

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on May 17, 2016, at 2:00 p.m., Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from May 11, 2016.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Ms. Ann 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.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Palmer.

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session: Strategic Priority-setting.

Welcome and Meeting Overview

Agenda Item No. 3. Environmental Scan.

Ms. Lee Catlin addressed the Board and stated that other localities from across the country also participated in this survey, so there were topics, trends, and benchmarks denoted in staff's information. Ms. Catlin stated that there were also ratings in terms of characteristics of services, quality of services, and how important Albemarle County citizens feel it is to focus on certain priorities.

Mr. Sheffield asked what the sample size was for the most recent citizen survey.

Ms. Catlin responded that she would get that information, and noted that it was within a 5% margin of error.

Ms. Mallek stated that in the past, Weldon Cooper had used about 600 respondents, and this survey may have been about half of that.

Ms. Catlin reported that staff also wanted to get a sense of what leadership in the organization felt were challenges and opportunities, so they had discussions with the Leadership Council to gather that input. She stated that staff also wanted to provide the Board with some data, but in an effort to not overwhelm them with material, they decided to provide a snapshot of what they felt were key community indicators, categorized as general population and demographics, employment and labor, and housing and real estate. Ms. Catlin asked the Board to provide feedback on anything that impressed them out of the data that was provided.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was any demographic data gathered from respondents in terms of where they lived, as it might affect their responses, and if there is clarity in the survey questions provided in terms of "public transportation," as those responses tend to be negative. She stated that where people live would likely influence their expectations for service, sense of independence, and what they feel is important.

Ms. Catlin responded that staff can further delineate the demographic information in terms of response location and provide that to the Board, but because the survey is standardized and goes to a lot of benchmark communities, the County does not have the ability to tailor it as they have in the past, so there may be a question or two that is less applicable to Albemarle. She clarified that the number of survey respondents was in the 400 range, but staff would provide the exact number.

Ms. McKeel said that she recalled it being 300-400, which seems like a relatively small sample.

Ms. Palmer asked how the survey proceeds with those who are asked.

Ms. Catlin explained that surveyors ask questions at the beginning that establish age and other characteristics until they get a certain number of respondents from identified subgroups, and in terms of a scientifically valid survey in the way surveys are vetted, this is considered to be valid. She noted that the survey is done by the ICMA and other partnerships at a national level, and staff can provide the Board with the methodology and documentation.

Mr. Dill commented that in the area of "built environment," all trends were down, and there was less satisfaction overall among respondents across the board, and 55% of those surveyed responded positively to the term "new development," although it was not clear how the question was asked.

Mr. Randolph commented that the survey indicates the Charlottesville/Albemarle area is a bicycle-centric culture, and mentioned that a resident, Ben King, had just won the second stage of the Tour of California, which is one of the top events in the world. He stated the survey shows that travel by bicycle is down, and he feels the reason is because of structural impediments for people to bike in the County. Mr. Randolph said the City is investing in its bicycle infrastructure, and the County needs to meet them at the boundary line to ensure as seamless a transition as possible so that people can access

facilities in both jurisdictions. He stated the Planning Commission has also been sensitive to the need for multi-modal transportation.

Ms. McKeel commented that she is concerned about the loss of employees due to retirement and/or people leaving the organization, and she is concerned about the quality of police officers and teachers the County will be able to attract. She stated that it is critical to the quality of life in the community to be able to attract and retain good employees, and these concerns have been validated through her participation in exit interviews among County employees.

Ms. Mallek stated the reason there has been a big drop in the “new development” category may be because things were quiet during the recession, but now that things are starting to accelerate all over the County, it makes the master plan implementations incredibly important, along with protection of the character of neighborhoods. She added this is not just one or two isolated areas, but a concern from people across the entire County about new development.

Mr. Dill stated the language from the Leadership Council seems to talk about an “urban community,” which is not the same as the Neighborhood Model that has been embraced for a number of years, and it seems to be a bit of a mixed message.

Mr. Foley said the way staff considers the Neighborhood Model is the desired form for new development whether it is in an urban area and redeveloped or out in a green area, and the other development is what exists now, particularly in the urban ring where things are aging. He stated that staff has talked a lot about the aging urban areas that have infrastructure needs, service demands and changing demographics, versus new development.

Ms. McKeel commented that there is not a full awareness from people who live and shop in other areas like Crozet as to the urban ring and the needs.

Ms. Mallek responded that they have their own type of urbanization happening, and the County needs to understand that a shift is needed away from super high density in areas that already have established residential neighborhoods, even if they are in the growth area. She stated that voters were upset in 2007 that the Board was driving everything toward the maximum, and while the recession slowed it down, the same concern is coming back around again.

Mr. Foley stated this is an important issue, because the Comprehensive Plan calls for a certain amount of density.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that it calls for a range and the County had been aiming only for the top of the range, so they need to realize that some places are not suitable for the top of the range.

Mr. Foley said that is a good comment for staff to reflect on.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he is not sure what the survey data means showing the trend of police is “down,” which was in the government portion of the information, not the community characteristics.

Ms. Catlin said the introduction to the survey points out that the data was reflective of what is happening in a larger environment, so there may be things happening that have a local impact even if they are not specific to just this area.

Mr. Dill asked Ms. Catlin if there was anything that jumped out at her from the survey data.

Ms. Catlin responded that the survey reinforced the fact that the community is losing ground with the 20-64 year old range, but gaining ground on the other ends of that, which is not necessarily a bad thing but does have implications for the workforce and other things. She stated the population growth rate has slowed down considerably from where it was at one point.

Ms. Mallek commented that in the participation box in the survey, only 38% of respondents had ever had contact with local government, which may speak to their sense of self-sufficiency or to a lack of communication. She stated the reason why the County survives with such a small staff compared to other localities is because people are very take-charge, but also very community oriented and will help neighbors out themselves rather than thinking someone else should do it.

Ms. Catlin asked the Board what they want to be mindful of as they transition to talking about strategic priorities.

Ms. Palmer responded that they still need to make some decisions about the stormwater management and how far they will go with it.

Mr. Sheffield stated they also need to address the gray infrastructure and how they will take ownership of it.

Ms. Mallek noted that it is what they already own, and assuming responsibility for it is quite daunting.

Mr. Dill stated there is also the bigger picture of responsibility for energy savings, carbon dioxide releases, and water and air issues.

Ms. Palmer said that solid waste is a concern to her and she worries that it will get lost in the shuffle, but it is really important, and just does not have the kind of dollars associated with it as redevelopment, education, salaries, etc. She added that the Board has not made a decision yet about addressing solid waste.

Ms. Mallek stated the natural resources goal was down to just one bullet, partly because they had accomplished so many things, and referring to the L-Cap in a plan already adopted would be one way to address Mr. Dill's concern.

Mr. Foley stated the County's environmental management and stewardship are different than the natural resources plan, with an ambitious plan a few Boards ago that got narrowed down, and staff is hearing the Board now say they want to look at it again.

Ms. Mallek commented that there are regional partners to help share the load of it.

Ms. Catlin asked if there are other items to bring to the forefront.

Ms. Mallek stated that she would like them to talk on the projects in the revenue-sharing program with the match from the state, and she would like to have a discussion and a refocus onto some higher level projects because they have lost the opportunity to do a \$5 million project by "nibbling away" and doing smaller projects. She said there are situations where the zoning and development decisions have already been made and people are already living there, and the County has dropped the ball about the connections needed to get those people where they need to go.

Ms. Palmer stated that the lack of staff capacity, particularly a transportation planner, is a concern for her, and she would like to be able to convey to the public which capabilities exist and which do not.

Ms. Catlin responded that the program and service inventory will provide the opportunity to discuss that, with the whole point of this process being to assign resources to the things that are most important, and that means identifying the things that are not deemed as important and reassigning resources to other areas.

Ms. Palmer stated that she would like to get to a point where the Board can take a hard line on some things that the public expects.

Mr. Foley said this is definitely where the County is, and while the Board will be doing the program and service inventory, the Leadership Council will be going through it first and making some recommendations on things that staff may not talk about much.

Mr. Randolph commented that using the National Citizens Survey captures a snapshot in time and is valuable to that end, but he wants to focus on the priorities reflected in the MOUs with the City, with affordable, quality housing scoring lower in the survey; and the community doing a better job by combining City/County resources for things like Pre-K education, the environment and solid waste, as well as collaborating on economic development. He stated that he would like to be mindful of where they have already gone as a Board, along with peers in the City, and transportation is critical to that, as is protection of the unbuilt environment. Mr. Randolph said he feels the County has already established where its priorities are and what they need to work on.

Agenda Item No. 4. Review of FY 15-17 Strategic Plan.

Ms. Louise Wyatt addressed the Board and stated that they will be looking at a strategic plan progress report, which was shared with the Board via DropBox. Ms. Wyatt said the first item they will tackle is the vision statement, as there are currently two, the vision adopted by the Board in its strategic planning process a few years ago, and a separate vision adopted when the Comp Plan was adopted in June. She stated that while the vision statements are very similar, there are slight differences and they were drafted for different purposes, so staff would like to get some feedback from the Board as to whether they want to have one or keep two separate ones for different purposes.

Mr. Foley explained that when they started the Comp Plan process several years ago, they started with a vision statement from the strategic plan, but it got revised along the way, and they have tweaked it somewhat.

Ms. Mallek stated that she feels the new one is much better and proposed that they formally adopt it.

Ms. Wyatt said that the new one was adopted with the Comp Plan.

Ms. Palmer commented that it was recognized that it is better to have a shorter one, but she would prefer to get rid of the old one and adopt the new one.

Ms. Wyatt stated that the next item for Board consideration is to roll off some items in the existing strategic plan that staff believes are already complete and have been operationalized to some degree, and are no longer at the strategic priority level. She noted the items that staff thinks are complete, such

as the adoption of the Comp Plan, establishing the Economic Development Office, hiring the transportation planner, and establishing the Community Development work plan.

Board members agreed with Ms. Wyatt that those items could be categorized as “complete” and no longer need to be strategic priorities.

Ms. Wyatt pointed out that just because the items are taken off the strategic plan does not mean that they are not priorities, they have just been operationalized.

Ms. Mallek stated that she would like to push back a little bit on the Leadership Council's comment that items “demand immediate response,” because sometimes she sends emails to staff when she thinks about them, but does not expect them to respond if it is a Saturday. Ms. Mallek said that people will be respectful of Board and staff's time if they are given a chance to be, but if they pander to the fact that they have to stop everything and jump through hoops, they are making a mistake. She stated that it is better to communicate that something is being worked on, rather than jumping into it and risk making a mistake, which is much worse than taking the extra time needed.

Mr. Sheffield stated his concern with removing the community engagement piece is that he gets feedback that the County's information is not as readily accessible as the Board and staff might think it is, with people seeking their own information about developments, etc.

Mr. Kamptner asked if it is the timeliness of the information or the delivery method.

Mr. Sheffield responded that people are respectful of the time it takes to pull information, so it is more of the delivery method, and while he does not like to form committees unnecessarily, it may be helpful to assemble a group to provide feedback on access to information. He stated that it is not just Board agenda items, but also things like information on new developments, signs, etc., and once you start using the information it becomes easier. Mr. Sheffield said that there is a new development going in next to Dunlora, and the emails will start coming in to him and to Mark Graham, and lack of readily available information can lead to anxiety.

Mr. Randolph commented to Mr. Sheffield that he is talking about being proactive rather than reactive.

Mr. Sheffield agreed, stating that they are just providing access to information.

Ms. Mallek stated the one history lesson from that is there is so much that changes from the beginning of a project to several weeks in, with staff sometimes having to react to something before it is complete. She said that as the community advisory councils mature, that will become the place where developers go first to try out their ideas, with citizens knowing they can come there to learn about things and ask questions.

Mr. Foley said that it sounds as though there is more in this area to do, and Mr. Sheffield's suggestion of a focus group is a great idea.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he has been following the notion of digital governments on Twitter, and as he enters the older adult group he is aware that there may be different approaches needed, but they need to get it into their strategies that the information should be easy, quick and accessible.

Ms. Mallek responded that the County should tell citizens it is doing the best it can, because the information has to be inputted, checked and verified, and it is not reasonable to think that it will just automatically be put out there.

Ms. Randolph added that there is also the issue of families that do not have access to the internet in their homes, with an overriding assumption that everything can just be put on the County website. He said it is very apparent that parents choosing the limited amount of time for bandwidth access will be dedicated to their kids' schoolwork and not for their own purposes. Mr. Randolph stated that the idea of a focus group is excellent, and they have to make sure they include people who do not have internet access to get their input on how they will access information. He added that it is a challenge for people in the rural area to know what is going on at a County level, but also at a national and international level.

Ms. Palmer commented the County now has a citizen engagement plan for every major initiative, so her question is how they define that, and how many committees they can have.

Ms. Mallek noted that their terms expire when they get to the end of what they are doing.

Ms. Catlin stated that the County would have a public engagement plan for any policy decisions or initiatives with significant impact, with a focus on getting the word out. She said that this effort includes using existing mechanisms to get the word out, with some warranting establishment of a committee. Ms. Catlin stated that in June they will see a public engagement plan for a small area plan, and the committee for that will be the existing Places 29 Advisory committee, and they are trying not to create multiple pop-up committees, but when they need a broad range of perspectives, that is the time to bring citizens together.

Mr. Randolph said the County's commitment to engaging citizens and involving them in master plans in those areas has been really critical to the success of those master plans and the buy-in of those

communities. He stated that he does not think they have reached the maximum with this and would like to see rural advisory councils for master planning, in areas such as Monticello and the east side of Carter's Mountain to Blenheim Road, which would benefit from natural resources planning. Mr. Randolph commented that given how things are going on a state and national level, the Board cannot think enough about their responsibility as local elected leaders about ways they can seek an increase in democratic participation, because that will produce people who will want to rise up and take on a broader role. Mr. Randolph said that his Planning Commission representative came up from challenging the County, then went on the CAC, and is now a Commissioner, and he noted that his own course was similar, so it is a natural series of progressions for people to begin with community engagement, and the County will be better off with their public service.

Ms. Palmer stated that she is all about community engagement, but her point was related to staff capacity once a committee is started, and whether that can be defined from the onset.

Ms. Catlin responded that Emily Kilroy does an excellent job but is only one person, so they do have to make a decision about that.

Mr. Foley commented that Ms. Catlin may put together a public engagement plan without forming a committee, but whenever the County does form a committee, it will come before the Board for approval, so they will have an opportunity to monitor that and ask questions as to staff capacity.

Mr. Randolph responded that there may be a different way to staff that committee also, and it had been valuable to have a staff person there at the beginning of a community advisory council, but for older CACs they may not need staff, perhaps after the first year or so. He added that this is a model they cannot spend enough time talking about, as it is something that differentiates Albemarle from surrounding localities.

Ms. Mallek stated that having had citizens who were involved in master plans and boards that have adopted master plans, it is incumbent upon the Board members to pay attention to them, and there is serious frustration among constituents when they are not involved.

Ms. Wyatt asked if there is anything else staff identified as operational that the Board does not feel comfortable rolling off the plan.

Ms. Mallek responded that they will always continue to improve, so it does not necessarily need to be "strategic."

Ms. Wyatt stated that staff will spend time on the items remaining on the FY15-17 plan and referenced several posters presented, noting that the items remaining are those that are not complete or operationalized, so they would form the beginning of the FY17-19 plan. She noted items needing further clarification as to whether the remaining items are still strategic and whether they will continue to be strategic through FY17-19, and whether the proposed rewording is generally acceptable to the Board. Ms. Wyatt said that in critical infrastructure, for example, most of those items remained but there was a statement around broadband that was rather vague, so staff drafted another objective around "establishing and implementing strategic direction to expand affordable broadband access to underserved and rural communities." She asked the Board if this adequately captures their intent.

Ms. Mallek responded that it does, providing that it reflects that they are trying to figure it out, not necessarily that they are going to do it.

Ms. Wyatt confirmed this is the intent.

Ms. Wyatt reported that the remaining items related to the Rivanna River corridor and Pantops Master Plan, exploring and developing strategies designed to revitalize aging urban areas, evaluating the potential use of an urban service district to find enhanced services and infrastructure in the development area, and accelerating the revitalization of the Rio/Route 29 interchange area. She stated that this is what is in the current plan now, and the Board can add more priorities going forward.

Mr. Dill commented that it seems to him they have already figured out critical infrastructure and it has been operationalized.

Ms. Mallek said that she does not agree, as there are a lot of decisions left to be made.

Mr. Dill stated that there will always be decisions to be made, but it is different from solid waste, which they have not really decided how to approach. He said that he sees strategic goals as not deciding what is the most important, but identifying things that are important that they are not doing.

Mr. Randolph stated that Mr. Dill is focused on the "what", and he agrees that this is not a question, it is the "where" and "how," and the devil is in the details of that, along with "when."

Mr. Dill said that some of that should not necessarily be in their strategic plan, but should be covered in their operational plan.

Ms. Mallek stated that the funding is the essential part of the infrastructure question, with the Board needing to figure out how they will strategically fund those things.

Mr. Foley said that broadband would be an example of an item that needs to be part of the strategic process.

Mr. Dill responded that broadband is an example, in his mind, because it requires a decision as to whether they will continue to approach it the way they have been and let the private sector handle it, or develop a different strategic approach. He said the parks questions would be less so, unless they are contemplating making a big new park.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that the County has three park sites totaling 1,000 acres that they currently cannot use.

Mr. Dill asked if they will be doing something about them in the next year.

Ms. Mallek responded that she certainly hopes they would within the next three, adding that they would not want to repeat what they did with Preddy and leave the properties alone for 15 years, as that site experienced encroachment from poachers, trespassers, etc.

Mr. Dill said that he would like to have as few things as possible to address because it will become difficult to establish priorities if there are many things all deemed to be important.

Ms. Catlin responded that part of the ranking process will be to move those things up or down, and part of what they have seen in the CIP for so many years is that because there are so many core things that need to get done, things like parks never end up getting funded. She stated that a strategic discussion would be whether there is an approach that focuses on the core, but also provides the possibility for quality of life items to rise further in the queue.

Mr. Foley said this is a strategic issue that the Board should contemplate.

Mr. Randolph commented that parks and planning were both omitted year after year.

Ms. Wyatt reported that in looking at proposed objectives, staff wants to check with the Board to see if those are still aligned with their intentions and desires.

Ms. Catlin said the establishment of an economic development office has been completed and can be checked off as a goal, and staff added a goal related to partnerships and incentives with the Rio/29 area.

Ms. Mallek noted that they can create a model that can be replicated in 10 years.

Mr. Foley said those sound like the right places to be in the process.

Ms. Wyatt said that staff tweaked goal five around City/County/private sector partnerships for preschool programs, and staff took the existing goal six and broadened it to include where things stand currently with the water resources program. She stated the next step would be for them to evaluate what is missing and act accordingly.

Ms. Mallek and Ms. Palmer noted that there were some specifics in the Comp Plan that are not reflected here.

Mr. Foley stated that the Comp Plan contains hundreds of strategies, so if there is something the Board wants to pull up to the forefront, they can do that in this process.

Ms. Wyatt said that in terms of the goal related operational capacity, there were several objectives completed and several that were operationalized, with two goals staff is recommending be carried through the FY17-19 plan: developing alternate sustainable funding strategies and other resource opportunities to address the long-term operational and capital funding needs for schools and local government; and tightening the objective around recruitment and retention, implementing staff's recommendation to address salary compression.

Ms. McKeel commented that the word "avoid" or similar is needed so that it does not seem that they are advocating for compression.

Mr. Sheffield asked if they will be discussing building capacity as part of this process.

Mr. Foley responded that they will talk about it after the break.

Ms. Wyatt stated that the last goal around rural areas has two objectives completed and one remaining regarding work around developing a rural transportation plan, which staff has reworded to provide more specificity.

Mr. Randolph noted that they should also discuss land capacity in addition to building capacity, and as land becomes available it is going to be incumbent upon the County strategically to buy it. He said the Board has talked about its options in the context of specific decisions available, and there are very limited options in terms of available land that the County owns, so he would suggest that as an addition to goal seven.

Ms. Palmer asked if the Comp Plan reflects a land bank approach for the County.

Mr. Foley responded that there is a community facilities plan, but they have not gone to the next step with a land bank strategies in a long time, and that is how the County got property at Mill Creek and Polo Grounds Road.

Ms. Palmer noted that there are some smaller sites available.

Mr. Foley responded that those he mentioned are the two larger tracts.

Ms. McKeel stated that they really have not done any purchasing for schools, and she was part of the team that went around looking at sites.

Ms. Mallek clarified that both of the properties Mr. Foley mentioned were purchased for future school sites.

Ms. McKeel commented that the school was dependent on the Board for those sites.

Mr. Foley stated that the schools made requests for land, and they have not put requests in, although they have in the past and the Board has included them in the CIP.

Ms. McKeel said the schools work with the Board on this and she wants to make sure going forward that they make sure it is done.

Mr. Foley responded that the way to do that is by addressing it in the strategic plan.

Ms. Mallek said that it could even be couched as "be on the lookout for sites."

Mr. Sheffield stated that even though this is a two-year plan, some of the decisions would have 50-year implications, and if they are planning correctly then a Board should not be struggling with where to locate a school or a fire station or substation for police or library.

Ms. Palmer said that at some point they have to drill down and determine what they have the money to do.

Mr. Sheffield commented that it has more to do with staff capacity than money.

Ms. Catlin stated that staff has a list of the items identified by the Board during their budget worksessions, as well as the items the Board has talked about in this session, so when they return from break they will establish what they feel should be included in their strategic priorities ranking. She pointed out that this is not a large wish list, but items for the Board to decide should be moved into the FY17-19 strategic plan for ranking.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 3:31 p.m. and reconvened at 3:48 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 5. Review of other identified issues and concerns.

Ms. Catlin presented a list of items that have emerged from the Board's worksessions, and it needs to be established whether they rise to the level of inclusion in their FY17-19 strategic plan.

Ms. Catlin stated that senior issues were mentioned in the budget worksessions, including the Senior Center's request for funding.

Mr. Sheffield said that it should go beyond the Senior Center discussion and include an age-friendly concept, which has been an issue for JAUNT, JABA and others, and define the aspirations of what it means to be age friendly and how that works its way into the Comp Plan and other initiatives. He stated that when the Board is looking at urbanization in the development area, the lens should go beyond looking at walkability for younger generations and also look at walkability for older generations, with the Board accounting for the age-friendly aspect in their decisions.

Mr. Randolph asked how they are doing the weighting of these items.

Ms. Catlin responded that if there is general agreement among Board members for an item to get some consideration, it will go on the list, and when they do their rankings the importance of the item will be established.

Ms. Mallek commented that if the language is similar to that for broadband, "establish and implement strategic direction to define what an age-friendly community is," or similar, she can get behind it.

Mr. Sheffield noted that the number of kids 5-17 is the same for the demographic of those 65+.

Ms. Catlin said it sounds as though the Board is supportive of the item related to planning for an age-friendly community.

Mr. Sheffield stated that it could even be just a policy for accounting for that dynamic, because they do not have money to do everything but they can make more comprehensive decisions for the money they do have.

Mr. Dill said that sometimes it is even more a matter of making aware decisions, such as not having swinging door stalls in public facilities.

Mr. Sheffield added that in terms of transportation, something like working with VDOT on the timing of pedestrian crossings, which are meant for the average pace, but perhaps not an older pedestrian.

Ms. McKeel commented that it is more of an awareness of looking at decisions through the lens of senior issues versus what they normally would have done, and she expressed concern about framing it through the lens of the Senior Center because that is not the whole picture here.

Mr. Sheffield said the Senior Center is a form of a community facility to be taken into account, so when the County invests money in schools, libraries and fire stations, it should be taken into account there are other public facilities that take on different forms.

Mr. Foley stated that they can develop a broader goal issue under which strategies would fit, and the demographics here make this a strategic issue, and they are evolving to a place where they must do things differently.

Mr. Sheffield noted that retirees bring both volunteer hours and money to the area.

Ms. Catlin commented that geo-policing is another item that has come up in the Board's discussions, and the question is whether this rises to a strategic priority and what the expected outcome is.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he sees this as an operational capacity issue that may not necessarily need to be in the strategic plan, and the question for him is how effective geo-policing would be in achieving their policing capacity needs. He said that it was doing a great job with the core purpose of connecting the community, promoting awareness and bringing back the police in the community feeling, but to him the frustration is that there are still issues with certain crimes and crime rates, traffic and public safety that geo-policing may not be addressing. Mr. Sheffield said he does not know if this needs to be a strategic approach, or just a matter of not having the capacity to fully implement that vision, and if doing so will solve those issues.

Ms. Mallek responded that it is a capacity issue, and adding three more officers per year for the next four years would provide enough to address some of those issues, because right now they are trying to do both, which is not possible. She added that she would definitely support moving this forward as a high priority.

Ms. Palmer said the pace of hiring police is a strategic issue, and asked if the issue is how fast the County is going to hire people to implement geo-policing, noting that Mr. Sheffield had raised a totally different point.

Mr. Sheffield agreed that he had raised a different issue but he is not a law enforcement expert, so if the police chief came in and said that he could address those deficiencies with a stronger geo-policing force, then that is his call. Mr. Sheffield stated that he is simply noting the deficiencies in the current policing effort and is not questioning whether geo-policing is good or not, but the goal is to determine whether it will solve those problems if it is expanded.

Ms. Palmer responded that it would be good to have that information prior to making a strategic decision as to how many officers and how quickly they are hired.

Mr. Sheffield stated that Colonel Sellers has talked about problem-oriented policing as well, so it may be that the POP approach is favored over geo-policing.

Mr. Foley said there are two major things going on that are strategic issues, traffic policing and the issue of backup for officers. He stated that if the goal is geo-policing but the crime rates are low, the question is what kind of outcome they are seeking. Mr. Foley said that the geo-policing is about a lot of different things, so in a two-year fiscal plan one of the things they are trying to do is get to strategic issues to which the funding is tied, and it may be that the geo-policing label needs to be a bit more defined to get at the targets they are trying to achieve.

Ms. Mallek stated that they can prioritize funding to increase police staff if they want something general, and then the choices will be among the different programs, rather than having the Board focus on one part of it. She said that she is reminded of the police asking for four new officers every year but are not given any, then having two years when the Board provided some but not providing any in FY17. Ms. Mallek stated that she hopes they will continue to try to make progress to get to where they need to be, knowing they are falling further behind as people move in and the population continues to grow.

Ms. McKeel commented that the Board agrees that safety is a priority and this gets at that, but geo-policing is only a part of what they need to be doing, and she hesitates in seeing it listed by itself because it drives capacity, when there are other capacity needs as well.

Mr. Foley said the second shift, which is the next priority in geo-policing's ultimate plan, is the one that will get them to the backup officers, and since they are looking at a fiscal plan for two years they can focus in on something that is about geo-policing but that might have a more specific target.

Ms. Catlin stated that geo-policing is a broad priority for the next few years, so perhaps they can narrow it down to something that meets the next iteration of geo-policing and addresses safety issues.

Ms. Mallek said that officer safety is a huge requirement.

Mr. Foley said the Board also noted that this is about officer capacity.

Mr. Randolph commented that given the gang problem in the County, one of the needs is community policing, and geo-policing and community policing are two sides of the same coin, so the Board needs to work with the new Chief on his priorities as he moves forward. He stated they need to attentively listen to what Chief Lantz says because they have been pulled in different directions, and they need to be prepared as a Board to provide more personnel, but it is critically important that they defer to what the Chief tells them is the critical need based on the department's statistics. Mr. Randolph said they need to allow Chief Lantz to have some latitude and implement his own version of geo-policing, which will likely be more community based. He stated that he would not want to limit the Chief in his ability to adapt as he moves forward, and it is important to keep this broad.

Ms. Catlin said that the next issue for discussion is the Department of Social Services (DSS).

Mr. Dill stated that his son's wife works for the Georgia DSS in an analysis capacity, and he feels it is important to recognize that the Albemarle County DSS is so short-handed it will never be able to serve everyone in need. He said that because of this, they need to determine which programs the County should support to make the most difference to the clients and the community in terms of safety, drug addiction/alcoholism, child abuse prevention, and while child abuse programs might require more resources, it may save money in the long run.

Ms. Mallek stated that it would be good for DSS Director, Phyllis Savides, to answer these questions for all of the Board because she would have the best handle on the effectiveness of programs. She added that the County's DSS handles about 50 more cases than state recommendations and there is typically a high burnout rate, but the department has performed very well under those conditions.

Ms. McKeel commented that she would like to delve into this in a bit more detail, noting that when Valerie Palamountain from PVCC had presented, she indicated that the largest feeder group driving the homeless population were the young adult demographic age 18-26, who are coming out of the foster care program. She stated that this helps inform what provides the best return on investment, as that group often ends up in drugs and in court, so it would be helpful to address ways to break that cycle.

Mr. Randolph stated that while there are roles for government and statutory requirements to provide services, there are nonprofit organizations that can step in, and the County should look at ways in which partnerships might be established that allows for service delivery in a more cost-effective manner, especially given shrinking federal and state dollars.

Mr. Foley said that investing in a facility that might prevent individuals from having to go in a CSA treatment facility would be the type of nonprofit investments that might alleviate demand on DSS.

Ms. Catlin noted that the Board's strategy would be prioritization of the kinds of investments that make a difference and have an impact on specific outcomes.

Ms. McKeel mentioned that at a recent IMPACT meeting, that group indicated their next issue of focus will be senior services.

Mr. Dill responded that they were actually returning to it.

Mr. Sheffield said that JAUNT has worked to help them realize that as professionals, they are dedicated to serving that cohort.

Ms. Catlin stated that the next four items are the MOUs that reflect and connect to the strategic plan already, the regional transportation authority, the environment beyond natural resources, education and pre-K, with housing not yet having a link to the plan, but probably needs to be on the list since they have just signed an MOU with the City related to it.

Mr. Sheffield said that he wonders if they should have a section of the strategic plan that talks about how the section connects to the MOUs, and going forward future Boards should link them to the strategic plan so there are no inconsistencies. He mentioned that he feels the housing issue should go under development areas.

Ms. Mallek stated that when they were talking about the four topics, her understanding was that when the City and County work on the four issues in the MOUs, they would do their best to work together, not that those were the four highest priorities in the County's strategic plan.

Mr. Randolph clarified that this was not what he meant to imply in his comments.

Mr. Foley noted that three of those items are already in the City's and County's strategic plans, but housing is not in the County's, and the jurisdictions have completely different programs. He stated that Mr. Sheffield had suggested that it go in the development areas section, but Mr. Foley pointed out that the section is "redevelopment and housing," which refers to housing and other redevelopment.

Mr. Sheffield responded that they could also have a goal nine that just says they support the MOUs or regional initiatives.

Mr. Dill suggested that they add a goal of working with the City as much as possible on any issues as appropriate, not just the four in the MOUs.

Ms. Mallek said that is the "goal nine" approach mentioned.

Ms. McKeel stated that in talking about redevelopment and affordable housing as it relates to the City and the MOU, the pie chart presented shows that just 2% of the new dwelling units are in the Jack Jouett District, which is why she talks so much about aging infrastructure, redevelopment and affordable housing. She said that as the City is redeveloping, those impacts are spilling into the urban ring, and she is interested in working with them on these issues, as it is not in the City's best interest to have the County blighted around it. Ms. McKeel added that they also need to be able to provide housing for families in the best way possible, and having two-bedroom apartments with 14-16 people packed in is not the way to do it. She noted that it is really a matter of figuring out how to best connect with the City and do things, and maybe the key is communication.

Mr. Foley mentioned that there are community groups now that are tracking the movement of residents from the City to the County.

Mr. Randolph commented that the two localities are one community in housing.

Ms. McKeel said that it also applies to things like the transit system.

Ms. Palmer stated that she agrees with Mr. Dill that working better with the City is the major strategy, but they will also want to pull out that issue within the strategic plan to address.

Ms. Mallek noted that the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission is running that process as the agent for both jurisdictions, so next year maybe the County would better know how to put it into the strategic plan.

Ms. Catlin said the first three items discussed have a natural connection to their goals, and it sounds like the housing and redevelopment has a connection to the development area urbanization goal, so it could be put there.

Mr. Randolph commented that they ignore the affordable housing issue at their own peril, as it is linked to fire/rescue, DSS, police, education, and all the high-cost centers. He stated that workforce housing is another significant issue, as mentioned by Colonel Sellers in his comments, with 75% of the police force living outside of the County. Mr. Randolph said that just the wear and tear of commuting in police cars is considerable, and those officers are not part of the community here or interacting with neighbors, so workplace housing is part of the City/County MOU for affordable housing.

Mr. Foley asked if the Board sees this as part of the development areas as its own objective focusing on these issues, versus a rural and urban issue.

Ms. Mallek stated that there is a lot of affordable housing in the country, but that is a burden on the people who have to drive a long way, so she would hesitate to say that it is development areas only.

Mr. Sheffield said the question of affordable housing needs to be in the regional context, and what they do with the four MOUs as part of the strategic plan addresses that. He stated the County can come up with its own affordable housing plan, but it does no good if it contradicts with what is going on with the City.

Mr. Foley stated they talked about regional solutions being solutions about a particular issue, rather than the "regional" itself being the issue, and staff felt that having regional approaches under each issue where they fit makes more sense than having it as a standalone item.

Ms. Catlin said there was mention of a tourism program during one of the budget worksessions, so the question before the Board is whether that is something that should be part of a strategic plan and work into that, or whether there is another avenue for moving forward.

Mr. Randolph stated that he can see it under goal four, economic prosperity.

Mr. Dill commented that from a strategy point of view, it would only be worth including if it is something more than promoting Monticello and balloon rides.

Ms. Mallek stated that she hopes they will get more from the City/County/CACVB group than just that, and that meeting is coming up in the near future, with a report back from Mr. Foley and Ms. Catlin. She explained that they had set up a new committee in November to gain a better understanding of the operations of the CACVB, which gets almost \$800,000 of County funding annually, and helping County businesses with their tourism success.

Mr. Foley pointed out that there is a regional operational structure in place for how they deal with tourism, and the question is whether the CACVB is doing as much as they can and how much benefit the County is receiving from it. He stated that there is a process underway with that currently, so the question is whether it is a separate strategic issue or whether they should continue to evaluate it to see if it is optimal.

Ms. Mallek responded that it is a way to see how it goes, and then they can decide whether they need to elevate it.

Mr. Dill said it would be a separate priority if they want a convention center, for example, that has larger events that draw out-of-town people, beyond Monticello.

Mr. Randolph asked what is wrong with Monticello.

Ms. Mallek commented that they have been relying on it for years.

Ms. Catlin stated that pending the review report in July, it may go in a different direction.

Ms. Catlin said that increasing library hours and operations was also raised as an issue.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he brought it up and does not know if it is really a strategic issue.

Mr. Foley noted that tourism could be a budget priority and not necessarily a strategic issue.

Mr. Sheffield said that from the feedback he gets it is a budget priority, versus the budget limitations they have.

Ms. Mallek stated that this is an area where community partnerships are very helpful, and people raising money for extended hours is a great way for them to get involved with the library.

Ms. Catlin said that enhanced entrance corridors was also on the list.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he had brought that issue up because there were points in the entrance corridors such as the Rio/29 area that will require regular maintenance.

Mr. Dill asked who takes care of them now.

Ms. Mallek said that the Route 29 people provide funding for weed-eating and similar services.

Mr. Foley stated that the Facilities and Environmental Services Department takes care of entrance corridor services beyond what VDOT does at a very low level, adding that the County takes it on and contracts it out. He said that Mr. Sheffield has raised an issue that takes it to a whole new level, and there are challenges in other areas.

Ms. McKeel stated that she also gets calls about the large wall near Barracks Road that has white paint and graffiti, including from the UVA Foundation as that is one of the University's entrance corridors.

Mr. Foley said that the VDOT project takes them to a new level, and the strategic issue for the Board is the need to do more about aesthetics and beautification in the community and whether that is important to them.

Mr. Dill stated that it fits in with the tourism issue in terms of making the area inviting.

Ms. Palmer commented that it is an issue of what level they will spend on it.

Mr. Randolph noted that when it extended its bypass, the City of Lynchburg leadership appealed to corporations in the community and developed partnerships in which they were allowed to put signs up in return for helping to pay for the beautification. He stated that Albemarle may be getting big enough that this must become a viable strategy because the County will not have the resources to address the beautification needs on its own.

Ms. Palmer stated that she would like to see how much it costs before putting signs up all over.

Ms. McKeel stated that she is not necessarily saying that she wants taxpayer dollars to go to that wall at Barracks Road and she will look into partnerships, but this goes back to the crumbling urban infrastructure issue and the need to make development areas a place where people choose to live.

Mr. Randolph stated that as you drive through Lynchburg on 29 across the James River, you see the areas on both sides of the road are always cut and the signage of the corporations supporting the community is consistent throughout those beautification areas.

Ms. Mallek said that when people drive south from Greene County, the grass needs to be short enough so that people can actually see the "Welcome to Albemarle County" sign, because the grass there is often four feet high, which Mr. Rooker rebelled about when he was on the Board, prompting them to put \$40,000 into the budget for mowing.

Mr. Foley commented that they will find some ways in the development areas goal for this to have a life.

Ms. Catlin stated that they will now revisit the items they had discussed and which should be included in the strategic plan.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the police training facility should be included under critical infrastructure in near-term planning, because while it may be identified in the CIP, identifying where it will go and what the guiding principles for that location will be important. He stated that the location could be a source for crime suppression in some crime-ridden areas, or a possibility for adaptive reuse of a building like CATEC, when that facility finally moves to PVCC. Mr. Sheffield said that a developer may even be able to proffer land for a facility if it is in the right place.

Mr. Dill said that it could even be a state funding mechanism, and to him this is the perfect strategic item because it does not cost any money, but they would be ready when the time comes.

Ms. Mallek stated that they should be ready with the information as to what size facility they need, how many classrooms, etc., which they do not have information on now.

Mr. Dill said they should also know how many partners it will take to make it work.

Mr. Sheffield agreed that the other aspect would be whether they have defined partners, and the City and University would go in with the County on it, which raises the issue of where the facility would need to be located and whether they would accept a location in the County.

Mr. Foley stated that all of those things will be considered when an item rises to the level of being strategic, so if this is a priority item then it should be included here.

Ms. Mallek noted that they have six months to decide whether to pull out of the Weyer's Cave facility.

Ms. McKeel asked if schools are included as part of critical infrastructure.

Mr. Sheffield responded that there is strategic direction for schools.

Ms. Catlin said that she also heard them address in their conversations environmental management issues beyond just natural resources protection but also L-CAP, energy, solid waste, climate protection, and she does not know if they feel there needs to be additional language in the strategic plan that covers broader environmental issues.

Mr. Dill stated that it can be combined with the MOU, but he would almost suggest dropping the MOU and expand it to reflect larger environmental issues that go beyond the community.

Ms. Mallek said that she would support an addition under natural resources.

Mr. Randolph asked what they would want to do in terms of carbon buildup and global warming on a local level.

Mr. Dill responded that it can include things such as installation of triple-pane windows.

Ms. Mallek said that it is all in the L-CAP report.

Mr. Sheffield said that if a majority of the Board is going to support any strategy, they will have to know what resources they will put behind it.

Mr. Dill stated that it may not cost them anything to implement things like requiring County building standards to be silver LEED certified, as other cities are doing.

Ms. Mallek noted that they had already done that with the County building and other facilities, and through the LEAP Program there are already tremendous programs available to help citizens with their own individual energy consumption at home, and if Andy Lowe on staff can be freed up to spend more time on it, that will help a lot.

Ms. McKeel asked if there are any zoning or ordinance changes or code upgrades to provide more resiliency and redundancy in this regard.

Mr. Foley stated that this is a pretty big topic and the strategies sometimes fit into zoning and other areas, and explained that Albemarle was a leader in this area for a long time, but in the Tea Party era they attacked this across the country, and while the Board held onto some things, it was not as ambitious as what was done before. He said the County has some staff members who are very knowledgeable in this area, so they could probably regain some ground.

Mr. Kamptner stated that there are some areas in which Albemarle goes above and beyond what federal regulations require, such as flood hazard overlay regulations, the dam break inundation zone regulations, but one area in which the County is weak, where there is some flexibility, is authority to engage in incentive zoning. He said they will talk about this in the worksession regarding the new proffer legislation, which will affect their ability to receive proffers related to affordable housing. Mr. Kamptner stated that if they are going to seek affordable housing in the rezoning process, it will be through incentive zoning, and while there are some bonus density factors in place right now, they are not incentivizing developers when they go through the process. He added that the authority to engage in incentive zoning can address some of the other things the Board is talking about where the County does not have express authority to do them purely through regulation, which will allow them to take advantage of measures such as building standards.

Mr. Dill asked if the County will be giving them money instead of the reverse.

Mr. Kamptner responded that the developers will receive tax credits.

Ms. McKeel said that other communities seem to be taking advantage of some of these things, and she wants to make sure the County is looking ahead.

Ms. Palmer commented that one of the basic things they have been planning is replacement of windows, but the energy cost savings are not that great. She stated that she feels they should be supporting prospective climate change and moving forward with the pipeline from Sugar Hollow to Ragged Mountain Reservoir.

Ms. Mallek said if they put that in the strategic plan, representatives on the RWSA will have clear direction from the County.

Mr. Foley said they can develop a statement regarding "enhanced efforts towards environmental sustainability," or similar, and then the Board can craft a statement if they feel it needs another component to it.

Ms. Catlin stated that the Board also mentioned a decision still pending about stormwater infrastructure, and asked if they want to add anything to the existing language.

Ms. Palmer stated that the reason she brought it up is because they had not decided whether to they are going to meet mandates or go further than that, and it has to be in the strategic plan for them to make a decision about it.

Ms. Catlin said that they also discussed transferring revenue-sharing money from smaller projects onto a few larger projects.

Mr. Sheffield noted that with House Bill 2, a lot of the projects ranked high because of the amount of local money assigned to it.

Ms. Mallek stated that instead of using revenue-sharing money for small projects in the County, they could double it with a match and get projects done a lot faster. She said that Jarman's Gap, for example, was planned from 1988 to 2010, so it takes a long time to get things accomplished.

Mr. Foley said that a whole new approach around the use of revenue sharing will get them much farther along with some of the urban development issues they have been discussing.

Ms. Mallek stated that they need to get some of these connections done so the communities function the way they were designed to.

Mr. Randolph asked if they had addressed special districts in their strategies.

Ms. Wyatt responded that they had included it under goal three.

Ms. McKeel asked if this is the right place to put it.

Ms. Catlin said that she had put it under critical infrastructure.

Mr. Foley noted that it is something to support development area transportation needs.

Ms. Mallek stated that it could be under either goal two or three.

Ms. Catlin said that Ms. McKeel had mentioned something about pay scales, retention and hiring quality, and the current goal is focused solely on compression.

Ms. McKeel reiterated that she is concerned that they have lost candidates because of salaries and people are leaving due to retirement, so she had recommended that they look at police salaries outside of the regular pay scale. She said she would like to figure out a way so they are not coming back every four or five years with compression issues.

Ms. Mallek said this is a strategic thing they can address through reclassification.

Mr. Foley said the original statement was, "Develop and begin implementation of pay strategies that address staff recruitment and retention challenges," and compression is one of those.

Mr. Randolph stated that they cannot just look at police, they will also have to look at fire/rescue.

Ms. Mallek said that it is not at all the same situation.

Mr. Foley suggested that staff look at it further and bring it back to the Board, because other localities have a public safety structure, and to implement that, if fire/rescue personnel were determined to be paid adequately then they would not need to be addressed as part of that process.

Ms. McKeel stated that she feels it is worthy of investigation.

Ms. Palmer agreed, adding that she has learned of people moving to the area recently who want to join the police force, but cannot afford to serve in that capacity.

Mr. Foley stated there was an opinion piece in the paper recently about underpayment of police officers, and he feels that it does not accurately portray the situation, as there had been a market study and adjustment of police salaries two years ago. He said the article compared police pay versus salaries at Wegman's, and if that is true then it would also be the case for other localities and the City, because the County is paying based on that market. Mr. Foley stated that since the article in 2012 about police staffing, the County has added 19 police officers, and staff will send an email out to the Board that contains facts about what is really being paid and how it compares, and that will all be re-evaluated again this year.

Ms. Palmer responded that perhaps they should look at other communities.

Mr. Foley said that her point was whether their adopted market is the right one to be looking at.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would also like to address the problem of coming back every few years with compression issues.

Mr. Foley said that staff can bring this back with information on that issue, at which time the Board can compare it against other issues in terms of priority.

Mr. Randolph stated that the incident he had heard about regarding an officer not being able to afford to live here was a person from Albuquerque, and that clearly is not a comparable locality in terms of scale of operation and annual budget.

Ms. Mallek recalled that she thought there was the ability to pay extra in the scale for people who had extra language skills and training.

Mr. Foley said they have implemented two or three other measures that have improved officer pay based on skills and education, and that will also be in staff's email.

Ms. Mallek stated that the reclassification is the solution for the police department alone.

Ms. McKeel agreed that it is a great idea, and said they will be able to come back at a later date and figure out which of these strategies they would include.

Mr. Foley clarified that Ms. Palmer talked about re-evaluating the market, and the Board needs to decide whether they should.

Mr. Dill suggested adding some different localities such as Burlington, VT, or New Haven, CT.

Mr. Foley stated that there were 30 localities in the adopted market, which were derived through a complicated and controversial process, and even within that 30 they decided to aim for the top quartile for teachers for comparison. He said that for hard-to-fill positions, they decided to look just at the localities that are most like Albemarle, so there are different ways to get at this.

Ms. Palmer asked if they did the bottom of the top quartile for police.

Mr. Foley responded that they only did that for teachers, and otherwise it is the 50% benchmark for classified staff.

Ms. Catlin noted that Mr. Randolph had mentioned bicycle networks and the seamless transition of the City and said that it was included as working with regional partners to determine alternatives to expand alternative transportation.

Mr. Randolph stated that he is comfortable with that as included.

Ms. Catlin said the last item is rural area master planning and rural area advisory committees, and stated that they had talked about it during citizen engagement, which they had acknowledged was operational. She stated there are several items that they still want to do to move that forward, and Mr. Sheffield had mentioned several things they will follow up on. Ms. Catlin noted that Mr. Randolph had pointed out that master plan areas have advisory councils and rural areas do not, so they should address whether they want to have advisory committees for the rural areas.

Mr. Randolph stated that master planning does not necessarily imply a desire for intensification of development, it is to agree upon what critical resources are and how to preserve and maintain them for the long term. He said that part of his campaign platform was to look at a small area plan out beyond Monticello and running up along the west side of Carter's Mountain, encompassing all of the timber there and going out to the fork leading in one direction to Blenheim, so he sees the value of that in terms of addressing development pressure.

Mr. Foley asked if that is really about the increased activity in the rural areas and the need to address that change, because that is strategic in a more focused kind of way, pertaining to intensification of uses in the rural area.

Ms. Mallek stated that they have the country crossroads on the list, and having the community organizations start those discussions has been an effort for about four years. She noted that the people in the western part of the county are interested in the country crossroads idea because there are buildings there that are sitting empty.

Mr. Dill said that he does not think it is enough to just preserve the rural area, because the Board does not control that and has to react to things like wineries and distilleries, so there might be positive ways to support local agriculture.

Ms. Mallek said the County is trying to become a bit more proactive and solve some problems ahead of time.

Mr. Dill said that he likes the idea of having it considered as part of their strategic plan since it encompasses 95% of the County's land area.

Mr. Sheffield asked if they should better define "economic preparedness" under the goal related to economic prosperity.

Mr. Foley responded that it will come out of the strategic plan process in terms of what they need to do to prepare for economic success.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the proactive rezoning aspect should probably be under development areas, and said that one possible reason for the negative feedback in the community survey regarding new developments is because the County's current zoning efforts do not reflect its aspirations. He stated that it is also a reflection of their inability to properly plan for future infrastructure, so if they can effectively zone what would happen with land uses, they will better define those expectations as well as the infrastructure and service demands. Mr. Sheffield said that by-right development sometimes causes much more complication, but at least there is an expectation set that it is a by-right ability. He added that there are three different aspects to being proactive, in his assessment: setting expectations, having the adequate context for infrastructure, and economic preparedness.

Mr. Sheffield stated that they need to have a strategy to address small area planning, and the County has a lack of projects, such as revitalization of aging areas, to add to a bond referendum. He said that he does not know what form that would take, but it is an area of concern for him. Mr. Sheffield stated that they also talked about the physical capacity for operational capacity, and they need to be giving that consideration for land banking for future uses, whether it is schools, government, or economic preparedness. He said that stormwater gray infrastructure is also catching up to them, and having sinkholes appearing is a symptom of a bigger problem, and he does not know if that would be a strategic item, and it is more of an infrastructure or development area issue rather than natural resources. Mr. Sheffield stated that in his district, there is a sinkhole area in the Commonwealth Drive area that the landowners would likely try to address by throwing bags of concrete down a pipe, which can result in a civil issue between the County and landowners.

Ms. Mallek noted that there is a whole chapter of stormwater with all of the other conveyances to the County that has not even been mapped or assessed.

Mr. Foley asked if this is all related to stormwater.

Mr. Sheffield responded that stormwater is the cause of it, but it is not a natural resources item to him, it is concrete pipe in the ground for a community purpose that is on private land.

Mr. Kamptner stated that what Mr. Sheffield is talking about is critical infrastructure, and how it might be appropriate within natural resources would be in the context of enhanced stream banks and buffers, requiring riparian easements, and similar measures.

Mr. Foley noted that this was contained in the level of service discussion, but graying infrastructure is a bit different because it involves public easements, and the framework is in fairly good shape.

Ms. Mallek said that for goal seven related to operational capacity, the County has heard a lot from constituents about gaps in zoning ordinances and codes, so while a long-term goal would be reduction of time to process these, they also had a discussion with Mr. Kamptner about solving these issues and needing staff capacity to be able to assist the legal department with them. She stated that there were three projects in Crozet currently that would bring this issues to the forefront, and she hopes they will add under operational capacity some extra staff, as there are some EDA things that will save them money and move some of these things forward.

Mr. Foley asked if these are related to regulatory changes.

Ms. Mallek responded that she hopes they will not have to rewrite the whole chapter and just focus on small things that need to be fixed.

Mr. Kamptner stated that since the ordinance has been amended for over 36 years, there are things they can fix, but long term, recodification is needed and the current districts are awkward and out of date. He said that a lot of it ties into Mr. Sheffield's comments about the need for proactive zoning and creating innovative, form-based regulations that allow things to happen in a 21st Century way.

Ms. Mallek noted that they made a start with more opportunities in the Downtown Crozet District, which was the experiment they adopted in 2010.

Mr. Foley stated that these things are in the work program, but they always get pushed down in favor of other things they are reacting to as they come along, so making it a strategic issue and dedicating for two years to get to that point would be the kind of thing they need to capture in this strategic effort.

Ms. Palmer asked if it is mostly related to ZTAs.

Mr. Kamptner responded that a lot of it is in pieces on his computer, but he has not had time to get to it, and the other issue that ignites the need for what Mr. Sheffield is suggesting is the new proffer legislation that drastically changes the way impacts will be addressed, so it will be good to get out ahead of it to achieve the desired outcome.

Ms. Mallek commented that they need to spend time now to save time later.

Mr. Randolph said that he interpreted what Mr. Sheffield had said as meaning they should move to more form-based development, and Mr. Cilimberg had recently alluded to that in his comments.

Mr. Sheffield said that this is true for some strategic places, and in more general places it is just being proactive with the rezoning for the purpose they want to see, rather than waiting for an applicant to go through a long process.

Mr. Foley noted that the new objective added about revitalization in the Rio/29 area referenced proactive rezoning, and maybe what the Board is saying broadens it beyond that.

Mr. Sheffield stated that the frustration among constituents relates to the inconsistencies and holes that are in some of the codes.

Ms. Mallek added that sometimes the text and the master plan conflicts with what the map says.

Mr. Randolph commented that Southwood will be most suitable for form-based development, and they will need to look at how they address it because it does not fit the mold of the development areas, and it will be a major challenge because of its many dimensions.

Ms. Catlin stated that staff will take this information back and turn it into their FY17-19 strategic plan and give them a tool before their June 7th session that will give them their first shot at a ranking, so when they come into that session they will already have a layer of that work done. She said they will prioritize in terms of top, middle and bottom tiers, with staff then looking at a program and service inventory and costing out what it takes to get to what the Board has deemed important, and how programs and services align with that. Ms. Catlin stated that as a starting point, staff will bring back to the Board a plan for assigning resources to the things they have said are most important, getting as far down the list as possible, with the really difficult discussion pertaining to what things are left out, what should be adjusted, etc. She said there are some sequencing things that may make logical sense, and they will be working on it iteratively over the next several months.

Agenda Item No. 6. Citizen Engagement.

Ms. Catlin said that staff also wants to address citizen engagement and solicit the Board's input as to what level of engagement they want and when. She stated that during the budget process, the big community meetings are only marginally helpful, so the idea of forming a focus group with interest groups that will be invited to attend rather than random attendance. Ms. Catlin said that citizens' advisory

committees would be one such vehicle. She stated that staff has also considered “listening opportunities” in both high and low-tech settings, as a lower-key way to hear from people who might want to communicate with them about these issues. Ms. Catlin said staff feels that going out to the community after the Board does its rankings might be a good time because they will have identified their priorities and put them in a preliminary ranking.

Ms. Mallek said there are regular community meetings already in place, so those would be good opportunities in which to solicit feedback, with a list of the 25 or so priority items.

Mr. Sheffield asked staff what their thoughts are on forming the focus groups.

Ms. Catlin responded they will put together a list of stakeholder groups that are broad and representative and share that with the Board, then recruit people for those groups, such as budget stakeholders from the Chamber of Commerce, PTOs, etc. She said that if the Board has people they think will be helpful, they should recommend them to staff.

Ms. Mallek said that people tend to comment and interact in their own groups rather than a larger setting.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he would prefer a more objective approach of random constituents so they get a sample size that is not the regular cast of characters giving input, such as a mailer or phone call.

Ms. McKeel said they would need a mix of both.

Ms. Catlin agreed that a good mix would be focus groups, advisory committees, and existing meetings or events.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he appreciates the people who regularly provide feedback, and he would also like to hear from people who are busy with work and family but who would be willing to come in and spend an hour or so to provide input.

Mr. Randolph emphasized that it is important for a survey to be simple and suggested that they collect information at places like the Scottsville Food Lion, so they can get input from constituents whose opinion is important.

Ms. Catlin said if the Board agrees that the time to go out and solicit feedback is after their June 7 ranking meeting, staff can put together a plan for reaching out to constituents. She mentioned that they have not had a public hearing on their five-year financial plan before, so when they reach the point of adopting the two-year strategic plan they can have a formal public hearing, as some other localities do.

Mr. Randolph stated that he feels it is important to do that because it will attract press attention, and that would get out to citizens as a preface to show up with a survey.

Mr. Dill said that he is a bit concerned about high expectations from the public if they are surveyed by the County about specific efforts and assuming these items would be addressed in the short term. He stated that the Board is expected to represent the people and they should be getting expert opinions and researching topic, but wonders if it would really help them to get votes on the environment, gray infrastructure, etc.

Ms. Mallek stated that they would not know unless they ask, and while it is up to the Board to make hard decisions and not ask people about every single issue, these are the big items that consumes a lot of resources.

Mr. Dill asked if she would really shape an opinion based on what constituents fill out in a survey.

Ms. Mallek responded that this is why she talks to constituents in small groups.

Mr. Sheffield noted that what shapes direction for him is from feedback from constituents, and this is just another feedback process.

Mr. Dill commented that they spent a significant amount of time on these efforts, and perhaps the way it is phrased will make a difference.

Ms. Catlin said it is important to convey that this is a forced choice exercise that is about effectively using constrained resources, not a wish list.

Ms. Mallek stated that the introductory paragraph will be really important.

Mr. Sheffield said that just because the Board is listening does not mean the County has the resources to do something.

Mr. Dill said that he would also like to hear from experts.

Ms. Catlin emphasized that with the public participation for any of their projects, they try to start out with the understanding that the Board considers data, information from staff, their own belief system,

comparison information from other communities, etc., not just one lens.

Agenda Item No. 7. Wrap-up, next steps.

Mr. Foley stated that the hard work will lie ahead in terms of ranking and assigning resources to some of these priorities, but they will also have to bring some of the regular budget items that will be measured against these priorities.

Recess. The Board recessed their meeting at 5:30 p.m., and reconvened at 5:41 p.m. to go into closed session.

Agenda Item No. 8. Closed Meeting.

At 5:41 p.m., Mr. Sheffield **moved** that the Board go into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection One to discuss and consider prospective candidates for the Board Clerk position; and under Subsection seven to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice relating to the County's court facilities. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Agenda Item No. 9. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 7:15 p.m., Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each Board member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Mr. Sheffield **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Agenda Item No. 10. Adjourn to May 18, 2016, 1:00 p.m. in Room 320.

At 7:16 p.m., Ms. Palmer **moved** to adjourn the Board meeting to May 18, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in Room 320. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 08/03/2016
Initials: TOM