the Board's next strategic plan will be in May or June, so these can be a strong focus at that time that will turn into action items.

Ms. McKeel commented that she would like to see some action items that may come out of this document, but she is not sure exactly how that will happen.

Ms. Galvin said this is why staff needs a first pass at it.

Mr. Bellamy stated that he appreciates Mr. Randolph's comments relating to affordable housing, and it would be great for both localities to align on their affordable housing policies, as he is not sure how helpful it is to have developers providing money in lieu of actual units.

Ms. Galvin stated that a regional housing authority would be a vehicle that will allow them to do what they have said.

Mayor Signer said it will flow out of government structures.

Ms. Szakos commented that it sounds wonderful and they should probably end up there, but it may not happen immediately.

Mayor Signer suggested that they not amend the five bullets specifically, but will attach an appendix each year of specifics stemming from them, and they can be action items or priorities with the different areas. He stated the real emphasis here is what goes forward from the process and who is doing it.

Ms. Szakos stated that what they have added is more along the lines of philosophical guidance and not specific to implementation, which will be added later.

Ms. Palmer said the implementation might already be in the comp plans. Ms. Galvin agreed, adding that they may just not have operationalized it.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that the City and County may have different rules as far as what they can do with things like affordable housing, so it will be important to be aware of those differences before moving onto any next steps.

Ms. Szakos stated that she and Ms. Mallek had talked a bit about developing another MOU on economic development, because it is easy to view it in the context of competition with each other, but it should be viewed more collaboratively because a biotech facility, for example, may need a hub area in downtown but need manufacturing facilities elsewhere.

Mr. Sheffield said it is easy to slip into a competitive mode with economic development, but the reality is that luring a business to the area means selling both the City and the County.

Ms. Galvin commented that they are definitely interrelated, and support one another.

Ms. McKeel noted that as a whole, they are more attractive.

Mr. Foley mentioned that some of the Go Virginia initiatives allows revenue-sharing monies.

Mr. Sheffield said that for future discussion, he would like to talk about having an age-friendly community, and the World Health Organization has a matrix of about eight categories, and the local area had done two or three of them very well, but not all. He stated there are people who are retiring but will not want to sit still, so they will either need to be served by local government or find some other locality in which to live.

Ms. McKeel asked if it would be better for the group that Mr. Sheffield is working with to continue their work and solidify it a bit first.

Mr. Sheffield said that it would be, and stated that the group will be engaging both the City and the County in their process.

Mayor Signer stated it would be helpful for the Board and Council to agree on a process for the joint efforts moving forward, and it sounds as though they are in agreement on making the five bullets more specific, or to keep them as written and have a process whereby the MOU is just updated on an annual basis with an appendix that contains priorities and action items, with the specifics finding their place there in consultation with staff and whatever body is charged with updating this.

Ms. Szakos suggested that they can do both, with having the general philosophical additions as well as specifics.

Ms. Galvin stated that moving forward, the amended document is what will lead to successive planning.

Ms. Mallek suggested using "as amended," because people tend not to read appendices.

Ms. Szakos asked if the Board and Council can sign them at their next regular meeting.

Ms. Palmer stated the Board meets the following day.

Mr. Dill asked who is doing the correcting.

Ms. Palmer and Mayor Signer indicated they would work with the clerks on it.

Mayor Signer stated that the Council can do it at their March 7 meeting or the one following that.

Ms. Palmer said that for the Board, it will be one of their April meetings.

Ms. Mallek noted this will allow time to circulate the documents.

Ms. McKeel clarified that both bodies are in agreement on the four conceptual areas presented, but will be getting back final drafts.

Ms. Palmer said that Mr. Dill's suggestion is to overlay them with the Board's strategic plan and the comp plan to see where there are opportunities and interest in doing these things.

Mayor Signer asked what body will work with staff to implement this.

Ms. Galvin and Ms. Szakos asked if that is needed at this point, and in the short term their respective staffs can bring items forth for discussion in the context of existing policies.

Mr. Fenwick commented that they can accept the plan by acclimation.

Both the Board and Council were in consensus to move forward as discussed.

Adjourn. With no further business to come before the Board and City Council, the meeting was adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 05/04/2016
Initials: EWJ