

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on February 14, 2017, at 10:00 a.m., at the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commissions Water Street Center, 401 Water Street E, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from February 8, 2017.

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

ABSENT: None.

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

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order and Welcome.

Charlottesville City Council Present: Mr. Wes Bellamy, Mr. Bob Fenwick, Ms. Kathy Galvin, Mr. Mike Signer and Ms. Kristin Szakos.

City Staff Present: Mr. Maurice Jones, City Manager, Mr. Mike Murphy, Assistant City Manager, and Ms. Leslie Beauregard, Director, Budget and Performance Management.

The Board of Supervisors' meeting was called to order at 10:09 a.m., by the Chair, Ms. McKeel.

The City Council meeting was called to order at 10:09 a.m., by the Mayor, Mr. Signer.

Mr. Signer stated that this meeting was prompted by the Board and Council's 2016 execution of four memorandums of understanding focusing on four areas of common interest, and agreement that collaboration was better than competition as a path forward. He noted that the four areas were natural environment, transit and transportation, redevelopment and housing, and two areas of education: pre-K and vocational/career/technical. Mr. Signer said there was a meeting at the end of the year in which staff discussed potential areas of collaboration, with this meeting intended for action items and areas of cooperation for transit, as well as an update on Route 29/Hydraulic and a possible economic development MOU.

Ms. McKeel stated that there is often talk in the press and among community members regarding disagreement between the County and City, and how they are always at odds and always arguing, and this meeting represents the ongoing collaboration and work they do, with an effort to find even more common ground.

(Note: Mr. Sheffield read the following Transactional Disclosure Statement: "I am employed as Executive Director of JAUNT, a regional public transportation provider owned by the City of Charlottesville and the counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Louisa, Nelson and Buckingham located at 104 Keystone Place, Charlottesville, Virginia 22902, and have a personal interest in JAUNT because I receive an annual salary from JAUNT that exceeds \$5,000 annually. He stated that given the content of the discussion, he can participate fairly, objectively, and in the public's interest")

Agenda Item No. 2. Regional Transit System Update.

Mr. Chip Boyles, Executive Director of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) and the Charlottesville/Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), addressed the Board and Council. Mr. Boyles stated that just over a year ago, the TJPDC and MPO reviewed the current operation of transit providers in the region and made recommendations on possible strategies for improved cooperative operations that may or may not lead to a regional transit authority. He said that in preparing for the presentation at this meeting, his staff sent out some draft documents, which reflect some changes in the presentation and the summary narrative of the TJPDC Board, and after this meeting and further recommended changes from the City and County, the process would advance to deeper exploration of a regional transit authority endeavor.

Mr. Boyles reported that this effort began over a year ago with the Planning and Coordination Council (PAC), when they discussed possibilities for a regional transit authority in relation to a 2008 study done through TJPDC. He stated that the MPO offered to provide an operational study of the region's systems to determine steps towards an authority at a more moderate level than what was recommended in the 2008 report, if an authority is the avenue the City and County wants to pursue. He noted that Wil Cockrell of TJPDC is the project manager for this, and has worked with the City and County over the last year. He said that given time limitations, he would begin with a summary of recommendations, followed by supporting information, more detailed recommendations, Board and Council input, and next steps to make this a reality should they decide to move forward with an authority.

Mr. Boyles said they started the process with a problem statement that "the region's transit systems suffer from a very complex, informal, and sometimes disorganized system of coordination." He stated it was relayed to the TJPDC that there have been a number of misunderstandings, local conflicts, and lost opportunities, but it has been nice throughout the process that while there is merit to some of this, there are a lot of areas in which the criticism is not warranted. Mr. Boyles noted that there is a lot of communication taking place between the three transit providers: JAUNT, CAT, and UTS, as well as a lot

of informal communication and partnering among agencies.

Mr. Boyles reported that one of the recommendations is to create what would be termed a "regional transit partnership," which is nothing like an authority from a legal standpoint but would look a lot like a regional authority in the way it operates, creating a regional advisory board made up of City, County and JAUNT Board representatives, and similar to the MPO policy board, replacing a VDOT representative with a Department of Rail and Public Transportation representative. He noted that the role of the partnership would be to test the structure, and one thing they found was that jumping into an authority is a long-term commitment that is not very easy to back out of. Mr. Boyles stated that a partnership rather than an authority would give a pilot program and a test timetable so they could first see how things would work, and could also begin to look at transit planning in a cohesive and comprehensive manner, rather than having individual transit providers planning within their own agencies, making it more of a regional planning tool. He commented that this would work to integrate their long-term planning goals within the MPO's long-range transportation plan, as well as the region's rural long-range transportation plan. Mr. Boyles said they also feel that a regional partnership would simplify and formalize existing transit relations, as one of his concerns has been that informal communications are only as good as the leadership in place at the time, and should it change, unwritten policies could fall by the wayside. He stated that a partnership could serve to ensure the sustainability and longevity of those relationships, even throughout leadership changes.

Mr. Boyles stated that the other thing he found to be important in all types of regional partnerships is to create something that can be implemented very quickly and cost-effectively, and something that can be counted as an immediate win towards a longer term goal. He said it would also provide a venue for continued communication, coordination and collaboration between localities and citizens, as well as transit providers, and would allow the partnership to continue in a formal manner if all involved bodies wanted to continue pursuit towards an authority. Mr. Boyles noted that the TJPDC has looked at other regional agencies, and it is quite complicated and expensive to ensure they have all the information needed to make this kind of high-level fiscal decision, and this partnership would allow the discussion to continue. He said it is possible that the partnership would fulfill anything needed to reach the regional goal, and an authority may be something in the very far distant future and not something needing to be looked at immediately. Mr. Boyles stated that this would allow either direction to occur.

Mr. Boyles said that transit has been in existence a long time in the community, and he presented an image of a streetcar from 1914. He stated that the University's system began in 1972 and became a public corporation in 1982, and in 1975 the City acquired the Yellow Transit Company and began providing public transportation within the City of Charlottesville. Mr. Boyles reported that this moved along quite nicely, with the 2008 regional transit authority study as mentioned, and while there were some positive actions resulting from the study, rebranding, and legislation passed to create a regional authority, there was no legislation that allowed the funding of the authority to occur. He noted that the study included approximately \$140 million of capital improvements to implement the regional authority, bus rapid transit lanes, new capital rolling stock, and other investments, but there was not the political will needed to move that type of effort into implementation. Mr. Boyles mentioned that the study has just been sitting on a shelf since then, but they have used a lot of information from the study and the basis of it to say it is not the direction they want to pursue with what they are trying to accomplish now. He said they are looking at strictly an organizational effort, with no discussion of what it would cost to transfer or purchase capital assets, as it is just an effort for existing entities to work together in an improved manner.

Mr. Boyles said that some of the other parts of the plan that did not work out include the capital investments, because it was very confusing as to who would own what, given that the federal government pays a large share towards capital improvements, as well as the investment for the City of Charlottesville that they have made into those improvements. He stated that there was also concern at the time over discrepancies with employee benefits, as some jobs would be moved from a City department to a regional authority, and there was waffling political well as to whether a regional transit authority was something that merited moving forward. Mr. Boyles said there are some great regional system operators in the area, with both JAUNT and CAT winning awards at the state and national level, so things have worked very well until recently with the urbanization of Albemarle County and the growing demand for services outside the City limits. He noted that this has been supported by recent reports from the Weldon Cooper Center related to growth of the urban area of the County and within the City limits.

Mr. Boyles explained that Mr. Cockrell spent a lot of time, with assistance from other TJPDC staff, surveying the Board and Council, meeting with staff at multiple levels of JAUNT, CAT, and UTS, and reviewing budgets, strategic plans, and mission statements, then comprising that information and following up with elected officials and chief administrative officers. He stated that Mr. Cockrell then did a number of benchmarking exercises comparing the community to systems similar to this one, which usually consisted of college towns and similar populations. Mr. Boyles noted that this was difficult because there are very few systems in similar peer groups that operate with three distinct service providers, although there are several that have partnering arrangements. He said that in looking at other college towns, their numbers are quite high because they may have just one system that provides service for college students, city and county residents, and moving students around on campus greatly elevates ridership numbers. Mr. Boyles said the TJPDC has looked at a number of those and has borrowed ideas from some peer agencies as to how they operate, which is reflected in the report.

Mr. Will Cockrell addressed the Board and stated that Ms. Karen Davis at JAUNT, Mr. John Jones of CAT, and Ms. Rebecca White of UTS had provided him with significant information about their systems, and JAUNT and CAT, as well as the City and County, have received national recognition. Mr. Cockrell stated that the systems have been around for about 40 years, with lots of discussion taking place

about them, and what has been determined is that the issues are related to communication and coordination, as the systems themselves are in place. He said that CAT has provided services to Albemarle County for a fee, and the County is the City's single biggest customer; JAUNT is also a public corporation, and it contracts to provide commuter service, as well as ADA service. Mr. Cockrell noted that the commuter service is actually the largest portion of JAUNT's business, which is a common misconception, and there is an official written agreement between CAT and JAUNT, which talk to each other quite frequently. He said that UTS has to report to student groups and other University groups, and work with the City and its trolley for service around the University, serving as the free public transit provider in that area. He noted that the University is also working with JAUNT on a Crozet service, and working with the County and UTS on the Route 29 express service. He said the MPO works with CAT and JAUNT on funding allocations.

Mr. Cockrell stated that they are proposing under the partnership structure to align the City and County as an advisory board that functions to provide better coordination, staffing the MPO and working with the University for trolley service. He noted that they can put this in the work program and use federal funds to help staff the effort.

Mr. Fenwick asked why the UTS was not included in that effort. Mr. Cockrell explained that the UTS is an entirely different thing that falls under departments, such as housing. There was some discussion of the University being in an RTA with CAT and JAUNT, but it is hard to include it because UTS does not receive federal funds, so the recommendation is just for greater coordination to help blend the system with the others. He stated that they are trying to look at more of a regional transit system, as other regions have, with the goal of having more transit planning that includes benchmarks for success. Mr. Cockrell said they have looked at other systems from a systematic perspective, including other regional, urban and rural systems, such as Salisbury and College Park, Maryland. He stated that they also looked at other regional transit authorities in the Mid-Atlantic area to get a sense of how those work. Mr. Cockrell noted that those systems have been in place for a long time, but both the City and County are growing and changing, with new hired development starting to bring the population up. He stated that the urbanized area has reached the 92,000 range, with the character of the area changing and transit becoming more of an issue. Mr. Cockrell noted that the City and County have worked together on a new funding formula, with the County having some new services as a result, and the cost of contributions has increased. He commented that once a line item hits \$1 million, it seems to become more real and get more scrutiny. Mr. Cockrell noted that there has also been staff turnover at the County, the City, JAUNT and CAT, with some processes in place that got left behind.

Mr. Boyles stated that the MPO was asking today for direction from the Board and Council as to whether they want to move forward with the RTA, in terms of creation of a regional transit partnership that would be advisory in nature, keeping the current CAT Advisory Board and having it utilized as a citizens advisory committee that could help feed information, staffing the regional transit board with MPO funds. He explained that one step in the process would be to formalize and clarify existing and new transit agreements, and the study recommends that an annual or biannual agreement be adopted between CAT and the County, submitting a draft agreement to customers during budget time each year so they know exactly what they are paying for which services. Mr. Boyles noted that it would be a big undertaking to determine what the baseline service would be to create the first contract because, for example, when CAT runs to Fashion Square Mall, the minute it crosses the City/County line, it does not automatically become a "County service." He said that conversely, the same holds true with the service coming from Hollymead into the UVA hospital, so there may be significant work required in terms of who should be paying for what.

Mr. Boyles said the MPO staff could help develop working with CAT, JAUNT and UTS for a consolidated regional plan, and continue the benchmarking and baseline of services, with regional strategic planning that identifies goals for a transit system, such as easing congestion, increasing ridership, developing land use patterns, etc. He stated that a regional transit plan could help do that and would also help relaunch the feasibility study for a regional transit authority, if that were the direction indicated by the Board and Council. Mr. Boyles said this would take an approval in concept from them to direct the MPO to work with their respective staffs to move this forward, or to revisit it later, and the timing is good because the MPO is kicking off the long-range transportation process, so this could be incorporated. He offered to answer questions.

Mr. Bellamy asked if there is a cost benefit associated with this potential partnership or creation of the RTP, and if the committee would be comprised of County, City, staff, and citizen representatives. Mr. Boyles responded that there would be a cost, and the MPO currently receives funding at the state and federal levels for general transportation planning as well as transit planning, and they could utilize their existing transit planning budget to help facilitate the partnership. He said if the partnership wanted to do a regional transit authority comprehensive study, that would require additional money. He clarified that citizens on this committee would have to be considered, as the current MPO Policy Board does not have that in its voting membership, and one of the things to be decided would be to closely mirror the MPO Policy Board with a small group of voting members and a larger group of non-voting members, or a true regional authority that typically has a large group of members.

Ms. Galvin said one of his slides indicated that to keep an RTA on the table, the composition of the regional transit partnership is critical, but an earlier slide indicated that the first attempt at forming an RTA failed because the existing providers of transportation were not comfortable with changing and were concerned about the impacts on staffing and benefits. She expressed concern that they are only populating the partnership with agencies that are doing quite well but have an interest in keeping things the way they are, so her question is how they will get to the point of launching a feasibility study for a

regional transit authority.

Mr. Boyles responded that it would need to be part of the decision-making process of what the partnership board would look like, because one of the dilemmas identified with regional entities is that elected bodies turn over fairly often, and this is a complicated item to understand, as it involves multiple funding mechanisms. He stated that hopefully the right composition of a longstanding would incorporate that institutional knowledge so they are not having to resell the concept over and over.

Ms. Galvin commented that they have not discussed the users of the system, and the employers and employees to be captured are not involved in any of these communications, which she feels need to be built in. Mr. Boyles replied that the MPO's thought is to include that in the strategic planning process when looking at this as a regional service.

Ms. Galvin said she is saying that they need to be part of the decision-making process.

Mr. Randolph stated they must acknowledge that this is just the first step in the process, and down the road, as increased cooperation develops, they can remove the inefficiencies and inequities and build a model that can successfully meet the needs of both the City and County, as well as stakeholders. He noted that they do not yet have the timeframe for this, but at least there would be some forward momentum.

Mr. Cockrell commented that this is a regional issue and there is already a policy board in place, so the thought is to use the entity that is already formed and swap out a few members, such as switching VDOT out with DRPT, and also having a member from JAUNT on the board. He said that non-voting members would include staff from all three transit agencies, and while they have not yet talked to Greene County Transit, they are a potential partner. Mr. Cockrell stated that there are quite a few students who use the transit system, including PVCC students.

Ms. Szakos stated that if they are looking at a model that includes voting and non-voting members, she would like for them to look at an organization that represents low-income individuals, such as PHAR, or form a transit riders association.

Ms. Palmer said that what struck her in reviewing the information about this was that they all get along well individually, but when it comes to big regional items, they repeatedly break down because they are looking at fiduciary responsibilities for their localities. She stated that it is the economically disadvantaged who move across the lines, and these factors become less consequential when talking about regional issues. Ms. Palmer emphasized that the approach presented here is wonderful, and she was happy to see that the RTP would eventually work toward an RTA, and she appreciates the fact they are getting this for citizens who need it. She also stated that the City is quickly approaching a population level of 50,000, which eliminates it as a candidate for reversion, which is something she has always wanted, so that makes the regional efforts increasingly important going forward.

Mr. Randolph stated that the RTP provides value in terms of better data collection, which hopefully will lead to increased federal dollars. He said the RTP is also trying to give them a higher level view for the region and how the communities need to work together, including the Shenandoah Valley's connection to the Charlottesville area, and they would need a broader discussion of an expanded regional transportation system. Mr. Randolph commented that they need to focus on a way to get people to and from work, as that really does not exist now.

Ms. McKeel commented that an RTP would provide opportunity for them to understand the issues each locality has and find some common ground. She noted that much of the issue has related to communication, with very different understanding about regional transit.

Mr. Dill stated they should think about how to maximize the service aspects and the efficiencies of it relative to what they have been in the past. He said that with the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, a lot of money was spent on meters to measure levels of usage between the localities, which did not increase the amount of water or the efficiency of its use. He stated that he presumes they will have lower costs with a regional transit authority, but he has not heard an emphasis on this and they should not focus on this right away since that is where the tension is created.

Mr. Boyles said they started to understand in their research that using a group to determine the desired outcome, whether it is more riders or more efficiency, as they need to come together on their goals as part of regional collaboration.

Mr. Fenwick stated that he supports the possible inclusion of localities like Greene, and asked if there were UVA representatives present, as he would be more comfortable if UTS was included beyond just the hospital.

A UTS operator who was part of the study group commented that she would not want to speak for the entire organization without some input from others.

Ms. Szakos stated the reality is that the City and County are two different organizations with different funding streams, and are sometimes in competition with one another, and this model of regional transit partnership will help get this moving forward regardless of what they decide to do. He said that the proposal to include UVA staff, particularly someone from transportation, is really important. Ms. Szakos stated that it is important to include users at the table.

Ms. Galvin stated she would like to see another version of this that reflects more representation from users and different institutions, and she cannot sign off on the partnership until she sees another version.

Mr. Jones then read the statement presented in the report related to the recommendation for the RTP and RTA.

Ms. Szakos noted that the RTP would be a precursor to the RTA.

Ms. Galvin **moved** that City Council move forward with creation of a regional transit partnership that could lead to establishment of a Regional Transit Authority, provided with a charter for approval that identifies the membership. Mr. Fenwick **seconded** the motion. On a voice call vote, all voted aye. There were no nays.

Ms. Palmer then **moved** that the Board of Supervisors move forward with the creation of a Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) that could lead to a Regional Transit Authority (RTA) and it would be provided with and approve a charter that establishes the membership. Mr. Dill **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: Mr. Sheffield.

Agenda Item No. 3. Route 29/Hydraulic Planning Update.

Mr. Boyles reported that VDOT has approved the majority of the funding for a small area plan leading up to the transportation element of a preliminary engineering report for the Hydraulic/Route 29 intersection area, with a draft boundary bordering the Route 250 Bypass/Route 29 intersection, the Route 250 Bypass/Hydraulic intersection, running west on Hydraulic and slightly north up Route 29 to Greenbrier. He emphasized that the boundary is subject to change as the advisory board starts to receive input, and VDOT has put together an advisory board of 12 members, including elected officials from the City and County, planning staff directors, community development and planning directors from both localities, a citizen planner from each, an MPO representative, a citizen planner from the environmental community, and several business and property owners from the areas around the intersection area, including the new owners of Stonefield, representatives from Whole Foods and the K-Mart property, and manager of one of the hotels. He noted that they begin meeting March 9, and VDOT has already contracted with two consulting firms, with phase one being land use planning to feed into the transportation element, contracting with Kimley Horn consultants to do that portion of it. Mr. Boyles said that traffic engineering, as part of phase two, would begin during phase one, with traffic consulting performed by Baker International, which will produce a preliminary engineering report and take recommended transportation improvements and get them into a format that can be applied for Smart Scale funding. He stated that currently the timeframe is for September 2018, but there are some discussions that it may move up to June or July 2018, so this will be a very rapid exercise, with Kimley Horn asked to complete their small area planning in six to seven months.

Mr. Boyles reminded the Board and Council that nothing in this process usurps their roles, nor those of the planning commissions, and a plan will be prepared with significant input through the typical processes. He noted that there is nothing that mandates one plan to fit the needs of both the City and County, although that is the hope, and consensus is that if they are in agreement on the transportation elements, it will give them what is needed to apply for long-term funding. Mr. Boyles mentioned that this is the same process that has been going on for three years with Route 29 Solutions, with Philip Shucet hired by VDOT to facilitate, and the panel intends to meet every two weeks, just as the previous panel has done, with meetings taking place until September 2018 or until an application is submitted for funding.

Mr. Sheffield commended Mr. Boyles for moving this forward and getting the necessary funding. Mr. Boyles responded that the MPO feels it is crucial, and it is nice when there is a successful project down the road on which to base it.

Recess. The Board and Council recessed their meeting at 11:22 a.m., and reconvened at 11:40 a.m.

Agenda Item No. 4. Update on Cooperative Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs).

Agenda Item No. 5. Economic Development Discussion.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, addressed the Board and Council and stated that she wants to emphasize that this is the product of a joint work team with both City and County staff members, and the effort had been a positive and energizing opportunity for staff at all levels, as well as internal and external partners across both localities. She commented that it reinforced areas where they are already doing well and also encouraged some innovative and creative partnerships and new

directions. Ms. Catlin said the objective staff is seeking today is to get consensus on the shorter term objectives to be discussed, as well as direction on any of the longer term objectives the group feels should continue to be pursued. She stated that the four areas of collaboration include: redevelopment and affordable housing, education, multimodal transportation, and environment.

Ms. Catlin provided a brief recap of how they got to this point, with the first part of this discussion being drafting and endorsement of the four MOUs themselves, which are presented to the Board and Council and reflect what they wanted to state as their positions on the collaborative efforts. She stated that they had a meeting several months later on the state of the collaboration in the four areas and produced a document that they provided to Board and Council. Ms. Catlin said the document reflects opportunities that they may want to pursue, and both bodies felt that the direction was positive, and they wanted to see specifics related to actions in areas where they have identified opportunities.

Ms. Catlin explained that staff has delineated the information by each MOU, taking them to a higher level of definition and putting them in categories of short and long-term implementation. She stated that she would briefly discuss the short-term items, which are things that are already ongoing or new things that would fall within existing resources or policy direction, which staff recommends they continue to work on within the timeframe provided, unless there is direction from the group that this is not something they should be pursuing. Ms. Catlin stated that under redevelopment and affordable housing, there were three short-time strategies that staff felt were achievable within existing resources and policy direction; under education, there were two categories of pre-K and workforce/career-technical education. She said the education objective calls for work with established partners such as CATEC and PVCC, and the Charlottesville-Albemarle Early Education Task Force, to expand the programs that have already shown some success and have good opportunities in the short term for further expansion.

Ms. Galvin asked about the comment in the report that the County had received a grant to conduct community outreach at Southwood, with completion of initial activities expected in summer of 2017, and asked when the County got the grant and what was entailed, as the timeframe seemed ambitious. Ms. Catlin explained that there was a grant received through efforts by County Housing Director, Ron White, who has pulled together a team looking at working with Habitat for Humanity on an action plan for the County within that timeframe.

Ms. Galvin commented that the City has tried to do a similar effort with its housing authority, so perhaps they could compare notes on that process.

Mr. Bellamy sought confirmation from the County that they could not have public housing sites, and stated that people use Section 8 vouchers for places like Mallside within the urban ring. He asked if they had any autonomy in working with properties to make improvements or expansion in that area. Mr. Kamptner responded that he did not have an answer prepared for that.

Mr. Sheffield said they could provide him with that specific question for further review.

Ms. Palmer commented that she thought it was limited.

Mr. Bellamy stated that he would like to discuss how to create more affordable housing outside of what Habitat for Humanity is doing in Southwood, whether it is creating new development or increasing density, as he looks at the urban ring as potential for additional sites. Ms. Catlin responded that Mr. Mike Murphy would address that momentarily, as it is a topic they have discussed numerous times in the past.

Ms. Palmer noted that the County's Planning Commission has recently been looking into ways they can suggest some additional work on the County's part to make that happen.

Ms. Catlin stated that the strategies are outlined for education, including expansion of CATEC's offerings and working on pre-K, with some very successful initiatives already underway to expand and better coordinate within existing resources. She said that with transportation, they heard about the small area plan, and the TJPDC is also spearheading the bicycle and pedestrian plan that includes a short-term outcome they can work on. She stated that the environmental category has a number of short-term implementation objectives with no significant resource or policy changes, pertaining to solid waste, Rivanna River conservation, watershed compliance, the local climate action planning process, green infrastructure planning, and these are areas in which their staffs are already working closely together, but they are seeking ways to expand the partnership and regional programs.

Ms. Szakos said there have been rumblings at the federal level about the EPA and regulations that may disappear over the next four years, and asked if there are people on staff and on local bodies to act as if they are still there, as citizens still expect them to be green even if the federal government does not provide award for them. Ms. Catlin responded that it is obviously a changing landscape, but the assumption locally is to proceed with the direction of elected bodies until and unless that changes.

Ms. Mallek commented that their most successful approaches have been making changes locally to protect air and water here, and all of those things together make it better somewhere else.

Ms. Galvin stated that she and Mr. Dill have been working with staff to get a "Sol Smart" designation locally, and the effort receives money from the EPA with technical assistance from the Department of Energy. She said the goal is to make communities more invested in a renewable energy economy, and Charlottesville/Albemarle is the only combined jurisdiction, with all others being cities only.

Mr. Dill noted that they are doing this now, with staff looking at the soft costs for installation of solar equipment so there are regulations that can be tailored to make it much easier to install solar power. He said the cost of panels has decreased dramatically, and it is more expensive to hire someone to get permissions than to get the hardware.

Ms. Catlin stated that all of the short-term items identified in the matrix presented are those for which staff will proceed, unless there is direction from Board and Council otherwise.

Mr. Mike Murphy addressed the Board and Council, stating that staff feels the longer-term items need more time, money, or policy decisions from them, and possibly even legislation. Mr. Murphy said that under the housing item, the federal government has decided that there will be no new housing sites, and the City did discuss a regional agreement for Housing Choice vouchers. He stated that the City and County both did appropriations for vouchers and have discussed in the past the merits of combining into one organization, but staff has identified some risk in that when looking at other policies and programs. Mr. Murphy said that HUD may reevaluate its funding by assuming that "one plus one does not equal two, but one and a half," and the City and County do not want to lose any money for vouchers. He emphasized that this does not stop the localities from creating an entity or consortium that manages the vouchers, and HUD allocates 400-500 vouchers for localities, but because of rental costs in the area, fewer are appropriated out to clients in the community. Mr. Murphy said the County is looking at different ways to manage its housing office, and the City does not directly manage the Housing and Redevelopment Authority.

Mr. Randolph commented that having a partnership that synergizes policies and procedures to foster as much compatibility between the two will facilitate people's understanding of the vouchers and provide seamlessness between the communities. He stated this would encourage a system that is as transparent and easy to understand as possible. Mr. Murphy responded that part of staff's objective in this discussion is to identify efficiency in terms of having one set of staff that performs tasks, such as looking at units and requalifying people for Section 8, and most people who access services do not know where the line is between the City and the County. He added that other than project-based vouchers, someone in the City can use a voucher in the County, and vice-versa. Mr. Murphy said they have talked to staff about the idea of projects that can happen, and what facilitates that in the City is the affordable housing fund and housing advisory committee, which is not a line item in the County budget at this time. He noted that in its budget discussions, the City has contemplated doubling its fund, and staff believes the best way to approach this over time is to identify projects that can be worked on together, similar to projects like the Crossings or other affordable housing that elected bodies designate ahead of time, targeting low to median-income families. He said that currently this is just a suggestion from staff. Mr. Murphy commented that as they administer the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) process, it has sometimes made sense to ask organizations to come together and make joint application when they ask for City and County money, to look for services where there are gaps and overlap, to encourage collaboration, coordination, and communication among those agencies.

Mr. Murphy stated that with the education MOU, the City Council and City School Board have had a presentation from the Early Education Task Force, and the County is in the process of scheduling that on the Board's agenda. He said the task force exists for the purpose of the mission identified by the United Way to ensure every four-year-old in the community can access pre-K classes, and fiscal mapping also shows that over time, they would also want to decide as a group whether to look at the 0-3 age group, although the group has not yet endorsed that mission yet, and there are some issues identified, such as home visiting. Mr. Murphy said the fiscal mapping shows that the City and County are extremely generous with home visiting with local funding as it compares with other localities, but there is still an identified need for hundreds of families who might benefit from that service.

Ms. Galvin asked how that relates to family support services that relate to preschool programs, as there are a lot more of those in the County than in the City. Mr. Murphy explained that family support services is an initiative dating from many years ago that has been funded through a designated pot of money then was rolled into the Department of Social Services in the general government funds. He said that home visiting services are things that happen through Ready Kids or Jefferson Area CHIP and originally when ARC of the Piedmont was created, a nursing professional connects the family to a variety of resources for things like parenting skills. Mr. Murphy noted that there are no slots for 3-year-olds in Albemarle, as it is four years and up. He said there have been several media pieces related to collaboration in this sector as a result of the task force, with MACAA and Head Start, and the City and County school programs have come together and changed their application to a common application. He stated that a possible next step is one point of entry whereby people come to one place and are funneled to the appropriate agency, but it will not be pursued until there has been one year of the common application. Mr. Murphy said the outcome collaborative is exciting work that is a decade in the making, with a variety of partners in the sector, where there is now broad agreement and legal permissions to study the outcomes of children from home visiting through graduation, which would require consent along the way from the participating families. He stated that they will be tracking the outcomes of the current pre-K population and adding a year over time, so over the next decade there will be 10 different cohorts of information. Mr. Murphy mentioned that there have been people who have expressed interest in being part of the data measurement, and while the process is not ready to be opened up to all the interests yet, it is something that has the potential to become a community dashboard over time.

Ms. Palmer asked for clarification of who started the pre-K effort. Mr. Murphy responded that United Way is one partner who started it and has staff assigned to the effort, but the entire initiative requires the partnership of home visiting, schools, and social services in both localities. He confirmed that the funding is provided through agreement of all parties. Mr. Murphy stated that they discussed other

initiatives when they met in City Space, and PVCC has interest in doing more with the Kids College model, which staff sees as having some promise. He said there are some transportation issues as PVCC ran out of funding to implement the model, and they have asked about applying for funding from localities.

Mr. Randolph asked if there has been any discussion of telecommute education, as transportation remains a challenge, with logistics and cost to families being barriers to access, but computers at places like Southwood and Friendship Court could connect residents with the classrooms at PVCC without the barrier of transportation.

Mr. Bellamy noted that without internet, they cannot get that access. He stated that the discipline required to do work online can also be a barrier, and even scholars with high level degrees cannot discipline themselves to do online work.

Ms. Szakos commented that they also miss out on the community aspects of classrooms.

Mr. Bellamy agreed that some need to be around other people for support or assistance, and while he thinks telecommuting is a good idea, they need to be aware of barriers.

Ms. Szakos noted that PVCC already does a lot of online classes.

Ms. Catlin stated that with Kids College and Piedmont Futures, there is a real value to the synergy of bringing kids together with mentors and career directions, and soft skills that may not translate as well with telecommute learning situations.

Mr. Murphy stated that this is initially a summer program piloted to see if it could be an after school program, stemming from the City and County schools' vision for expanding Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math (STEAM) learning. He said there is a Growing Opportunity report that reflects collaboration among many City departments, and the County has expressed interest in having some GO training programs, with City economic development staff having the ability to expand it if there was funding available.

Ms. Galvin emphasized that they need to coordinate this with transportation, as that was identified with the Growing Opportunity report, to maximize usage of the program.

Mr. Bellamy said it is important to work on the RTP, it is about people and the City and County need to focus on expansion of things like the GO program, as it could have a positive effect on a lot of constituents.

Mr. Signer asked if they would direct their respective executives to move forward with the short-term objectives, as they would not be able to discuss several recommendations.

Ms. Szakos suggested that they identify any red flags, in terms of items they may not support. Ms. Mallek responded that the best approach would be for each body to discuss what they are willing to support in terms of long-term items, assuming there would be policy change, staff time and funding.

Ms. Szakos said that with the short term items, the best approach may be to identify those they do not want to move forward on, with the long-term items handled separately.

Ms. McKeel noted that they would not have time to get into all of the long-term items, but she feels that Mr. Sheffield has a good point in terms of the Growing Opportunity program.

Mr. Sheffield clarified that he would like to know the budgetary impact so the Board has those numbers during its budget process, and he does not mind building on the City's success.

Mr. Randolph commented that one group not recognized in the education discussion is the faith-based community, as there are national models of incorporating that sector in helping with preschool education and encouraging fathers to be more involved with their children. He added that some of those partners are ready to be asked and be involved.

Ms. Szakos noted that this would be in addition to the ABRT process.

Mr. Bill Letteri, Deputy County Executive, stated that since they had already discussed transportation in detail, they would now discuss the environmental MOU.

Mr. Bellamy asked if they had ever moved forward with a County representative on the CAT Advisory Board. Ms. McKeel responded that it had not happened yet but it may need to be part of the discussion, and she noted that the bylaws would need to be changed.

Mr. Letteri reported that there was a robust effort in 2013 focusing on various businesses, sustainability issues, transportation reduction strategies, and cost-saving ideas through the "Better Business Challenge." He stated that there were approximately 80 businesses involved, and the effort was a partnership with the County, the City, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Darden Graduate School of Business. Mr. Letteri noted that there were four award winners that came out of the 2014 competition, which is a communications and awareness program and effort to get businesses energized, and perhaps the County and City environmental groups could work together on future efforts. He reported that green infrastructure planning pertains to green space and open space, parks, greenways, and trail systems, and

how respective staffs can work together on identifying those resources, how they might be connected, and how those assets might be leveraged. He said that one thought would be to do a regional needs assessment that looks at the assets and what the community is looking for in terms of venues.

Mr. Letteri reported that the third area of environmental focus is the Rivanna River Basin Commission (RRBC), which is state sanctioned and has served as an advisory group to both the County and City, as well as Greene and Orange counties, but there needs to be some clarity and direction given to this group in terms of future focus. He stated that the Rivanna River Corridor Plan has been worked through with the TJPDC, which has chaired the discussions, and the two planning commissions have come up with a four-stage plan that will be brought forth to the Board and Council, and will likely define the subsequent phases of the program.

Ms. Mallek noted that the RRBC has been doing the work that was assigned to the Renaissance Commission, so those do not need to be separate items. She stated that the inter-jurisdictional effort is already established by the state, and the smaller communities all funded the budget last year, but the City and County did not. Ms. Mallek emphasized that if they want to see things happen, they need to get the funding established, and staff support is available through the TJPDC and other partners.

Mr. Letteri indicated that the staff presentations had concluded.

Mr. Signer stated that there is more discussion to have on economic development, but the other items could move forward to process and staff direction.

Ms. Szakos said they have already tasked their respective staffs through the MOUs to talk to each other and come up with recommendations.

Mr. Signer responded that each body could have its own work session to further explore the costs and decision points of the items.

Ms. Szakos said if there are snags or concerns over particulars, they can flag them for further discussion.

Ms. McKeel noted that both Board and Council would take the long-term items back and review them, then come back.

Mr. Signer added that staff could reconcile them.

Ms. McKeel stated that the County would be getting more information on the GO program as part of its budget presentation, and budgetary implications for participation.

Ms. Szakos said they could offer a per-person cost for joining the City's program.

Mr. Bellamy said he would not want them to kick the can down the road for these items, so timelines are important to him.

Ms. Galvin responded that if this would be tied to budget decisions for this fiscal year, that would provide a really good framework.

Mr. Signer asked if they would be scheduling another meeting in the next six months.

Ms. Palmer commented that they should just plan on a meeting every six months.

Ms. Galvin said that it would help her to get the materials at least a week in advance, as it is too much material to cover in one night.

Ms. Mallek stated that in a few months, the Board should be able to report back on what they can support or not support on the list.

Ms. Palmer said they could not say when a work session would fit into their agenda.

Mr. Signer responded that the City would hold one in the next two months. He stated that there are a lot of issues to discuss pertaining to economic development, and suggested they task the PACC with working on this, as UVA has a lot of interest in economic development and that committee is already a joint Council/Board body with significant involvement from the University.

Ms. Szakos said her concern with UVA is that they are coming at it from an intellectual position, rather than an organization with constituents, although they are a strong resource.

Mr. Jones stated that he disagrees, because almost all UVA employees live in the County or City, so they are participants in the local economy and comprise the largest employer.

Ms. Szakos said they are the largest regional employer, but are also driving wages down, which is an economic crisis.

Ms. Palmer stated that this is a great place to have a general conversation about collaboration, but with respect to policy, she agrees with Ms. Szakos.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that the PACC was created for communication, not for policy making.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would be interested in what they are doing together, and she would like to see a closer partnership between the City and County economic development offices. She said the MOU format talks about what they are doing together, so perhaps they could start with that and build on it.

Mr. Signer said they used a group of two on two to establish the other MOUs, then circulated them among colleagues, but the question is whether they wait six months to do something on economic development. He asked if there was consensus among Councilors to set forth on an economic development path.

Councilors agreed, but Mr. Fenwick abstained.

Mr. Signer established that there were four Councilors in agreement.

Board of Supervisors members reached consensus on moving forward with an economic development MOU draft.

Agenda Item No. 6. Adjourn.

At 12:37 p.m., Ms. Palmer **moved** that the Board adjourn to February 17, 2017 at 12:00 p.m. in Room 241 of the County Office Building. 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.

At 12:37 p.m., City Council adjourned its meeting.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 07/12/2017
Initials CKB