

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on July 25, 2016, at 3:30 p.m., Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from July 19, 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 (arrived at 5:25 p.m.).

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Attorney, Greg Kamptner and Acting Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Palmer.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. Closed Meeting.

At 3:30 p.m., Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board go into a Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection (1) to discuss and consider prospective candidates for the Board Clerk position. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Sheffield.

---

Agenda Item No. 3. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 4:01 p.m., the Board reconvened into open meeting, and 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 and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Sheffield.

---

**Recess and Reconvene in Room 241.** At 4:02 p.m., the Board recessed their meeting.

---

Agenda Item No. 4. Call to Order.

Ms. Palmer called the Board of Supervisors meeting to order at 4:07 pm. She asked that everyone introduce themselves. She also introduced the presiding security officer, Officer Laura Proffitt.

Mr. Keller called the Planning Commission meeting to order.

Mr. Gentry called the Economic Development Authority meeting to order.

---

Agenda Item No. 5. **Joint Meeting with Economic Development Authority and Planning Commission.**

Planning Commission Members Present: Mr. Bruce Dotson, Ms. Karen Firehock, Mr. Tim Keller, Mr. Mac Lafferty, Ms. Pam Riley and Ms. Daphne Spain.

Absent: Ms. Jennie More and Mr. Bill Palmer.

---

Economic Development Authority Members Present: Mr. James Atkinson, Ms. Lettie Bien, Mr. Rod Gentry, Mr. Vernon Jones, Mr. Donald Long, and Mr. Elton Oliver.

Absent: Mr. David Shreve.

Also Present: Mr. Jim Bowling, Attorney.

---

Item No. 5a. Review of Quantitative Analysis & Data Findings for Economic Development Strategic Plan.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that when the Economic Development

Office shared its approach for development of the Economic Development Strategic Plan in December 2015 (i.e. Economic Development Work Plan), it was anticipated that periodic check-ins with the Board would take place in order to share key findings that would help to inform the ensuing Plan. This will be the first of two anticipated briefings with the Board and other important stakeholder groups (i.e. Economic Development Authority and Planning Commission), with this one focusing on primary data points from the Comparative Analysis and the results of the site inventory evaluation.

The results of the site inventory evaluation, initially shared with the Board and Economic Development Authority in February, will be further reviewed at the meeting through the use of GIS tools. This review will focus on the currently vacant undeveloped/buildable acreage for business usage in the development areas to better assess its viability for meeting the needs of target industries. This evaluation will be based on information previously shared on land availability as presented on page 31 of attachment B.

The development of the strategic plan for economic development is being based on a comprehensive, best practices approach (Attachment A) that seeks to, first, develop a "portrait" of Albemarle County that is then compared to other Virginia peer localities with whom Albemarle competes for economic development opportunities. Over the past six months, the Economic Development Office has been gathering and analyzing key data points that are considered by businesses when deciding to expand or locate their operations. These data points, defined by the International Economic Development Council, are widely recognized and often used by site location consultants and business leaders. While subjective factors, obtained through focus group discussions and personal interview with key stakeholders, will also be considered in development of the Plan, that information will be shared with the Board at a subsequent work session later this year.

The quantitative, comparative analysis has been compiled and developed by an outside research consultant using credible, consistent data sources widely utilized by leading economic development organizations. In keeping with standard practices of site location consultants, the comparative analysis is based on a "point in time" and considers a number of decision factors important to businesses. These include: Population and Demographics, Workforce Availability and Quality, Business Clusters and Major Employers, Costs of Living, Business Operating Costs (e.g. tax structure, land prices, lease rates, utilities), Infrastructure, Transportation, Education and Training Programs/Partners, and Community Amenities ("quality of life" factors). A summary of the Business Expansion and Location Factors that describe "the Albemarle story" in relation to our peer localities is provided in Attachment B.

Like other localities within and outside Virginia, Albemarle County competes for businesses on a global scale; however, due to significant variations in cost factors - particularly tax structures between states - the comparative analysis has been limited to other Virginia localities. These seven "peer localities" were carefully selected based on a number of distinct factors which they share with Albemarle: proximity to major transportation networks, nearby college/university, demographic composition, important historic and natural resources, proximity to a larger metropolitan area, and focus on similar target industry sectors. The seven peer localities include Fauquier County, Frederick County, Hanover County, James City County, Roanoke County, Rockingham County, and Spotsylvania County.

To ensure objectivity and cohesiveness throughout the quantitative analysis, all of the comparative data has been shared and vetted with other staff from Community Development, Finance, Management & Budget, and the County Executive's Office. This shared understanding and team approach will be especially important to successful implementation of the forthcoming Economic Development Strategic Plan.

There is no budget impact.

The purpose of this meeting is to share key findings that will help inform the ensuing Plan. No action is requested at this time.

---

Ms. Palmer stated that Board member, Mr. Sheffield, called to say he was running late and will arrive around 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Faith McClintic, Director, Economic Development, stated that it is nice to have everyone together at this meeting, as they will all play a role in the execution of the Economic Development Strategic Plan. She invited attendees to write down questions on post-it notes she provided and said she would review them during the meeting recess and attempt to address them today, or at a future date if the answer is not available. She said the data is compiled using reputable sources that are readily available to businesses, and noted that she had sent members information in advance, including 35 pages of data, to provide a snapshot of how Albemarle compares to peer communities. When developing a strategic plan for economic development efforts, she said the County must first look at the current status to inform future direction, and said that providing jobs and increasing the tax base from the business community are two primary goals. She stated the conclusions reached were as a result of input from many individuals besides herself and the contract employee. She mentioned the names of several people involved for the first level of discussions. They then cleaned up the information and tried to answer some questions with information from County staff, with an ongoing team from the Economic Development Office and Community Development Department.

She displayed slides covering the areas of consideration in the process of formulating the strategic plan, and said that qualitative findings from community meetings and focus groups with

stakeholders are complete. Ms. McClintic said that she will focus on the quantitative findings, which are all data oriented. She noted that site inventory, infrastructure and engineers' evaluation will be subsequent to today's meeting, and she will summarize the findings but does not yet have recommendations to make.

Ms. McClintic stated that the strategic plan references "maintaining a strong economy," as this assists in providing an excellent educational system and can be done without destroying the rural and scenic heritage of the County, which are tremendous assets, and these are of equal importance to the EDA. She said that economic prosperity includes diversification of jobs and capital investment, which translates into machinery and tools tax revenue and other revenues coming from the business community. Ms. McClintic stated that the comprehensive plan references a healthy economy for present and future generations. She said the composition of the County population is changing within migration and natural births and deaths, and this exercise only looked at sites within the growth area boundaries.

Ms. McClintic stated that sustainability is an important piece to long-term viability in terms of Albemarle remaining a strong AAA-rated community, and said the quantitative comparative analysis (QCA) looks at Albemarle County's situation and how the County stacks up to the competition. She said that businesses look at the QCA, which is a competitive process of elimination when businesses consider where to locate.

Ms. McClintic showed a slide that listed peer communities that Albemarle uses for comparison and discussed the characteristics that led them to consider certain communities as peers, noting that examples of peer communities are Roanoke, Rockingham, Frederick, Spotsylvania, Hanover, and James City counties. She mentioned how they analyzed data on a qualitative and quantitative basis, but said they would just consider the quantitative portion today. Ms. McClintic noted how CNBC and Forbes annually rank states for business, and said at one time Virginia was at the top of the list but had fallen to 13<sup>th</sup> over the past few years. She showed the criteria considered to calculate the ranking and how they are weighted. She stated that workforce is the most important factor, then infrastructure and cost of doing business, and her presentation will focus on the latter.

Ms. McClintic invited questions. There were none.

Ms. McClintic stated that the presentation will now focus on costs and what comprises them. She said that businesses do not just want a site or building, but want a "place." Ms. McClintic cited a recent *Industry Week* article that consulted a principal with KPMG who said the key cost factors that businesses consider when deciding where to locate are labor, taxes, real estate and utilities; however, non-cost factors are also important, and businesses often start out looking at objective factors and then end up considering subjective factors. Ms. McClintic pointed out that this is why quantitative information must be looked at first, but qualitative factors must also be considered.

Ms. McClintic gave examples of fixed and variable costs and stated that some of the primary components of cost that businesses consider are tax rates, utility costs, regulation, development review time, land prices, and lease rates. She stated that manufacturing needs to be an integral part of the County's program, although some consider it to be a necessary evil. She displayed a slide that showed examples of existing manufacturers in the County and photos of their site locations and how they fit in with the environment. Ms. McClintic stated that the County is dominated by educational services, and this has worked well for the County. She noted that the educational institutions employ many people, but half the largest employers are not taxpayers, as they are state, federal or local government operations. She stated that it is never a good thing to put all the eggs in one basket, and gave an example of Stafford County and how the eggs were with the federal government with the Quantico Marine Corps base. Ms. McClintic emphasized that government budget cuts have affected things, and diversity in the employment base is important.

Ms. McClintic presented a slide containing data provided by the Virginia Employment Commission that shows the education levels of job candidates, high school diploma, Associate's degree, Bachelors, Masters, Ph.D., technical degree, etc., and their relationship to employment. She noted that there are many people looking for work who cannot find work. Ms. McClintic discussed how the Chancellor of the Virginia Department of Education had announced on July 1 the launching of a workforce credentialing system. She mentioned the 1-2-7 problem and stated that for every advanced-degreed worker, it takes two degreed employees and seven non-degreed workers to support that person, and noted a nationwide shortage of support workers. Ms. McClintic stated that Virginia has become a leader in the new credentialing process.

Ms. McClintic's next slide showed a list of target industries in manufacturing such as agribusiness, information technology, defense, finance, insurance, and biotechnology. She stated that over the past five years there has been a net loss of targeted industry jobs in Virginia. She stated that manufacturing has been targeted because of its multiplier effect, and it is estimated that for every dollar spent in manufacturing, there is a 133% return. Ms. McClintic gave examples of other industries helped by manufacturing, such as suppliers and distribution companies, and displayed a list of spin-off companies that resulted from major local manufacturing companies. She invited questions and then asked for Susan Stimart to present on factors affecting land prices, lease rates, and the search for commercial space.

In response to a question about the current slide and if it includes commercial, Ms. McClintic replied that commercial is included under mixed use. She also discussed commercial vs. manufacturing/light industrial space and how the Neighborhood Model envisions more of a commercial

component vs. manufacturing in terms of integrating well with the community.

Ms. Palmer stated that her understanding of the purpose of the Economic Development Plan had been mainly to increase revenues in order to decrease real estate taxes, whereas Ms. McClintic has been focused on jobs and economic prosperity. Ms. McClintic said that this is reflected by economic prosperity.

Ms. Mallek followed up by commenting on a report that showed 440 working families in the White Hall District that were not earning enough to be self-sufficient, and emphasized that the County needs something different.

Ms. Susan Stimart, Economic Development Facilitator, stated that she will review some maps, and recognized Mr. Derek Gerard from Community Development for his contributions to the process and many hours of time.

Mr. Randolph observed that there has been an argument made for increased manufacturing in Albemarle County, but the statistics confirm that there is underemployment. He stated the workforce is highly educated but often working in jobs that pay below the national norm based upon their educational background. He stated that he sees a disconnect with advocacy for manufacturing, as statistics suggest they should address the underemployment situation first. Mr. Randolph said they are blessed with a highly educated work force, yet by targeting manufacturing they are missing the biggest need, finding meaningful target industries that engage in full-time employment for the underemployed workforce. He mentioned higher value, intellectual property types of industries in comparison to manual deliverables in manufacturing.

Ms. Stimart replied that this is a good point, adding that there is an innovation culture in Albemarle. She stated that a lot of this involves prototypes of components that are being developed by masters and Ph.D.-level workers, but in order for them to produce and sell their products, the County can make money when those products are produced locally.

Mr. Randolph said he is glad she brought up the innovators and said the equation is missing the City of Charlottesville. He stated that if they combine the City and County and compare that to other counties in terms of business innovation, the County would blow all the other counties out of the water. Mr. Randolph said that a regional approach is missing in comparing Albemarle to other counties, and in ignoring Charlottesville they are leaving out a major component of the local economy. He pointed out that the statistics presented do not capture this, and businesses looking to relocate consider both the County and the City together.

Ms. Stimart agreed with Mr. Randolph, but said their results are based solely on their revenue streams. She said that while they have a wonderful cooperative relationship with Charlottesville, they must find ways to keep businesses in the County when they go from innovators to producers and sellers, in order to provide revenue to our community.

Mr. Gentry cited Spotsylvania, Stafford and Fredericksburg as an example of three highly competitive communities, and stated that it was difficult for them to achieve cooperation until a company like GEICO came and forced them to take a regional approach, even though everyone was trying to grab the brass ring themselves. He stated that they have a lot of work to do to bring Charlottesville and Albemarle together, and while he would love to see a regional approach to economic development, it could take forever to get there.

Mr. Randolph replied that the County keeps coming up with reasons why cooperation between Charlottesville and Albemarle cannot be achieved, and they continue to employ zero-sum strategies of winners vs. losers which, in the long term, result in everyone losing. Mr. Gentry responded that to get to a regional approach, Albemarle has to be the leader.

Ms. Palmer stated that the natural evolution for a small start-up business in the City is to move to the County, and she believes that City Council is interested in working with the County on this level.

Ms. Stimart said the County has a tremendous opportunity and can improve, but they have had a regional economic development effort, the Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development, for many years that also includes surrounding counties. She stated that it is also important to have an Albemarle County focus to achieve the most impact, and gave a hypothetical example of a small company in Charlottesville that needs a large parcel to expand which is not available in the City, with Albemarle needing to compete to avoid having the company move to a neighboring county.

Mr. Randolph, pointing out that Board member Brad Sheffield still had not arrived for the meeting, said he would put across a point that Mr. Sheffield would like to make: the most effective and immediate thing they can do is comprehensive, proactive rezoning. He said the comprehensive plan lays out a plan for residential development, but the County is weakest in terms of determining the types of businesses it wishes to attract and the kind of infrastructure needed. He said the County needs to better articulate the business land use intentions in the comp plan and immediately take steps to rezone to match. Mr. Randolph stated that the lack of clarity and appropriate zoning is keeping the County from being prepared for opportunities, and creates a high level of uncertainty for businesses that results in contention, delays with projects, and, at worst, scares off opportunity.

Mr. Keller mentioned that the study does not examine how the workforce moves and commented on how this information would be difficult to get. He said the break-even point in terms of the real estate

tax a household costs to pay its way in the system is around \$600,000, and the County needs to put this and other pieces together and consider whether attracting a workforce will still result in undercapitalization of the tax rate. Mr. Keller said it must be clarified whether the aim is to provide better jobs for existing members of the community or attract new residents, as well as how housing will factor into fiscal issues and whether it will create more costs.

Ms. Stimart assured Mr. Keller that she spared them a lot of data, and said there is data available on commuting patterns that she would be glad to share. She said they are looking at the number of new jobs created in the County in the past five years, and there is still a disparity between the cost of living in Albemarle and wage levels, with the high cost of living precluding some from moving in. Ms. Stimart stated that economic development can focus on either job generators or capital investment, and said that there are high-tech industries that do not create a lot of jobs, but the benefit to the locality is that they have a lot of machinery and equipment that creates tax revenue. She used a data center as an example.

Mr. Keller said they need clarification between what they are doing to solve the fiscal issues and what they are doing to provide jobs for the existing workforce, and emphasized that these are two issues that need to be thought of distinctly.

Ms. Stimart invited attendees to give her their written questions, which she would then address during the second half of the meeting.

---

**Recess.** The meeting recessed at 5:05 p.m. and reconvened at 5:15 p.m.

---

Item No. 5b. Discussion of remaining steps in Strategic Plan project.

Item No. 5c. Discussion of future meetings: timeframe and topics.

Ms. Stimart resumed her presentation and reviewed the history of recent economic development efforts. She stated that research conducted in 2009 found a shortage of industrial and business products that led to an action item to determine what the shortage and its elements were, and in 2010 the County adopted the Economic Vitality Action Plan. She stated that goal #4 of this plan was to remove obstacles and expand options for industrial land users, and two core actions of this goal were: countywide rezoning to light industrial for RA and R1 zoning in the growth areas; and consider designating more land in the growth areas for light industry. Ms. Stimart indicated that in September 2014, they completed the action plan but did not address those steps, and in June 2015, they entered a countywide comprehensive plan revision with a resolution to consider adding more inventory within the growth areas. She showed a map of areas where they could add light industrial to the available land, noting that they had excluded UVA Research Park and some other areas where the land was considered to be contaminated.

Mr. Randolph asked if the 5<sup>th</sup> Street Station project was built on land considered to be contaminated, stating that he believes it is important to have a definition of contaminated land. He also mentioned flex properties that are zoned for commercial with the option of rezoning to light industrial, and asked for clarification as to whether the figures presented for light industrial included flex properties. Ms. Stimart responded that she did not know the answer to the question about 5<sup>th</sup> Street Station and offered to go back and check. She confirmed that her figures for light industrial do not include flex properties.

Ms. Stimart continued her presentation and stated that in September 2015, they added 35 acres in the area of I-64 and Route 29. She showed results of a study completed in July 2015 that shows available remaining land and what can be assembled, looking at what was vacant and buildable. Ms. Stimart said that 196 acres were available for manufacturing if the UVA Research Park is excluded. She said that in the comprehensive plan, they took a special look at properties of 0-5 acres that could be part of an "assemblage." She stated the majority of land available is zoned for residential, parks and open space, and institutional. Ms. Stimart noted the biggest parcels are at Northpointe, which is acreage associated with Sweet Spot Holdings, and the two largest parcels available for assemblage are in Places 29, with one being 89 acres and the other at 73 acres.

Ms. Mallek asked if the assemblage is in common ownership or just adjacent properties. Ms. Stimart cited the handout provided and the complexities involved in the comprehensive plan, stating that as an example, what might be classified as office/R&D flex in Places 29 would be classified as light industrial in Crozet or downtown.

Ms. McClintic pointed out that the bigger summary tables where land designations were classified as light industrial, parks, mixed use, green space, etc. they worked to determine what fits where and what acreages was assigned to the broader categories.

Ms. Stimart showed properties in the Crozet area totaling 76 acres and potential use of the railway line. She then showed properties in the south and west beginning with the Sweet Spot Holdings. She then focused on the Pantops area, where there is very little land available for assemblage, then pointed out the Places 29 area and various parcels of land around Putt Putt Golf, Berkmar Drive, and Hollymead.

**(Note: Mr. Sheffield arrived at 5:25 p.m.)**

Ms. Palmer asked why the UVA Research Park was taken off the list. Ms. Stimart said that UVA

Research Park is very unique and has key provisions required for businesses that locate there: the business owner may not purchase land; the business must have a relationship with UVA and be compatible with its efforts; and there are design standards that a business owner must work under. She stated that they have taken prospective businesses to look at the research park over the years, but the interests did not align.

Ms. McClintic said that UVA Research Park has been included in the overall land inventory despite its unique requirements. She stated that she and Tom Foley have had numerous conversations with the UVA Foundation regarding working together and revisiting the conditions, and noted that there is ongoing dialogue.

Ms. Stimart showed the last assemblage, owned by United Land Corp. surrounding Rivanna Station.

Ms. Stimart said they looked at UVA's holdings and considered what UVA might do with them in the future, and their analysis shows 141 holdings within the growth areas, amounting to 2,756 acres. She stated that they also looked at federal and state government holdings, which represent 6% of the growth area and consist of 1,436 acres. She next showed what land is vacant and buildable within the growth areas and how it is divided among the different land use designations. Ms. Stimart said they also considered what might be available for redevelopment within the growth areas. She noted that they only looked at buildings with assessments of \$20,000 –\$100,000 and, since there is very little available under this criterion, they may wish to rethink this.

Mr. Randolph pointed out that there is significant acreage in the Scottsville area.

Ms. Stimart pointed out that Scottsville prefers to limit truck traffic, which would limit the kind of business development there.

Ms. Palmer asked if there is a rail line in Scottsville. Mr. Randolph and Ms. Stimart confirmed that there is.

Mr. Randolph pointed out that rail is limited there because it only goes in an east-west direction, reflecting its primary use to carry coal, and may not be viable for much longer.

Ms. Stimart gave several recent examples in which a brewery and a distillery considered relocating to Scottsville and had discussions with Department of Rail and Transportation officials, discovering that it was going to take some work to persuade them to allow for rail access.

Ms. Palmer pointed out that there are properties within a couple of years of remediation that should be on line soon that are not included among the available parcels. Ms. Stimart agreed that they excluded them to be conservative, although one of the properties is assessed at more than \$100K and would be excluded anyway.

Ms. Bien asked her to make the presentation more "real" for them in terms of the impact with a prospective company and what they are looking to do.

Ms. Stimart offered to provide a realistic summary, stating that they receive an inquiry, usually from the Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development, for a specific size parcel; they then determine the type of use, which will affect which properties they look at and whether they need to be in close proximity to highways.

Ms. McClintic added that a challenge is working within a time window that is usually 3-6 months that a prospective business has to select a property, and said the sites must be on line and ready to go. She said that even for existing local businesses that want to expand, the County does not have many options for them. She stated that at a future meeting, she will provide them with data regarding cost of business factors that businesses consider and where the County stands.

Mac Lafferty asked if they had mapped fiber optics.

Ms. Stimart responded that Fiberlight had shared some of its plans when it first came into the community, and noted that the County's broadband task force will provide some data next month to the Board.

Mr. Dill commented that they are focusing too much on a shortage of land and said there really is sufficient land, as the County is larger than the island of Manhattan. He stated the consideration is really about what they want the community to be.

Ms. Palmer asked the presenters what they expect from the Board today. Ms. McClintic responded they are not expecting anything, and just wanted to share phase one of the data that will be used to inform the longer term strategies, as well as educating the Board, Commission and authority so they can have a discussion to develop the strategies they will ultimately put in place.

Mr. Randolph asked if an expedited public approval process will be part of the recommendation. Ms. McClintic responded that they are likely to make such a recommendation but are not there yet, as they are still quantifying how long it takes to get through the various components of the process. She stated that they plan to present recommendations as to what changes can be made administratively

versus process improvement versus policy changes made by decision makers, and confirmed that this would be a component of a SWOT analysis as suggested by Mr. Randolph.

Mr. Dotson suggested that, when considering tweaking the definition of “redevelopment,” they should look at sites that could have further infill development potential with unused capacity.

Ms. Spain asked for clarification on the calculation of inventory in the analysis, specifically whether it represented parcels in the entire County or just the growth areas. Ms. McClintic said it considers just the growth areas, and asked Board members for their impressions of the presentation and whether staff missed anything in terms of other areas they should assess.

Ms. Palmer asked what Ms. McClintic considers to be a “generation,” and also asked how they came up with an estimate that the population would double in the next generation. Ms. McClintic replied that a generation is currently defined by the Bureau of Economic Analysis as 30 years, and said the doubling of the population estimate was the conclusion of that group as it is what occurred between 1980-2010.

Mr. Randolph said the presentation format suggests that this doubling of the population looks to be what will occur in the next 30 years.

Ms. Palmer agreed with Mr. Randolph that the graph presented makes it look as if the population doubling estimate begins with 2016.

Mr. Randolph suggested they be consistent in their presentations and use a fiscal year, rather than fiscal year for some presentations and calendar year for others. He said that if there are changes, they should display an asterisk and an explanation of why a different time reference was used.

Ms. McClintic agreed, but said it is sometimes difficult to obtain fiscal year data.

Ms. Palmer asked for the definition of “pending projects.” Ms. McClintic said these are projects in the rezoning process. She invited further comment from Ms. Echols.

Ms. Elaine Echols, Principal Planner, stated that they have a list of projects in the pipeline and these are properties tracked in terms of rezoning or that are under development, adding that these were pulled out of the list of available properties shown in the presentation.

Ms. Firehock asked if they excluded properties with \$100,000+ of improvements. Ms. Echols responded that this piece was done towards the end and was giving general information on what might be available for redevelopment, so it needs a bit more work to zero in geographically on particular properties that the County can identify as having potential. She stated that staff would work with the Economic Development Office in obtaining greater clarity on what is available.

Ms. Stimart added that the redevelopment map was created by the Division of Real Estate and uses their definition consisting of properties assessed at \$20,000–\$100,000, whereas Planning and Community Development used a different criterion. She stated that there are two different categories of maps, with one listing vacant properties and the other listing properties available for potential redevelopment.

Ms. Firehock asked if a property, not currently being redeveloped, that is valued at \$100,000 but is owned by an investor who plans to tear it down, is considered to be an available property. Ms. Stimart replied that it would not be listed as an available property unless it has a redevelopment proposal in place and would be considered as part of the “built” environment.

Ms. Bien mentioned that she had recently passed along copies to the Board of Supervisors of a recent *New York Times* article entitled “How Anti-Growth Sentiment Reflected in Zoning Laws Thwarts Quality.” She said that she has brought some extra copies and invited members of the Planning Commission to take them.

Ms. Palmer thanked the presenters and their staff for their hard work.

Mr. Keller adjourned the Planning Commission meeting until July 26, 2016, 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Gentry adjourned the Economic Redevelopment meeting.

---

Agenda Item No. 6. Closed Meeting.

At 6:04 p.m., Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board go into a Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection (7): 1 to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding matters relating to cash proffers for zoning applications filed before July 1, 2016, and for rezoning applications filed on/after July 1, 2016 that are subject to new Virginia Code §15.2-2303.4. Mr. Sheffield **seconded** the motion.

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

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

---

Agenda Item No. 7. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 6:37 p.m., the Board reconvened into open meeting, and 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 and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

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

---

Agenda Item No. 8. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

---

Item No. 8a. **Discussion of a memorial chimney at Byrom Park.**

Ms. Mallek stated that fundraising is underway in the community and enough money has been raised to build a memorial chimney in Byrom Park, and she invited County Executive, Tom Foley, to present on this issue.

Mr. Foley stated that this is a good community project and volunteers have raised approximately \$25,000 to create a memorial in one of the parks to recognize individuals displaced when the federal government created the Shenandoah National Park. He stated that the matter for discussion is whether the County should provide funds for liability insurance for the chimney, which includes a commemorative plaque. Mr. Foley said he advocates that the County provide insurance coverage under its liability policy and not burden the volunteer fundraisers with this cost in the years to come, noting that staff will evaluate the project to make sure it does not have any significant liability issues.

Ms. Palmer said it is reasonable to her as long as they are checking the structure for liability issues. She asked if approval will set a precedent that could affect other things. Mr. Foley replied that each case will be up to the Board to decide.

Ms. McKeel asked about the message of the memorial, and whether it signifies that the government is "awful" and took land from people against their will.

Ms. Mallek suggested to Ms. McKeel that she read the brochures she had distributed about the memorial or go to the website, adding that the message is a statement of fact about what happened and lists the names of those affected. She emphasized that the most important thing is the binding of the community and the cultural memories of what was there, and if they are able to raise more money, with a goal of \$18,000, they can build a shelter for music events or presentations.

Ms. McKeel stated that she just wants to be sure it is a positive rather than a "tear down government" message, and with Ms. Mallek's explanation it seems fine to her now.

---

Agenda Item No. 9. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There were none.

---

Agenda Item No. 10. Adjourn.

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:47 p.m.

---

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 07/12/2017
Initials CKB