

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on September 7, 2018, at 10:00 a.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from September 5, 2018.

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

ABSENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeff Richardson, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 10:07 a.m., by the Chair, Ms. Mallek.

Ms. Mallek introduced the presiding Security Officer, Officer Dominick Zambrotta, and County staff at the dais.

Agenda Item No. 2. Accomplishments of FY17-19 Strategic Plan:

Presentation

Mr. Richardson stated that this would be his first opportunity as County Executive to participate in a highly interactive process and one the Board felt positioned them for a good upcoming budget. He said that staff was very excited about the accomplishments and progress made, noting that Ms. Kristy Shifflett would be providing highlights and asking for Board input. He stated that this exercise serves to promote the community's future, particularly in terms of economic vitality and quality of life. Mr. Richardson said the Board and staff would be looking to establish priorities toward refining the Strategic Plan.

Ms. Kristy Shifflett, Director, Project Management Office, stated that staff would start by addressing accomplishments and progress made so they can move into those priorities that may need an update. Staff is requesting input on those items as well as those in the further development category of the Strategic Plan. She noted that those have been receiving some interest and may need to be elevated to a higher level. She said they would break for lunch then go over some organizational initiatives, then dive into emerging initiatives – with opportunity for Board feedback and prioritization.

Ms. Shifflett said she would begin by celebrating their progress by first reviewing the accomplishments thus far on the 2017-19 Strategic Plan. The Board received a progress report last week, which lays out every objective of what has been accomplished. She stated that she would highlight the larger initiatives as they do not have time to review everything done.

Ms. Shifflett said she would start with the County's vision of abundant natural rural, historic, and scenic resources; healthy ecosystems; active, vibrant development areas; a physical environment that supports healthy lifestyles; a thriving economy; and exceptional educational opportunity. She stated that the County's values are integrity, innovation, stewardship, and learning. Ms. Shifflett stated that some of the biggest accomplishments and areas of concentration are: Phase I of the Rio/29 Small Area Plan, underway with innovative economic development partnerships, NIFI projects to meet neighborhood-level needs, Woodbrook School expansion, adoption of the Natural Resource Plan, formation of the Habitat for Humanity partnership for the Southwood community, mapping of storm water infrastructure, launching of a Regional Transit Partnership (RTP), improvement on the focus of aesthetics of high visibility urban spaces, transportation revenue-sharing funding of urban priorities.

Ms. Shifflett thanked the elected and appointed officials, staff, partners and the people and businesses of Albemarle County that all took part in accomplishing this progress.

Board Input

Ms. Shifflett asked Board members to share the items that made them the proudest as they reviewed the progress report.

Mr. Gallaway stated that a lot of the credit went to other Board members and what they worked on. As a community member before joining the Board, he was impressed by the work and diligence put into the Strategic Plan. He said that as an avid supporter of public education, he knows they are providing spaces that are in line with the School Division's goals for spaces, as well as just the capacity issues. He said that it was important to provide an educational experience in a way that is more meaningful for children as they leave the system.

Ms. Palmer stated that she is very happy with the work that has gone into redoing the Comprehensive Plan, which is nearing the time to be redone again, and the Ivy MUC transfer station, which opens in a few weeks.

Ms. Mallek commented that all of the initiatives are tied together, and many people stepped out of their customary roles to work on various aspects of the Plan. She emphasized that the County had made big steps in doing things differently to get a different result than just doing the same thing, which was a

real change of operation. Ms. Mallek also said that one of the challenges was that a lot of the information was new, and the Board had to really step up and approach this in different ways – making sure not to exclude things that other counties had done but Albemarle had not. She added that she was also looking forward to catching up on parks investments in the upcoming budget year.

Ms. McKeel stated that she was supportive of the schools and relooking at how County children are educated. She said she was also very appreciative of the work that happened around the development areas, specifically the older neighborhoods in the urban ring. She stated that the Board's focus in the County has been the rural areas, but if it wants to protect those areas, it needs to make the development areas be places people want to live. Ms. McKeel said that she was thrilled with the work the Board is doing on the environment, looking at resiliency and climate change. She stated that the Board has a lot on its plate and staff is very challenged, with priorities as to how that work flows being very important. Ms. McKeel commented that staff's work has been outstanding and stellar, and in looking at the report it indicates hard work.

Mr. Randolph stated that he would like to talk about some things that are fairly appealing but that are not included here. He agrees with Ms. Mallek that these items integrate into a composite of work being done. He said that he was pleased that the County opened up its first solar farm in the last year, which was a significant step in bringing Albemarle into the new energy economy. Mr. Randolph stated that the Board needs to credit itself for the commitment to create the broadband authority, which was an important first step for the County and allowed it to become a player with other counties that had already established their own broadband authorities – in some cases with more powers residual to those authorities than what was currently granted to the authority.

Mr. Randolph said that during the last two years, he was pleased with Parks and Rec having done its needs assessment and adding the two new parks: Hedgerow and Biscuit Run, with others in the wings that have not yet been officially announced. Mr. Randolph stated that as the County grows, it has to think about school capacity but also recreation capacity because it becomes more expensive per acre to own property with increasing land costs in Albemarle. He said that this allows the County to provide more open space for people to be able to recreate and enjoy.

Mr. Randolph stated that the less appealing things that do not show up on most people's list are Zoning Ordinance improvements, for which he credits the County Attorney's Office and Community Development. He said the public does not really see that, but it is truly a significant step forward. Mr. Randolph added that at the previous night's Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commissions (TJPDC) meeting, another county's supervisor mentioned that they were operating on a comprehensive plan dating from 2004. He said that TJPDC Executive Director, Mr. Chip Boyles, said that if they were challenged in court and there was no evidence of the county having reviewed that plan and the pursuant codes, they would have great difficulty defending themselves.

Mr. Randolph said that Albemarle is constantly going through its Zoning Ordinance, which is not appealing stuff but is good government practice. He stated that as mentioned in the news earlier in the day, the City of Charlottesville is discussing whether it can raise its existing debt capacity of \$80 million and entertain a \$50 million bond for affordable housing. Mr. Randolph stated that the Supervisors tend not to recognize and appreciate the amount of time it puts in as a Board and staff to ensure the sound execution of the County's fiscal management – with reporting to the public in a clear manner, which Ms. Lori Allshouse handles exceptionally. He said that the Finance Department and the fiscal management side of the County Executive's Office are critical to maintaining effective, sound, fiscally prudent government and giving the taxpayers the kind of government they want and expect.

Mr. Randolph also recognizes the dedication of police and fire professional personnel and volunteer personnel, as well as the Sheriff's Department. He is mindful of that having recently met with all three of the volunteer fire companies in his district. He emphasized that the Board will need to do more in the coming year as a county to ensure the viability of the volunteer companies, which requires the dedication of volunteers every night and every weekend to work on behalf of the County. Mr. Randolph stated that these people are a strategic asset and priority and should not be taken for granted.

Ms. McKeel stated that there is general agreement on all of the Board statements, they just articulate them in different ways.

Mr. Gallaway stated that he also wants to recognize former Supervisor, Mr. Brad Sheffield, in terms of his planning ability and way of accomplishing tasks.

Mr. Randolph said that four years seems like a long period of time, but it goes by quickly and the challenge is how to be effective in those four years in the best interest of the County.

Ms. Mallek stated that the Supervisors should champion change and hold on to the things they do not want to change.

Mr. Richardson thanked the Board for taking time to share what they are proudest of, adding that it has always been a challenge to carve time out to celebrate success. He noted that earlier in the week, the County had held a luncheon for departments to celebrate success on the opening of Woodbrook Elementary School, which is located in Mr. Gallaway's district. Mr. Richardson reiterated that they do not take enough time to celebrate success, and he appreciated the recognition the Board gave to staff.

Agenda Item No. 3. Priorities Needing Update from FY17-19 Strategic Plan:

Rio/29

Ms. Shifflett stated that staff would now review the highest priorities of the Strategic Plan, discuss where they need to move forward and why these priorities should carry over to the updated Strategic Plan. She said that the Board also received a proposed priority summarization; staff will also review that list throughout the rest of the meeting. Ms. Shifflett stated that Ms. Rachel Falkenstein would review the Rio/29 intersection area plans.

Ms. Falkenstein, Principal Planner, Community Development Department, reported that the Board's first priority from the FY17-19 plan was the Rio/20 redevelopment of the intersection area. Staff is proposing to carry forward three strategies from the FY 17-19 plan, with updated language and timeline. Staff has scheduled a Board work session on September 12 to discuss the possible Comp Plan amendment for the Rio/29 Small Area Plan. The Board had called for the adoption of a draft vision, which staff feels is on track for completion by the end of 2018. Ms. Falkenstein said that following that work, staff will move into a draft ordinance and potential form-based code. Staff needs to do some work with the Board to determine the format of that ordinance. She noted that staff estimates this process to take about a year, to allow time for engagement with the Board, stakeholders, and the community to get that code drafted. Ms. Falkenstein said that following that would be leveraging of public investment and developing policies and incentives to attract private capital, and that work will largely be led by the Economic Development Office.

Ms. Falkenstein presented an updated timeline with the items in sequential order, with the first two – service districts and vision – to be completed with the FY 17-19 plan, and moving forward with the 2022 plan would be zoning, investment, policy, and incentives.

Mr. Randolph asked if Community Development has had the opportunity to look at some best management practices and develop templates in looking at other localities as to where they have done a similar kind of urban renovation on a major corridor, with an eye to pitfalls and opportunities. Ms. Falkenstein stated that staff has done some field trips, visiting Columbia Pike in Arlington and roads in Henrico County. She said they have a framework built out as to what they would recommend, but have not had the opportunity to have that conversation with the Board because they wanted to have the vision and Comp Plan first.

Mr. Randolph commented that he assumes staff is looking out on the western side, where the trolley was to go. Ms. Falkenstein confirmed that is correct.

Ms. Mallek stated that she was in Arlington the day before and ended up at Merrifield, which emerged out of an old shopping center but was beautifully done with narrow streets – and the Downtown Crozet District is ready to be used in this way. Ms. Falkenstein concurred, stating that Crozet is a template to use here.

Revitalize Aging Urban Neighborhoods

Ms. Shifflett stated that there are many objectives under the category of Revitalizing Urban Neighborhoods, and staff has highlighted three that it wants to do more work on. She said that the first objective, "implement improvement actions developed from neighborhood inventory data to address neighborhood-level needs," and Ms. Siri Russell will discuss that with the Board.

Ms. Siri Russell, Management/Policy Analyst, addressed the Board, stating that this has been a team effort. Staff from Community Development, Facilities and Environmental Services, and Parks and Recreation have been very active with this project. She said that she would provide a high level overview of Phase 1 of the pilot project, then staff will be coming to the Board at a future meeting to provide a full report out of the activities taken place so far. Ms. Russell stated that this project was implemented to accomplish two Strategic Plan objectives: 1) to increase support for planning efforts and improvement actions to address neighborhood-level needs; and 2) to increase efforts to improve deteriorating physical conditions in the County's aging urban core areas.

Ms. Russell said that staff began its process by doing a mapped analysis of broader level calls for service from VDOT, Emergency Communications Center, and by looking at zoning and foreclosures. Staff determined that it was not getting down to the neighborhood level that the Strategic Plan called for, so it contracted with TJPDC to do an on-the-ground walkthrough of the areas. She said the Board appropriated funding for that endeavor in fall of 2017, and in the spring of 2018, they began the work. Ms. Russell stated they recently completed it and hope to proceed with Phase 2 in Spring of 2019.

Ms. Russell stated that the Phase 1 pilot took place in the area of Barracks and Ivy Road by beginning near Hydraulic Road on the side at Solomon Court and Angus Road. She referenced a larger map provided for the Board. She said that the data collected was condition information related to street lights, signage, bike and pedestrian facilities, curb and gutter, transit stops, street trees – and parks and rec type amenities like pocket parks, benches, public spaces, swimming pools, etc. Ms. Russell stated that the purpose of the work and what was explained in 2017 was that there were three applications staff was hoping to use this for: master planning, specifically 5th and Avon for the scoping of current conditions and establishing a baseline for public works strategies. She said that this would also allow staff to leverage the data to support Community Development Block Grant applications.

Ms. Russell reported on next steps, stating that staff would look at data collection and recalibrate it, for which they hope to get engagement from the Board – which may include engaging each Supervisor to get their feedback on thoughts for things that might be of particular import, then launching Phase 2.

Mr. Randolph commented that people might want to ask the question how this work in Phase 1 of the pilot Neighborhood 7 is different from a small area plan corridor study. There are attributes that look like this type of study, but there is a housing component that usually is not part of that. He asked if putting housing in would involve potential zoning changes, code restrictions, etc., to minimize blight and ensure the community would be able to regenerate and become vibrant in terms of appearance and community life. Ms. Russell responded that staff viewed data collection as a planning tool, not with a plan to change zoning, and the housing component was a pilot as part of the recalibration. She stated that they already have data from the County assessor that was checked against this collected data. Ms. Russell added that she does not know how it relates to a small area plan.

Mr. Andrew Gast-Bray, Director of Planning, stated that understanding where they are today is a difficult challenge. It takes a lot of time and resources to understand everything in its context, and this particular work is the raw material from which they would draw to do small area planning – so as to understand where they have to start to better understand where they would like to go, given what is on the ground and the identifying needs for an area. He stated that this is not a clear-cut boundary between where one ended and one began, but it is a great opportunity to understand better where they stood at this point.

Mr. Randolph stated that there will be a Phase 2 launch that seems to get into a small area plan, and where that actually happens is in the planning process and goals and objectives for regeneration. Ms. Russell said that Phase 2 would be a different location. When staff initially put this forth to the Board, the idea was to start off with one section and do the rest of the development area over time.

Mr. Randolph stated that he is trying to allow the Board and public to understand what the iterations are, where it is heading, and where the end goal is in terms of the impact on the community.

Ms. Palmer asked how staff is going to decide which areas to do first, how large those areas are, etc. Ms. Russell responded that the first area was chosen because it had a mixed area. The area was close to the commercial area and had dense residential, but also had single family mixes of income. She stated that going into Phase 2, staff looked at opportunity zone areas as areas where they would be able to use this information to leverage and that could inform some of the work happening, so that would be an ongoing conversation. Ms. Russell said that when staff comes back, it would be with a recommendation as to where those areas would be.

Ms. Palmer stated that the County has a lot of areas that needed attention, but she wants to mention the Sunset Road and Old Lynchburg Road extensions in particular, which has a lot of affordable housing, a lot of mixed use, and very underdeveloped road systems that were quite dangerous. She said that they do not know yet what it will look like, but it is a concern. Ms. Russell responded that because it includes the opportunity zone area two, staff is thinking along the same lines.

Ms. McKeel said that the area they are discussing that was just completed was a pilot to try to figure out exactly what it would look like and what needs to be documented. The area chosen as a pilot had the highest percentage of 911 and fire/rescue calls, so it seems to be a good place to start as a “hot zone.” She noted that it included some of the oldest infrastructure in the County. Ms. McKeel added that she was not involved up front and this is a pilot. At a recent meeting, staff showed her the results and what was culled from the pilot. She said that one of the suggestions made was the work was great, the pilot was good, and she suggested things in other neighborhoods that staff should be looking at going forward.

Ms. McKeel noted that one of her suggestions was that staff should meet with each Board member before going into their districts, so that they have a sense of the concerns for that particular area. She added that she would like to have input up front and at the back end. She mentioned that she was very impressed with the work staff did up to this point, and it aligned with her understanding of the area too, adding that her district is the smallest and highest density district. Ms. McKeel reiterated that the pilot will be informative for everyone and is a good way to get the data around the districts.

Ms. Mallek stated that before they started this, there was a discussion a year and a half ago about a maintenance code. She noted that staff was addressing the public infrastructure side – which made perfect sense and was essential – but at some point she would like to know where the maintenance code development stands. Ms. Mallek said they also addressed blight, but it did not have enough teeth to bring about behavior change on the part of landowners who abandoned their property but lived somewhere else and did not pay attention.

She said that the second issue is that she wanted to use the NIFI model in the master plan areas and how people wanted to jump in and participate. Once the pilot technique is perfected a bit more, she asked that staff consider the option of enlisting the master plan neighborhood residents, Boy Scouts, etc. to help gather the information. Ms. Mallek commented that they would be thrilled to do it because they know even more about what is going on than the County did. She said that ideally, they could have preloaded iPads etc., and they would be thrilled to be involved.

Ms. Mallek stated that in trying to determine where to focus, she suggested looking at any place in the growth area that has an older neighborhood, such as the Hilltop Park Tabor, which has housing built by the Barnes family for their workers. She said that through that neighborhood, with 12-foot-wide roads and no sidewalks, there were 4,300 dwelling units – and the only way out is Park Tabor, with no amenities, and it has destroyed the life of the people who have lived there. Ms. Mallek emphasized that rather than going district by district, maybe staff could find a way to do it in which they got to the real hot spots faster, as they did with Jack Jouett. She said that the previous thought with Board members was that the developers would pay for all of that with their rezonings, but the recession stunted that process and it was not the right approach anyway. Ms. Mallek said she hopes they will come back to that when they go to the next step. Ms. Shifflett responded that Ms. Russell would be bringing this information to the Board in the winter, and they will have an opportunity to dig in even more.

Ms. Shifflett said that the next topic is the County's transportation initiative: apply the County's transportation project prioritization process to plan, identify funding, and implement bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure improvements within and serving aging urban neighborhoods.

Mr. Kevin McDermott, Transportation Planner, stated that in the previous Strategic Plan, there were a lot of different objectives related to transportation, and this combines a lot of those into one specific objective with a few strategies. He thanked the Project Management Division for the work it did on Hydraulic Road with the brand new sidewalks; he also presented photos of before and after that project. Mr. McDermott said the strategies he was considering for this included submitting projects for state and federal grants, leveraging requests with transportation funds from the County's CIP. He stated that the other strategy is to work through the Regional Transportation Partnership to implement the transit service improvements, which can be through the transit development plan currently underway to adjust the routing system to serve the neighborhoods better, as well as the partnership that has developed that has allowed the County to develop the stops, put in amenities, and make them more inviting for citizens.

Mr. McDermott stated that he has a process for the Board to consider, which is mostly related to the grants piece. He said that in the spring of 2019, he will come back to the Board with another prioritization list for all transportation projects, which the Board had approved two years earlier. He noted that this is a two-year cycle, as that is the cycle they consider to leverage funds against state and federal funds. Mr. McDermott stated that in the summer, after the Board approves the priority list, the County will select projects to submit for revenue-sharing and transportation alternatives grants, which are due in the fall. He said that in the winter, they will look at the next Smart Scale process; in the spring, they will find out which grants are successful and how they can move forward, as well as making final selections on new Smart Scale grants. Mr. McDermott added that in the summer, the funded revenue-sharing and transportation alternatives projects start design. He said that in the fall, they submit for Smart Scale grants; in winter, they come back to updating the transportation priority list – and in spring of 2021, the process would start over.

Ms. McKeel stated that when she met with the staff and they talked about projects from the pilot, they often found that the projects intersected with local transportation as well as VDOT's work. Mr. McDermott responded that the outside planning processes are also going on at the same time as this, and those processes would feed into the County's prioritization process. He noted that it happened with the small area plan, Southwood, and other housing – and those processes feed into this and the County's master planning process.

Ms. McKeel commented that at the meeting, she had wished that someone from VDOT as well as the County's transportation department would have been present to hear that discussion.

Ms. Mallek stated that for the first time, Albemarle had a private investor provide the money for a local match for state and federal grant projects, and other counties do this all the time so it is an opportunity Albemarle is missing.

Ms. Shifflett said that continuing under revitalized aging urban neighborhoods, all of these projects were interwoven. Ms. Megan Nedostup is present to talk about Southwood and the Habitat for Humanity partnership.

Ms. Nedostup, Principal Planner, stated that staff wants to get some feedback and input on the staff resources as they continue the partnership with Habitat, moving forward to 2022. She said that with this objective, they would continue the teams created during the action plan the Board endorsed, at the same level of service providing to date, throughout the buildout of Phase 1. Ms. Nedostup noted that the County has dedicated staff assisting Habitat on the rezoning and other aspects of the redevelopment, and additional staff will be required throughout the buildout of Phase 1. She presented a timeline looking forward, adjusting with the rezoning process, with the milestones following the action plan that was adopted earlier in the year. She stated that the Phase 1 buildout and rezoning is anticipated for the first quarter of 2019, with site plan and subdivision approval for the first village, which would be in Block A, anticipated to start in 2020 and completed in 2021. Ms. Nedostup stated that the whole first phase, which includes Block A and Block B, is anticipated for 2024. She said that within the time period to 2022, the County will be working with Habitat determination on Phase 2, to begin work and submittal in 2020 for that rezoning.

Mr. Randolph stated that before the Board would be prepared to look at Phase 2 and any involvement of the County in that phase, it would be helpful to have some indication of the amount of staff time, per month, that has been devoted to this project. He said he also wants to see the County's return on investment. He thanked staff for their dedication, commitment, and effort invested in working on the

County's behalf to bring the project to fruition – which means being able to be passed by the Planning Commission and the Board.

Ms. Shifflett said that staff recognizes that there is still another eight months for the FY19 fiscal year, but in looking forward to 2022, they will be asking questions like this to make sure they align resources appropriately. She stated that they will be coming back to the Board about the Southwood project many times, but at this point they want to get feedback from the Board on the Phase 1 initiative in terms of its goals for the project.

Mr. Randolph stated that it may also be helpful to project ahead and what the estimation is for hours needed, with the Board to discuss that in terms of highest and best uses.

Ms. Mallek said that this is an example of doing something different to get a different result, stating that over 11 years, they had 6 units built at Avon Park – and the Southwood project with non-displacement for 380 units is astounding. She acknowledged the stress that accompanies guinea pig projects, but said this is a “no failure” option and they need to make sure they were doing the very best job possible every step of the way – but she has no intention of giving an ultimatum. She added that in terms of five years ahead, the Board does not have the information yet to make a decision.

Courts

Ms. Nedostup stated that the General District Court and Circuit Court expansion and upgrade would be reviewed by Mr. Trevor Henry.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Assistant County Executive, acknowledged Ms. Shifflett's work, stating that she has done a tremendous job in pulling County resources together, and he thanked the Board for focusing on the big picture items along with their everyday tasks. Mr. Henry said this was an important initiative in their FY 17 -19 Plan. They spent much of 2017 looking at the development services advisor and looking at different options. He stated that the four meetings in December 2017 alone is probably still very vivid in the Board's mind, and direction to staff to proceed with negotiation came out of that meeting – with work done by the County and City through much of this year. He said this is an important initiative to carry forward into the next phase, and assuming direction is provided in the Fall, staff will proceed with a proposal for design services. Mr. Henry stated that this will be about a five-year effort, and staff is proposing to push this forward as an important initiative for the County.

Ms. Mallek said that if the Board chooses to go forward with the courts downtown, they have conceptual plans so they are that much further along, and there is a lot of work that has gone into that.

Mr. Henry stated that they are starting from a good conceptual point, and there is a lot of work to get them from that point to implementation.

Agenda Item No. 4. Priorities from Further Development:

Broadband

Ms. Shifflett stated that they now will discuss the priorities from further development, noting that there are objectives in the Plan that are important but do not rise to the level of the highest priorities. She said that those brought forward today either took a larger role in planning efforts or rose to a higher level because of the Board and/or community's interest in moving these projects ahead, so staff will review each one with them.

Mr. Mike Culp, Director of Information Technology and Vice-Chair of the Albemarle Broadband Authority, stated that broadband has been an ongoing initiative for the County, beginning in 2014 and progressing significantly since. He stated that their objective is to establish and implement strategic direction to expand broadband, and they have been doing that. Mr. Culp presented a slide showing that progress, stating that Comcast announced that they are complete with their Greenwood project and has brought broadband to that community. He said that there is a lot more work to be done in that area, and further south is still a major gap that will require a significant project. Mr. Culp added that the further they get behind, the further the community gets behind in terms of generating economic development, quality of life. He stated that there are three other projects, which are smaller in scale but were completed in 2017. The staff is proud of the work that was done with the provider and is very appreciative at the state level – and DHCD has been very agreeable to the County's applications.

Mr. Culp thanked the Board for moving forward with the Albemarle Broadband Authority, stating that they have been meeting regularly and have lots of public interaction. He also thanked the Board for the \$200,000 toward implementation.

Mr. Culp stated that the County is currently working with the Central Virginia Electric Coop and will be providing a recommendation to the Board regarding their request for support, which came in about a month earlier. He said that the other activity between now and December 15 is submitting a Virginia Telecommunications Initiative (VATI) grant, which started at \$1.5 million but is now at \$4 million per year – which is what Albemarle would apply for. He stated that the Authority still has a goal to complete by spring of 2019 a project based on the \$200,000 fiscal agreement. They are working to try to get that

together and push it forward either as part of a VATI grant or a separate public/private partnership is yet to be determined.

Ms. Mallek commented that in addition to the areas where the Authority has been directly involved, there are many other locations where the neighbors have gathered themselves together to gather the \$25,000 to \$40,000 leverage money to get Century Link to raise its ROI enough to get the work done – at least a dozen in the White Hall District alone. She asked if the \$200,000 would be for leveraging a job in areas such as Howardsville.

Ms. Palmer and Mr. Culp confirmed that Albemarle had not received the grant in Howardsville.

Mr. Culp explained that this was generally referred to as “aid to construction,” so if there were ways neighborhoods could partner together and bring an LLC or some formation of a fiscal agent, that would bring the money to an internet service provider. He said the County would like to be involved, and they have made that clear to all the area ISPs. Mr. Culp stated that it could be viewed as a three-way partnership whereby citizens put together a certain amount of funding, the Broadband Authority could either match it or put in additional money, and working with the ISP would allow them to do more projects. He stated that the Authority had proposed this, but Century Link has not decided whether to do it yet.

Ms. Palmer stated that the Board needs to know that Century Link is rethinking its strategy on doing those kinds of projects. She pointed out that CVEC is working with all the surrounding counties and go by substation, which cross over from county to county. She added that Mr. Culp has been working hard to coordinate so they may be coming back to the Board with some of those possibilities requiring more than the \$200,000.

Mr. Culp confirmed this, stating that CVEC will be doing work on the Zion's Crossroads substation, which serves part of Albemarle, as well as the Martin's store, which is in Nelson County and serves western Albemarle. He stated that it is important that as this work goes on, they are not left out of the equation.

Ms. McKeel said that she was concerned when she heard an announcement recently that 2,000 people were going to be affected with one of the co-ops, and she wondered why Albemarle had not been more at the table.

Ms. Palmer stated that it was not a disconnect on the Authority's part. Mr. Culp agreed, stating that they are still doing the work and have not gone live with any of their substations yet.

Ms. Mallek said the determining factor is how much of Albemarle's geography is covered by CVEC.

Ms. McKeel stated that it is a lot more than she had expected.

Ms. Palmer explained that one of the Authority's challenges is that when they first spoke with CVEC, they wanted to do areas that Century Link was working on already, and they wanted money for that. She stated that with Mr. Culp coordinating with them, the County may have an opportunity to get some of the areas that Century Link is not providing service to.

Ms. Mallek commented that Mr. Gary Wood of CVEC has been great. He recently spoke to the 5th District VACO regional meeting, mentioning that his customers have been very clear to say, “Do this.” She said that for CVEC at this point, it is just an implementation step, which was really encouraging and put them in a different operational mode – but that is different for a local company than it is for Century Link.

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. Culp to mention the increased State dollars by the Governor and his administration. Mr. Culp responded that there is more to come, with VATI already increasing the amount to \$4 million.

Mr. Randolph stated that there are federal dollars coming into electrical co-ops now, so these are changing aspects of what has been happening. He said that Ms. Palmer and a Nelson County supervisor had discussed interregional cooperation, which had initially been considered by the Authority but required the first step of forming a County authority. Mr. Randolph commented that regionalization would be very valuable. The Board also needs to be aware that the FCC is changing its permitting process with 5G – the newest wave, which has smaller towers. He stated that Mr. Culp is doing an exceptional job of steering this effort through uncharted territory.

Economic Development Program

Mr. Roger Johnson, Director, Economic Development, addressed the Board and stated that he is speaking on behalf of the team that worked on economic development, which he had presented to them earlier. He stated that they have put together some items that could be seen if economic development were prioritized through this planning exercise, with discussion anticipated in the future on public-private partnerships. Mr. Johnson stated that they will be back in front of the Board in November, asking that it approve the strategy and tactics, and there will be partnerships for Go Virginia grants. He said they will also be working on the Broadway Blueprint, work with the tourism board and then making priorities. He

stated that policies, programs, and incentives will come back to the Board early in 2019, based on what they prioritize. Mr. Johnson added that staff will also provide the Board with site readiness updaters.

(Note: Ms. McKeel left the meeting at 11:21 p.m.)

Ms. Mallek asked if there was any feedback for the Board about the Go Virginia grant or if it was still in preparation. Mr. Johnson responded that it is still in preparation and the deadline is September 25, at which time UVA would submit the application – with the project focused on County property.

Mr. Gallaway mentioned that JLARC had come out with a study in July on workforce and small business incentives, which made recommendations to the General Assembly. He said that on September 12, they will be talking about the legislative packet – and he encouraged everyone to look at the report as it may affect that process.

Infrastructure Planning

Mr. Greg Harper, Chief of Environmental Services, reviewed the water resource protection programs, stating that this strategic priority focuses on investing in water resources infrastructure, which involves grey infrastructure – pipes, manholes, and channels lined with rocks that constitute the drainage infrastructure; and green infrastructure, which is watershed restoration. Mr. Harper stated that this fiscal year, they are supported by one-time monies. The new staff positions created to implement the programs that they wanted were also supported by that one-time money, so they are temporary in nature. He said they will have to consider requesting permanent funding for those positions, as they would for the rest of the CIP program in FY20.

Mr. Harper explained that as part of the drainage infrastructure program, they decided to look at a pilot watershed to do a video assessment of the drainage infrastructure in that area they felt would ultimately become part of a public system. He stated that they are sending a letter to 160 property owners in the watershed to get permission to video the pipes and manholes on their properties. He presented a slide that depicted existing infrastructure and delineated those having a public component conveying infrastructure from upstream to downstream properties. Mr. Harper said that for each of the properties this infrastructure lies on, they need to get permission – so a big part of this program is working with property owners. He said that in the future, if they decide they want to adopt this infrastructure as public, they will need to get permanent easements from this property owners.

Ms. Mallek asked if the funding for the drainage infrastructure was \$620,000. Mr. Harper confirmed that it was, adding that they hope to start getting access in the next few weeks, then do all the video assessment for the watershed pilot area over the next several months. He said he will come back to the Board in December to present the findings from the assessment and that it might refine cost estimates for the program, then they will be asking for Board preferences on some of the issues related to this.

Ms. Palmer asked how they would decide which easements to buy. Mr. Harper responded that they would not be buying easements but would hope to have them donated, as people would most likely be very willing for the County to take control or take management of the infrastructure that is under their parking lots – but that will take a lot of time. He said that almost all of it is private currently, with the redlines being the portion of the system that seem to serve more of a public purpose and not a private property. Mr. Harper stated that those are the ones they would want to focus on with the assessment and possibly pursue later for permanent easements. He said that once the assessments are done, staff will ask for the Board's preferences as far as what portion the County should take over and what level of service should be provided.

Ms. Mallek commented that things like the Carrsbrook hole should be fixed immediately, before the problems worsened. Mr. Harper agreed, stating that there might be less urgent items needed in the future.

Ms. Palmer asked if there is an inspection schedule now or if there would be in the future. Mr. Harper responded that they are currently private, but if the County were to acquire them, they would have an interest in them maintaining their portions – but it could not be required.

Mr. Kamptner explained that the privately owned and maintained storm water management facilities have agreements, which have been required since 1990, and the agreements have been revised. He said that if drainage easements are within a subdivision approved by the County and are part of the improvements under the subdivision maintenance agreement, they should be maintained by the owners or the homeowners' associations. Mr. Kamptner stated that because they are private, the County has no formal enforcement mechanism.

Ms. Palmer stated that the shopping centers and big parking lots do not take care of what is on top of the ground very well, and she assumed that their drainage pipes are similar to the level of care, as it could significantly affect the infrastructure if it was taken over.

Mr. Harper said the storm water management facilities have a separate inspection program, but with conveyance it is harder to inspect underground pipes and could not be done without permissions – and there would be no reason to ask permission to inspect what would continue to be a private system.

Ms. Mallek said that when a system fails, it becomes the County's problem – and she wondered if the owner has responsibility in any way if it fails and impacts other systems. Mr. Kamptner responded that the County had some failures that the Board had to step in and correct, and some of the facilities were on a single piece of property with just a house. He said that the financial burden of the systems was significant – so if there is a public basis, the County will. Mr. Kamptner emphasized that part of the program of Mr. Harper's division is to get ahead of the failures so they can prevent them from happening.

Ms. Mallek agreed, stating that the costs are significant to fix things like the Carrsbrook hole, but she was thinking of the bigger development projects that seem to be off limits that the developer should be held responsible. Mr. Kamptner explained that the downstream property owners have a remedy.

Ms. Mallek said that this puts the burden on the property owner when it is really the community's benefit. Mr. Kamptner agreed, stating that it is a pieced together system, and as the infrastructure matures and the County's philosophy toward the urban area evolves, the approach will also change. He noted that they are just at the stage where the approach is changing.

Ms. Mallek said that in the work they are doing, she wondered if they are improving the quality of the maps. As example, some of the streams are not called streams in Community Development. When there are flooding problems from new development, they need to find a way to get the best information possible, which happens on the evaluation of subdivision and development projects as well. She added that if the GIS information needs improvement and updating, she hopes they will find a way to do that.

Mr. Harper stated that part of the groundwork they have been doing over the last several years has been to map the drainage conveyances, so most of that has been done. Staff has a good idea of the location of the pipes and manholes, as well as the connectivity via channels to those. He said that if there is a problem, staff can sit at their desks and determine what areas are draining where – with much greater precision than previously.

Ms. Mallek said that the ultimate goal from her perspective would be before the upstream development happens, they are told they have to hold onto that water instead of allowing it all to run down through those open conveyances.

Mr. Harper stated that they were focused on the green infrastructure or watershed restoration, and they were not focused on Chris Greene Lake until the algae bloom brought it the forefront in the summer. He said that their division was actually working with Parks and Rec and the Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District, as well as the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, to try to examine the root cause of the algae bloom. Mr. Harper stated that they believe it was the result of too much nutrients coming off the watershed, but the question was where specifically and what could be done about hot spots. He said they are in the process of collecting all the data they can and analyzing it, so they can use the data to focus their efforts.

Mr. Harper added that they have also made some headway with the neighborhood of Dunlora to incorporate some BMPs into the neighborhood, to provide some storm water management and water quality protection that did not exist in this older neighborhood without much storm water management. He noted that the point of the watershed restoration program was to work with small neighborhood groups and watersheds to incorporate changes to result in cleaner water downstream. Mr. Harper noted that there will be quite a few water resource related capital projects that will be starting very soon – two stream restoration projects, BMP retrofit, and the Hollymead dam improvements. He said that the three projects not related to the dam total about \$1.1 million in construction costs, and the County has received about \$625,000 in grants to help pay for that, which is about 60% of the costs covered by outside parties – including a City contribution to the River Run project. He mentioned that the work being done in the pilot watershed will enable staff to have a better sense of what this program will cost in the future. Staff proposes using FY20 to be a bridge year between where they are now and a more permanent funding solution to the water resources programs.

Ms. Palmer asked for a breakdown of the grant money, contributions from the City of Charlottesville, etc. Mr. Harper responded that he would be happy to provide that to the Board in the future.

Mr. Richardson commented that the Board has approved one year of bridge funding, CIP related, to allow the further program development. Staff is exploring the potential for a second year of that – and that timing will come back to the Board in November or December.

School Space Needs

Ms. Shifflett stated that Ms. Lori Allshouse will now review school space needs.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, stated that she has been asked to present this because it has been a very important topic discussed through the budget and CIP processes. Ms. Allshouse said that this item receives leadership from the School Division and School Board, and it is a very important item for the Board. She explained that FY17-19 was a period in which staff was implementing all the improvements from the FY16 bond referendum, which were projects like Woodbrook, Western Albemarle High School learning space modernization, and school security. Ms. Allshouse said there was a lot of activity and implementation of projects that were occurring – but at the same time, the School Division articulated a strategic direction for school space needs going forward. She

stated that the FY19-23 CIP includes \$47 million for future School Division space and improvement projects, and the FY19 capital budget includes \$5.6 million in funding for the Division's preplanning, design, potential land acquisition costs associated with Center One, and capacity and school improvements. Ms. Allshouse said that following this work session, the Board will hold one with the School Board in which they will discuss long-range capital needs in a broad way, which is a good follow up to this meeting.

Mr. Gallaway stated that through the CAC, the Rio/29 North area, the capacity issue with the urban ring/elementary schools is not being solved in any long-term way, even with the addition of a new Woodbrook. He said that Baker Butler is experiencing major capacity issues, and Broadus Wood is a very small school. He stated that they put additions at Greer, Agnor Hurt, Woodbrook, etc. – but the capacity needs still continue to grow. Mr. Gallaway said that this was not even really discussed in their conversations over the past several months, and all the needs being addressed by the School Division now as priorities are high-school related, modernization; with their next school look in terms of capacity is Crozet.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 11:45 a.m., for lunch, and reconvened at 12:26 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 5. Operational Initiatives:

**Facility Planning
BPO**

Mr. Richardson said they will begin the discussion on operational initiatives, which reflect on the County's commitment to high performance. He stated that staff will cover long-term facility planning; business process optimization – connecting it to a study completed earlier in the year on a tech needs assessment that was authorized by the Board in the past year; diversity, inclusion, and succession management. He said this discussion will focus on where the County will be in terms of providing services to citizens, how those will be provided – with an underlying emphasis on customer service and cross-departmental coordination. Mr. Richardson explained that the diversity, inclusion, and succession management program dealt with what the County currently looked like and planning for the future, recognizing that they are a greying workforce and need to grow staff with cross-departmental sharing of human resources so that people can grow and learn. He stated that this is about adaptive challenges and recognizing that they need to change as the community changed – and the approach to work also needs to change across the organization.

Ms. Shifflett stated that these initiatives are not proposed for prioritization as part of the Board's work, but they are being discussed in terms of how they need to transform in order to move the initiatives forward. She said she would hand the discussion over to Mr. Henry, who would discuss implementation of facility planning.

Mr. Henry stated that in terms of implementing facility planning, hope is not a plan, and they are nearing capacity in several facilities. So they need to develop an overall needs assessment through a study process that results in a master plan related to next steps for county office buildings in terms of renovation, and whether consolidating different departments would make better sense with operations. He said he hopes they can look at near-term funding to get this process going.

Mr. Henry said that with Business Process Optimization (BPO), the tech use assessment has driven some internal and structural changes – with staff looking at how they work within their departments and how they work across the organization, with a focus on optimizing that. He stated that Southwood and Biscuit Run reflect efforts to work differently. Staff has formalized this and will continue to develop it to maximize customer experience. He added that the hope is to create some headroom by connecting systems that currently are not connected.

**Diversity and Inclusion
Succession Management**

Ms. Shifflett said that Ms. Lorna Gerome will review the diversity, inclusion, and succession management topics.

Ms. Lorna Gerome, Director of Human Resources, stated that the focus for the Human Resources Department will be looking at diversity and inclusion policies and practices, noting that the County had a Diversity Inclusion Generalist who left in July. She said that since then, the County has been taking time to assess where the gaps are with this work and get some feedback from stakeholders. Ms. Gerome noted that the Human Resources Department had done some work internally, and Ms. Charlene Green from the City came in and worked with the County. She said that County staff also watched the film *Am I a Racist?*, which was extremely powerful and facilitated some reflection.

(Note: Ms. McKeel returned to the meeting at 12:33 p.m.)

Ms. Gerome stated that the other area of focus will be succession management, as about one-third of the County's workforce is over 50 years of age, and they were aware that they need to focus on what workforce skills are needed in the future, assessing current staff's skills and building training to fill

the gaps. She noted that this will also focus on providing cross-departmental and cross-organizational opportunities, as well as leadership development opportunities.

Mr. Gallaway commented that succession management is extremely important and speaks highly of department heads who are willing to set employees up for leadership roles.

Ms. McKeel stated that she is very pleased they have the position in Human Resources that focused on diversity, and her understanding is that the position is being re-advertised. She said the schools, police and fire are struggling to find diversity for classroom teachers and officers.

Ms. Gerome agreed, noting that the County has not readvertised the position yet. She said the work that this employee did was related to building relationships and a needs assessment, and it is time to move to the next phase by putting structures and policies in place. Ms. Gerome stated that there was also a vacancy on the school side at the same time with a recruitment and staffing manager, so they would like to align both of those roles around diversity and inclusion.

Ms. McKeel said that regarding workforce skills, the School Division has for the first time somebody whose job is to look at workforce needs and matching up students with entrepreneurs and workforce. She stated that she is glad the County is partnering with economic development to inform the discussions around workforce skills and development.

Mr. Gallaway said that the apprenticeship programs and management of them are being taken over by PVCC, and that will be a new position there.

Ms. Mallek commented that both the schools and PVCC should perhaps be involved at the workforce board, because there are youth programs and youth funding, as well as job training credits, that help expand opportunities for student participation.

Agenda Item No. 6. Emerging Initiatives:

Parks and Recreation

Mr. Richardson stated that there are five areas staff flagged for discussion. This is the time to recognize any emerging issues that the Board needs to talk through. He said that they talked about three areas during the budget process that dealt with resource allocation: sustaining the organization, supporting and aligning the budget with strategic plans, and focusing on emerging initiatives.

Ms. Shifflett stated that Mr. Crickenberger will review expanding and promoting the County's outdoor recreational parks and amenities.

Mr. Bob Crickenberger, Director of Parks and Recreation, said that the Board is aware of the efforts in regard to the Biscuit Run master planning process, and although they have come a long way, there is much more to be done. He stated that thus far, they have held two community meetings – with a combined attendance of more than 150 people; an online feedback survey that have garnered over 1,200 responses; and plans to have at least one more public engagement activity. He said they hope to wrap it up in late December, which would include a full park master plan with phasing and cost estimates, then seeking the Boards, and DCR's approval.

Mr. Crickenberger said that the goal is to expand and promote the County's outdoor recreation parks and amenities. He added that he will not go through in great detail some of the quality of life projects currently being identified as they have previously been discussed. He stated that the goal of pursuing recreational projects in the urban and development areas, such as neighborhoods, community parks, and sport complexes was a high priority coming from the needs assessment. He said that these were defined in terms of urban services and regional parks. They are in excellent shape in terms of the current and future County population. He added that some of the projects, in addition to Biscuit Run, help support this initiative. Mr. Crickenberger stated that what is driving the need for neighborhood and community parks is the fact that the County is currently in a deficit of 172 acres for this purpose, and by 2032, a total of 264 acres would be required to meet this need. He noted that there is a potential FY20 funding for land acquisition, and this is not saying they will completely depend on funding to try to procure property for this – but they will be working with various partners to help explore this. Mr. Crickenberger emphasized that they do not see a lot of opportunities for land gifts and proffers within these particular areas, purely because in most cases some of those are not marketable because they are in a floodplain or floodway.

Ms. Mallek asked if they are talking about an urban infill park in spaces where perhaps an old building was gone, with trees and picnic areas. Mr. Crickenberger confirmed that it would be pocket parks that are typically five acres or less and neighborhood/community parks, which are typically 25 acres or less. He stated that they would be looking for a variety of different size parks and those amenities within that park system.

Ms. McKeel stated that there are some abandoned homes on small properties within the urban ring that might serve that purpose. She said that the Parks and Rec Department is the most popular with her CAC, which frequently requests that the department come to their meetings.

Ms. Palmer said that in her plug for rural areas, she has been approached by physicians and healthcare professionals, as well as citizens, about the lack of places to walk in southern Albemarle because it is all privately owned and the roads are completely unsafe to walk on because they have no shoulders. She said the Board has a long CIP list. She mentioned a small piece of County-owned property next to Simpson Park that the neighborhood had wanted to put walking trails on, which never got off the ground. Mr. Crickenberger replied that they will be looking at those opportunities.

Mr. Randolph stated that it is important for people in the urban ring to know the County has two parks now with Hedgerow, and while it is difficult in terms of resources, he would like to consider both of those parks simultaneously and the opportunities they present recreationally. He said the Board has previously met and discussed Hedgerow, reaching agreement that there were certain activities that might take place in that park that did not seem appropriate because of the cost and the access off of Route 29. He stated that he was hopeful they could pair them, as there is an opportunity to really address some of the pocket park emphasis. Mr. Randolph said it is valuable to think about pocket parks going forward, but in the meantime they have two huge parks – and trying to find ways to open them to allow residents to utilize them is part of a dual strategy.

Ms. McKeel stated that there is a need for pocket parks, and some of them might be on small pieces of property and where they have abandoned and blighted areas. Mr. Crickenberger said they will use the standard provided by the consultant regarding the size of a pocket park or community park, and what the recommended park amenities should be.

Ms. Mallek stated that she was thinking about the smaller repairs and just as a strategy would like the staff to consider phasing all of them so that one does not take up all the budget for one thing, to give the maximum number of interests the chance to have something. Mr. Crickenberger responded that they would have to identify the most important and most needed amenities and experience.

Ms. McKeel commented that in the urban ring, a small pocket park might not even need parking.

Ms. Mallek agreed, stating that people would walk or ride bikes.

Mr. Gallaway asked what the total acreage would add up to with all the green areas together, adding that they can still accept onsite proffers – so land acquisition in the urban ring is not that big of a deal. Ms. Mallek responded that this is happening a lot, but a lot of places do not have that option. Mr. Gallaway added that the County need to communicate the parks deficit to developers.

Climate Action Plan

Mr. Andrew Lowe, Environmental Compliance Officer, reviewed the climate action plan with the Board, stating that they plan to implement the plan – which has high-level goals for the community on greenhouse gas emissions and is woven in with all other topics. He stated that they have focused a lot of internal preliminary efforts in pulling together a team that can speak to Community Development, Parks and Recreation, Facilities, and can allow resources and opportunities to take place. He presented a timeline that showed the Fall of 2018 as the benchmark for having an internal team pulled together to kick this off and start putting things in place to discuss the energy sector. Mr. Lowe noted that this would include community involvement as well as coming back to the Board for an update. He said that the bulk of the work will take place in the Winter of FY18-19, with both internal experts and community stakeholders in areas such as transportation or building energy. He stated that staff will then come back to the Board in spring of 2019 with a draft for approval.

Mr. Randolph stated that he would recommend to people that if they are to be in a County vehicle that is idling for more than five minutes, they should turn the engine off because of the amount of CO2 generated. Mr. Lowe agreed, stating that it has both internal and external applications for the County's own fleet and own processes, but also within the community in terms of places of business that may have an air intake close to the parking lot – where you do not want a car or truck idling.

Ms. Mallek asked if local government has an idling policy yet. Mr. Lowe responded that they have had an internal policy within Facilities and Environmental Services, but they do not have a fleet policy at this point. He added that it is an area of operational control they want to look into, but that got into telecommuting and other operational items they may wish to explore for policies or incentive programs.

Ms. Palmer noted that the Albemarle County Service Authority has an idling policy.

Ms. McKeel stated that the schools had a policy on idling and had been struggling with parents who kept their cars idling while they picked up their children. She said that she hopes that they can have a consistent policy for both schools and local government.

Ms. Mallek noted that they started with energy conservation on public buildings.

Mr. Lowe said they could designate areas like that such as done on the Downtown Mall next to the Paramount Theater having no idling policies, so it can be done per area, per type, etc.

Ms. Mallek commented that all of these rules would logically have exemptions for ambulances and public conveyances, but it would be good at least on County property to limit the people in the parking lot who just sit. She stated that she also feels the County needs to move beyond the greenhouse

gas focus urgently, because they can do something about adaptation, resiliency, loss of biodiversity, etc. – and those are parts of the LCAP report that were equally important to the greenhouse gas issue. Ms. Mallek asked where this fit into staff's work plan. Mr. Lowe responded that this would lead into it. A climate action plan is typically about greenhouse gas emission goals and reduction of those emissions, which can then lead into resiliency and adaptation planning for the electric grid, agriculture, heavy rains, or extreme dry conditions. He said those things are associated but are also a separate pot. They are looking to explore those within this process in the very near future. Mr. Lowe stated that they are moving forward on some things they know would be able to be implemented, such as residential energy programs, and they have been moving forward with those.

Ms. McKeel stated that she has been to numerous government and school sites that have designated parking areas depending on the size of the vehicle, which is a way to make people stop and think what they are buying and driving.

Mr. Lowe noted that for Albemarle staff, if they carpool they get a middle lot space versus a lower lot. He stated that having electric and hybrid vehicles in their fleet is also helpful. He noted that the profiles have changed and the hybrids are out there and adopted at this point.

Affordable Housing

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, stated that he will focus on the strategy regarding aligning objectives and commitment. The main focus is updating the County's affordable housing policy and what it means with respect to certain projects. He explained that the policy is 15 years old and needs to be updated. Simultaneously the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) is in the midst of a regional effort to identify the affordable housing availability and demand – with a study expected this fall and completion by the end of the calendar year. Mr. Graham said that sometime in the Spring of 2019, staff will be back with the regional report and will review it, and will use it as a springboard for consideration of an affordable housing policy update – using both the data from the regional report and internal County data. He stated that they will also engage with stakeholders, as the community has many, and try to get the work going by Fall of 2019.

Mr. Randolph stated that the TJPDC Board met the previous night, and their Strategic Plan was finalized – so this Board needs to be aware that one Supervisor could be appointed to the overall 30-member regional affordable housing committee. He said that going forward, it will be valuable for this Board to look at not only what other members of the TJPDC are doing, but to look at the approaches currently being undertaken for affordable housing and other opportunities there might be for them to engage in.

Ms. Palmer noted that it is called a Regional Housing Partnership, and the Regional Transit Partnership will have a place on that. She said that the TJPDC would like the Board to appoint one person from the Regional Transit Partnership to have at the TJPDC's October 4th meeting. She said that it could either be a Planning Commissioner or Supervisor, but she would prefer the latter even though some Commissioners are very knowledgeable about the subject.

Ms. McKeel commented that there is no point in putting affordable housing where there is no transit.

Ms. Palmer noted that there was a lot of discussion about stakeholders – the larger advisory committee, the smaller executive committee – so there was an entire process. She said that she also wanted to ask Mr. Graham about the County's policy, particularly their decision about Brookdale. Ms. Palmer noted that there was not been a policy in place for that, and that would have been her preference. She added that she would hate to have the Regional Housing Partnership be duplicating what staff is working on at the same time, and anything handed over to them should be considered in terms of connectivity.

Mr. Graham commented that at a higher level, they need to look at affordable housing as a regional issue – not a County or City issue – but in looking at the particulars of each locality, there must be unique strategies for them. He stated that things like inclusionary zoning may work better in the County than the City, and how they use Community Development Block Grants may work differently in one locality versus another. Mr. Graham said that these are things he is hopeful they can coordinate so they can get it into the updated policy.

Ms. Palmer said when they were doing Brookdale, she learned from Ms. Elaine Echols how complicated it could be and she walked away knowing there was a lot involved in the policy.

Mr. Gallaway asked if they have someone who has researched all the different tools that could be used to approach affordable housing. Mr. Graham responded that the staff look at it continuously, including what other localities were doing, and he has not found a magic bullet yet.

Mr. Gallaway commented that he does not think it is any one tactic, but there are localities in Virginia that do a litany of things – and it did not seem that Albemarle has one central location for all of those tools.

Mr. Graham explained that they have a fairly good list of tools but do not have the alignment between the objectives and the commitment, and they are hoping the policy could help with that, in

addition to the new data they were getting at both the regional and County level. He added that they have a lot better data than they did back in 2002 when they started working on the current policy, and he hopes it will help them drive how they better align those objectives to what the County's commitment is.

Ms. Mallek asked if there is any established method for preservation of existing affordable housing, noting that she had mentioned the houses in Hilltop and downtown Crozet, which are good starter and downsized homes. She said that there is a neighborhood in Old Trail with small houses that are being bought up faster than they can be finished. Ms. Mallek expressed concern that what would happen here is that older small houses would be purchased and replaced with new, expensive homes right up to the borders – changing those neighborhoods dramatically and giving remaining residents the feeling that they are being forced out, as has happened in Arlington.

Mr. Graham stated that there are a lot of tools in the toolbox, and they would want to consider all that as part of this. He said there is a lot of discussion in terms of whether the best return on investment was actually into maintaining existing stock versus trying to produce new stock of affordable housing.

Ms. Mallek said they get the quality of life community feel that is different than moving into an apartment complex, which a lot of people do not want.

Ms. Phyllis Savides, Director of Social Services, addressed the Board regarding affordable housing vouchers. Ms. Savides said the County's housing choice voucher program was moved from the former Office of Housing to Social Services. Ms. Savides explained that the proposed initiative for a specific housing choice voucher program targets non-elderly persons with disabilities. She said that last spring, a grant opportunity became available, and while DSS and the Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless discussed whether they should pursue it at that point, they realized they did not have the infrastructure in place and the capacity to pursue it – so they made a commitment to spend this year positioning the community to draw down these funds that are targeted to providing vouchers for those individuals.

Ms. Savides said that this would cover those who are either transitioning out of institutionalization, at risk of institutionalization, are already homeless, or are at risk of becoming homeless. She stated that they would need to do this in close partnership with Region Ten, the primary service provider for these individuals who are determined to be disabled in some capacity. She said the requirements for the funding are that the public housing authority or voucher holder would need to be the applicant, but they would want to do this in close collaboration with Region Ten and the Coalition, which oversaw the community's continuum of care for the homeless.

Ms. Savides stated that they also hope to look at the housing choice voucher program and research what other opportunities they might have to expand the number of vouchers, as well as potentially reopening programs that used to be in existence, such as the family unification program.

Ms. Mallek asked if the numbers of vouchers are continuing to shrink because of the fixed federal dollars, or if that has improved. Ms. Savides responded that she is not certain because of her limited expertise, but she asked Mr. Ron White to address it.

Mr. Ron White, Chief of Housing, addressed the Board and explained that it has not changed. The budget process at HUD gave an average of what a community spent the previous year, with a small cost of living increase. He said the funding is usually not enough to fund everyone at 100% across the country, so they get a proration of that, which is how the budget had been done for the last six or seven years.

Ms. Mallek asked if the County invested in that voucher dollar amount only, or if it is strictly federal money. Mr. White responded that it is federal money only, although the Board did help with the Crossings when it first opened, as they put money forward so those individuals would not be affected.

Solid Waste

Mr. Andrew Lowe stated that in identifying strategies for solid waste (material management, such as recycling and composting) was to ensure protection of natural resources. This objective is for taking recycling out into the community to the rural areas for an expanded service program, similar to McIntire's Recycling Center, including source separating. He said that this industry is changing rapidly, and he encouraged the Board to look at the two videos that the Solid Waste Alternatives Advisory Committee put out recently. Mr. Lowe noted that one of the partnerships with SWAAC, working with the RSWA on the Ivy Material Utilization Center, focused on how to best utilize that facility. He said that their monthly meetings have brought up a master plan for the Ivy MUC, which would include a recycling service center, similar to McIntire.

He said they can model the operations and costs associated with that type of a service and provide an additional model for the community to see when the facilities are implemented. Mr. Lowe noted that the Board will see through the budget process the acquisition of potential land to develop these in various parts of the community, particularly the rural area. He said that curbside commingling has been a big change for County residents, and this will provide options for source separation for those residents and for community members who do not get those services from their service provider.

Mr. Randolph stated that recycling is a valuable addition to the community, but he had asked the RSWA to provide the Board with the empirical results of the longer hours at McIntire in terms of the quantity of recyclables received, but it has not been provided yet. He said that it will be critical in moving forward that the SWAAC's recommendations for locations be brought to the Board for discussion. He said that in the past, there was a proposal to site a transfer station in Keene and Avon Street Extended, and it is critical for the Board to have a discussion about the where, how, and cost and reach agreement. He mentioned that Nelson County phased its facilities in location by location, but this Board needs to discuss it because it needs to be planned into the CIP in moving forward. Mr. Randolph said he hopes they would bring that to the Board as quickly as possible, and he urged staff to be aware of that so the community can weigh in.

Ms. Palmer commented that she thought the RSWA's report on the McIntire extended hours had been sent to the Board, and, if not, she will make sure it get to the Board.

Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Lowe what his timeframe was for the master plan for Ivy so they could get compactors down there. Mr. Lowe said that Mr. Phil McKalips, Director of Solid Waste at Rivanna, brought some information to SWAAC in August about what this specific model would look like. He stated that there were several different options for the RSWA Board to deliberate on, which he had provided.

Ms. Palmer stated that this is one part of the master plan, and she brought that to the committee first so they could provide feedback. She mentioned that the DEQ has encouraged Rivanna to do a composting program at Ivy, and UVA and other local people who picked up composting are already using the Ivy site as a transfer for somewhere else. Ms. Palmer said the committee and UVA are very interested in this, and it could possibly stimulate pickup of compost if there was a place to bring it close by. She stated that she is not sure if they would contract with a private composter to run it or if Rivanna would run it, but it would have some budget impacts and definitely overlap with the climate change issue.

Ms. Palmer said that there are a lot of elderly people in the rural areas, but the haulers want the trash taken to the end of the driveway, so the people are likely going to start using burn barrels. She stated that reenergizing the hauling industry is important and also plays into the composting issue. Ms. Palmer said she thinks they need a more full-service recycling and trash drop-off in the northern part of the County, and they are trying to organize as much information as possible before doing the budget in the next cycle.

Mr. Gallaway stated that he has forwarded Ms. Palmer's email regarding the data on McIntire to Board members.

Mr. Randolph said that he did find it, noting that the report said there was a 50% increase in hours during the summer and during that time period there was a 19% increase in plastic – the leading indicator of recyclables. He stated that it is not so helpful in terms of knowing how many people came in because people can make multiple trips. He thinks the Board will want to look at it closely because of the lower return. Mr. Randolph suggested that they examine what other communities are experiencing and what would be appropriate for the County.

Ms. Palmer stated that it is difficult to tell whether the County is getting any extra because Van der Linde has just closed.

Tourism

Mr. Richardson stated that the first CACVB meeting with the newly constituted executive board will take place the following week, and it may be too early for the Board to place a level of priority. He said the Board will hear about a convention center feasibility study within the next month, and there will also be other opportunities for the County's member on that board to influence change accordingly.

Ms. Mallek said that questions have arisen about what zoning will be available and required to provide things like glamping, which continue to grow in popularity.

Agenda Item No. 7. Discussion.

Ms. Shifflett stated that there are several things for them to work on – to offer up this opportunity to talk more about specific items and discuss initiatives the Board would like to add to the list around the room. She said that they all care deeply about varying topics, and at the end of the day they were trying to prioritize and pick out the critical things for the County's vision.

She then facilitated the Board in a "dot" exercise to select high, medium, and low priorities. She noted that this would be done by consensus.

Mr. Richardson stated that the Board has nine dots total, and he encouraged them to consider the critical issues the community must confront and what best promotes the community's future. He said when they come back next month, after Mr. Dill returns, they will review high, medium and low priorities.

The Board completed the dot exercise.

Agenda Item No. 8. Prioritization.

Ms. Shifflett explained that she will take all of the information and prioritization done and compile that input, as well as having Mr. Dill partake in the process. She said she will provide a draft to the Board in October and allow for another discussion, and they were aiming for final adoption in November. She mentioned that it is helpful for staff to understand the vision and strategies moving forward so that they have some guidance. She thanked staff and the Board for their work.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the County builds in capacity when things come up that are not on the strategic list and are deemed important. He asked if those things should be part of the Strategic Plan. Mr. Richardson responded that in a community known for a high quality of life, there will continue to be emerging priorities the staff cannot plan for – and they must show a level of discipline to preserve some level of capacity, which is an art as much as a science. He said this is undesignated capital, an extra level of fund balance, and where it is most difficult is with staffing capacity – but an emerging priority might mean hiring a contractor or consultant. Mr. Richardson stated that he believes they need to preserve a level of capacity, as there will continue to be emerging initiatives and opportunities. He said he hopes they can preserve some capacity as they move into the budget process and not commit 100% or more of resources.

Mr. Randolph cited a solar farm proposal that he brought to the Board after they had done their budget, and Community Development put together a schedule because there was a ZTA and a special use permit that had to occur there. He said they put together a fast track process to accommodate the applicant, but were still sensitive to the County's operating procedures.

Mr. Gallaway commented that when different segments of the community come to Board members and are talking about the same thing, those priorities rise to a different level. He stated that one of those is availability of childcare at both the pre-K and after-school levels, which is also a workforce issue in terms of availability and affordability.

Ms. McKeel stated that the School Division and UVA should be involved in those discussions, with potential opportunities for collaboration. She also mentioned the Boys & Girls Club as being partners for childcare provision, adding that the top issue in keeping UVA staff at work is childcare.

Mr. Randolph stated that it is critical in talking about UVA as an institutional partner that the primary sector where childcare is provided is the private sector. He said that in the time period he has been on either the Commission or the Board, they have seen several applications of permitting childcare facilities, and the Board and County have defended the importance of childcare in the face of opposition due to traffic and other factors. Mr. Randolph added that they have demonstrated their willingness to work with the private sector, and there is clearly a need for it.

Ms. McKeel mentioned that there are numerous models where universities around the country are building childcare facilities because it helps their staff get to work and stay at work, and they need to think about tapping into their partners more closely and seeing what alliances can be built.

Ms. Palmer said that the business model surrounding the family-run in-home childcare has its issues, and one of the ones the County deliberated at length in the past has since closed.

Mr. Gallaway stated that when looking at affordable housing issues and social services, childcare can be the piece to make it not possible for single parents to work, and at that point government does have a role.

Mr. Randolph mentioned VACO's 2018 Presidential Initiative: Healthy Virginia Counties in Action Spotlight on Early Childhood.

Agenda Item No. 9. Next Steps.

Ms. Mallek said that in terms of organizational initiatives, it would help to have more frequent report-outs from committees on which the Board serve as liaisons, and this could be handled by email as well as in reports at the meetings.

Ms. Shifflett stated that a goal for the Project Management Office is to try to bring updates to the Board more frequently.

Mr. Randolph commented that the Board often does its reports at the end of the meeting when the public has already left the meeting. The Board may want to consider having another time where they have things on a post board, where they let people know the key points of what is going on so the public also knows.

Ms. McKeel asked if there is a dashboard in use. Ms. Shifflett confirmed that there is one with reports, which allows the Board to see them at their own convenience.

Agenda Item No. 10. Adjourn to September 12, 2018, 2:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 2:12 p.m., Ms. Mallek adjourned the Board meeting until September 12, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 01/16/2019
Initials CKB