

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on January 30, 2019, at 6:00 p.m., TJPDC Water Street Center, 401 Water Street, Charlottesville, Virginia, for the purposes of holding a joint meeting with Charlottesville City Council. The meeting was adjourned from January 16, 2019.

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

ABSENT: None.

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 6:10 p.m., by the Chair, Mr. Gallaway, and the Mayor, Nikuyah Walker.

Agenda Item No. 2. Welcome and Introductions.

CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Wes Bellamy (arrived at 6:24 p.m.), Ms. Kathy Galvin, Ms. Heather Hill, Mr. Mike Signer and Ms. Nikuyah Walker.

CITY OFFICERS: Interim City Manager, Mike Murphy, Assistant City Manager, Leslie Beauregard, City Attorney, John Blair, Director of Communications, Brian Wheeler, and City Clerk, Kyna Thomas.

Ms. Walker noted that Mr. Bellamy was running late, but be at the meeting shortly.

Ms. Emily Kilroy, Director of Communications and Public Engagement, Albemarle County, thanked everyone for attending the meeting and asked staff and elected officials to introduce themselves. Ms. Kilroy acknowledged additional County and City staff in the audience. She stated that some staff may be called upon to offer information, if need be. Ms. Kilroy also thanked the media.

Ms. Kilroy thanked Mr. Chip Boyles of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission for hosting the meeting.

Ms. Kilroy stated that this meeting is a follow-up from the October 2018 meeting of the Board of Supervisors and the City Council. She said the subject for that meeting was to look at "Priority Setting in a Collaborative Context," which means how the City and the County can identify opportunities to work together on items with a shared priority. Ms. Kilroy stated today's meeting is intended to be a "next conversation" to help get both bodies toward more concrete projects to work on in advance of the next meeting in the summer or fall of 2019.

Ms. Kilroy said the desired outcome for the meeting is to build relationships, share information and establish a process toward collaborative process toward budget-related priority setting, to develop a process for collaborative strategic-goal setting. Ms. Kilroy said those are the hopes for the meeting, and then reviewed the proposed agenda.

Agenda Item No. 3. Past Collaboration Efforts.

Ms. Kilroy reviewed past collaboration efforts and stated there is a strong history of collaboration between Albemarle County and Charlottesville. She noted that each elected official is seated at the table by City and County tenure, paired off by one elected with a lot of experience in the community and the other with less experience in the community. Each pair has been given a set of yellow cards listing various collaborations over the decades.

The pairs are Ms. Walker and Mr. Randolph, Ms. Hill and Ms. Palmer, Ms. McKeel and Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek and Mr. Signer, Mr. Gallaway and Ms. Galvin, and Mr. Bellamy will join with Ms. McKeel when he arrives.

Ms. Kilroy stated that each pair will list one collaboration between the two localities from each decade and are asked to put them in order, with the exercise taking about four or five minutes.

Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, listed the collaborations from the 1970s in order from date of origin: Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Commission, Rivanna Solid Waste Authority, Jefferson Madison Regional Library planning, Jefferson Area Board of Aging, and Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority.

Mr. Kevin McDermott, Transportation Planner, listed the collaborations from the 1980s: Christmas tree recycling program, Ivy Creek Natural Area, Planning and Coordination Council, Airport Authority, and Therapeutic Recreation Program.

Mr. Walker listed the collaborations from the 1990s: Children's Services Act, joint skate park, Darden Towe Park, Thomas Jefferson Health District, and the Blue Ridge Regional Jail Authority.

Mr. Kevin McDermott listed collaborations from the 2000s: agreement for the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Community Attention Foster Families Program, City-County Fire Services Agreement, Regional Hazardous Materials Response team, and the Greenway Program.

Mr. Walker listed the collaborations from the 2010s: Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless, the Courts Agreement, Hydraulic-29 Small Area Plan, Transportations Alternative Program Grant for the 5th Street Station trail hub, and the Rivanna River Corridor Plan.

Ms. Kilroy stated that is a list of 25 collaborations since the 1970s. She said this is not a comprehensive list and asked for missing items. Mr. Dill stated CATEC. Mr. Randolph stated the Piedmont Family YMCA in McIntire Park.

(Note: Mr. Bellamy arrived at 6:24 p.m.)

Agenda Item No. 4. Present Collaboration Efforts.

Ms. Leslie Beauregard then moved on to a discussion of the four Memoranda of Understanding between the two communities that were signed in 2016 and the one that was signed in 2017 – Economic Development. The topic of conversation was how to use these documents to guide future collaboration, or how they could be used to improve collaboration. Ms. Beauregard said the goal was to operationalize the documents to effectively contribute to strategic planning goal setting.

Ms. Galvin asked if they are to suggest areas for each MOU. Ms. Beauregard responded that could be one strategy.

Ms. McKeel said her recollection of the MOUs was that they were intended to drive staff in both localities to better cooperate. She said the documents stated there was to be a dedicated staff member assigned to promote success. Ms. McKeel said the two elected bodies only come together once or twice a year, but where the “real rubber meets the road” is when staff takes initiative to phone each other when they work on issues along the City-County border, such as at Barracks Road. Ms. McKeel said the goal was to coordinate efforts and said this is a big issue in her district. Ms. McKeel asked if a dedicated staff member has been assigned for each MOU and if not, whether that is something that needs to happen to implement the intent of the MOUs.

Ms. Galvin stated that the elected officials need to ask staff what action items have come from the MOUs to date instead of putting forth new action items. Ms. McKeel asked staff to say how they thought the MOUs were working or how they might be lacking. Ms. McKeel stated the intent of the MOUs was to drive staff cooperation on a daily level because of the close nature of the community.

Mr. Signer said that Ms. McKeel's question is good, but he has three items: one is economic development and he wants to know how that is working on a project basis, particularly on Route 29. He asked if the two economic development departments are working together and noted that Albemarle's Economic Development Department is busier than it used to be. He said his second question is affordable housing and any City strategy that does not include the County would not be sensible because the County plays an important role in terms of population. Mr. Signer asked if the two communities are working together. He said his third issue is greenhouse gas reduction and whether the two localities are working and setting together.

Mr. Randolph said Mr. Signer raises a good point. Mr. Randolph stated the role of the Board of Supervisors is to be strategic, and the MOUs established the four priorities. Mr. Randolph said the question is whether the four priorities have worked and the goal for today is to prioritize the priorities.

Mr. Randolph stated that the two localities should focus on one or two rather than seeking to pursue all four. Mr. Randolph noted that the top strategic priority for the Board of Supervisors is climate change and suggested a conversation with Council about whether that should be a collaborative priority.

Mr. Randolph said that affordable housing still resonates and there has been no change. Mr. Randolph said that economic development was not discussed originally, but there is cooperation and they are not engaging in zero-sum behavior with one another; they are trying to be collaborative and cooperative. Mr. Randolph asked for a list of what should be on the table for strategic priorities, and then there should be an attempt to reach agreement on at least two priorities, but rank all four.

Ms. Walker stated that in the pre-meeting she suggested a broader view would be better before taking a narrow view. She said both elected bodies have separate strategic plans and coming up with joint strategic priorities to add to the individual plans could be a strategy, which would signal to staff what the focal point is for joint efforts. Ms. Walker said then there would be an opportunity to modify the MOUs to focus on one joint priority.

Mr. Signer responded to Mr. Randolph and said he could not disagree more with the notion of only focusing on one or two priorities. He said government does not work that way, and that is not how regionalism works out. He said the four priorities each contain broad directives, as did the fifth, and government needs to be able to chew gum and walk at the same time. Mr. Signer said the initiatives from the MOU should branch out and lead to more initiatives. Mr. Signer stated that one of the points of the exercise was to lead to more cooperation. Mr. Signer said the three priorities he brought up would fall

under existing MOUs, such as intensifying efforts to reduce greenhouse gases, as falling under the environmental MOU. He said more specifics on affordable housing could emerge from that MOU related to the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission's Regional Housing Partnership. Mr. Signer said he wants more specifics on economic development cooperation, given the County's renewed effort in that arena.

Ms. Palmer said there are two threads: one is how the strategic plans of both elected bodies would be coordinated. She said she wants to repeat what Ms. McKeel said about getting staff to state what they have done. For instance, Albemarle staff is now developing a climate action plan, and Mr. Dill and Ms. Palmer sit on the committee, and that means that Mr. Dill and Ms. Palmer know that County staff is working with City staff on that task. She said the City has already done their plan. Ms. Palmer also stated there is ongoing transportation work. Ms. Palmer stated that each time there is a meeting, there would be a conversation about where multimodal needs are. Ms. Palmer said her district has a lot of new affordable housing units such as Timberland Park, which just opened up; another is Brookdale, which has 96 units on Old Lynchburg Road at 60 percent of area median income.

Ms. Palmer said there has to be a way to get people to walk safely under I-64 on that road, and the new residents need that connection. Ms. Palmer said that topics like this keep getting mentioned at meetings, but the two capital improvement programs never seem to match at the same time. Ms. Palmer said the City and County could be applying for Transportation Alternative Program grants from the Virginia Department of Transportation in order to merge the transportation and affordable housing needs. Ms. Palmer said she understands strategic initiatives but wants to make sure that elected officials are aware of what staffs in both localities are working on.

Mr. Bellamy said he agrees with Ms. Palmer and Ms. McKeel and said that Mr. Randolph has valid points. Mr. Bellamy stated that if there is overlap between both communities, particularly on the issues of race and equity and affordable housing, there could be discussion of these issues among elected officials. He said he does not want to squander the opportunity to address the hot topics that community members want to hear about from elected officials. Mr. Bellamy stated that the topics of race and equity and affordable housing are ever present at this time.

Mr. Randolph noted that while race and equity was not listed as an Albemarle priority, it is built into the redevelopment issue and urban neighborhood revitalization. He said it was not singled out but is an implicit part, particularly in Southwood.

Mr. Bellamy stated that he did not intend to insinuate that race and equity were not important topics for Albemarle.

Mr. Randolph said he did not take it that way but wants to indicate it is a priority for the County. Mr. Randolph said race and equity are subsumed in as an overall major issue for redevelopment and urban revitalization.

Ms. Palmer said this is also a driver for the County's efforts to improve access to broadband internet.

Ms. Mallek stated that it is involved in workforce and economic development, as well as with outdoor recreation.

Ms. McKeel said it might be helpful for staff to explain how they are using the MOUs now.

Ms. Hill said that for her, all of the issues are intertwined, and it is difficult to look at any of them in a silo. She reiterated that all of the items in the MOUs are connected to each other: housing, transportation, education and economic development. She said it is important to look at them as part of a system rather than isolating facets of the system.

Mr. Gallaway asked what the MOUs mean to staff. He said that Supervisors bring up the MOUs all the time with their constituents. Mr. Gallaway asked how the philosophy of the MOUs integrate into the daily work of the staffs.

Ms. Galvin said that before creating or revising the MOUs, she wants to know how they have been used, noting the bullet point to "identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate or communicate where possible, including review of the organizational structure of boards that serve both communities." She said there is a staff function identified in each MOU and she wants to hear about that. Ms. Galvin stated she wants to hear about work on collaboration on multimodal transportation and collaboration on the Hydraulic Small Area Plan and the Rio Small Area Plan. She said she wants to hear what is being done for joint implementation, something that was spoken about when the two comprehensive plans were updated through the Livable Communities grant. Ms. Galvin said she has drawn up a diagram that she could send to the other elected officials.

Ms. Galvin said there are global values that pertain to race and climate, which are big issues that are overarching values, then there are big place-based situational initiatives such as neighborhood revitalization, Route 29 redevelopment, and affordable housing. Ms. Galvin said there are also local government fundamentals that become the connective tissue or everything that makes a community, i.e., public safety, schools, justice, economic and workforce development, health and recreation and infrastructure. Ms. Galvin said there are three big buckets that are related, and the two bodies could state that they have shared values which play out in how decisions are made. Ms. Galvin said she sees that

the two bodies are on the same page, but the way it has been presented indicates the two are on separate tracks, but she does not think that is correct. She said if they could be diagrammed as a system, as Ms. Hill indicated, the more the two bodies could think collegially and comprehensively.

Mr. Dill said that concerning race and equity, the County is going to celebrate Freedom and Liberation Day, and there are other symbolic things. Mr. Dill said he does not think this meeting is the right time to hear from staff on what they are doing. He said that is important, but that would be a follow-up item as staff is not ready to present. Mr. Dill said he is interested in focusing on the environment and that is a way to get the community involved. Mr. Dill said he was speaking with Mr. Kamptner about ways to show community members what their carbon footprint is, and people have found it stimulating to find out what steps they could take.

Regarding affordable housing, Mr. Dill said he finds it critically important to address the needs of seniors. He said economic and workforce development efforts could help people afford market rate housing rather than have them be subsidized. Mr. Dill said seniors do not have the opportunity to increase their income, and he is interested in separating the two affordable housing components and prioritizing senior housing.

Ms. Walker asked if staff did not have a list, and if the MOUs were written and there has not been a collaborative effort, it would be up to elected officials to set the tone for that. Ms. Walker asked what other elected officials think and asked if the culture has really been created to allow the collaborations to happen in a seamless manner.

Mr. Murphy stated that the overarching theme was to zoom out to the 30,000-foot level. He said these meetings have happened a lot over many years. Mr. Murphy said the MOUs are one context under which the two communities collaborate today, but they do not capture all of the collaborations that happen between the City and County. These are significant at the departmental level and it is an everyday consultation. He said this could be a partnership between parks and recreation, or social services, or other departments. Mr. Murphy said there is more than just a climate or spirit of collaboration, but it is tactical and happens every day. Mr. Murphy said there has been multiple updates to both bodies about what has happened both at the staff level and in community-led initiatives; for instance, a lot of action under the education MOU has been done through partners such as Piedmont Virginia Community College or through the early education task force.

Mr. Murphy said he could go through those if it would be meaningful. The plan for this meeting was to talk about items such as revenue-sharing, touchpoints, and collaboration through partnership. He stated that late January is a weird time of the year for the two bodies to have this conversation as a way to direct resources because both localities are deep into the budget development process. Mr. Murphy stated that the ultimate takeaway of this meeting is for elected officials to tell staff what the important things are, and if there is to be joint cooperation that takes more resources and funding, the next joint meeting in August or September could set up regional efforts that would be funded in the budgets for FY21. As such, Mr. Murphy said staff is prepared to offer updates on any of the program areas either at this meeting or in a written report to come later. He noted that if the elected officials agree with Mr. Randolph on selecting two big things, staff could do that and bring back more information.

Ms. Palmer said this is a year in which VDOT accepts TAP grant applications, and the elected officials could be talking about specific issues such as that. Mr. Murphy agreed that one track for this meeting is to talk about substantive, current problems that elected officials could help problem solve; and the track taken for the meeting is to talk about the long-term strategic trajectory.

Mr. Gallaway said he hears frustration from those elected officials who feel they already set the long-term trajectory in 2016 and 2017 when they signed the MOUs, and there has been turnover on both elected bodies. Mr. Gallaway said if the next Albemarle budget has not been informed by the five MOUs, there would be some tough questions for the County Executive. Mr. Gallaway said it is his understanding that the five issues in the MOUs were already prioritized.

Ms. Galvin asked what opportunities staff might have uncovered that would have created opportunities for joint initiatives out of the MOU categories. Mr. Gallaway said there has also been turnover on staff and that could be an out for them, but there should still be some accountability and staff should be able to provide information on what the culture of collaboration currently is among staff.

Ms. McKeel stated she was not asking Mr. Murphy for a detail of everything staff has done, but asked for a big picture. She asked if the structure of the MOUs have helped staff. If so, she wants staff to speak to that. Ms. McKeel said the MOUs have been around for three years and she said she wants to know if they are guiding staff's work; once that is answered, they can address other issues.

Ms. McKeel said the MOUs have established priorities for staff since they were signed.

Mr. Richardson said he has not been around terribly long but thinks the MOUs are extremely important and beneficial. He said that City and County staff appreciates clear direction from both governing boards that set the expectation that staff is to work together in the five areas. Mr. Richardson said that there is a lot of day-to-day operational interaction in a number of areas. He said there are opportunities that have been missed, possibly in getting budget staff together before the budgets are developed, to talk about aligning capital improvement requests. Mr. Richardson said that could have been done and there is an opportunity to do more of that in the five areas. He stated that the City and County staff work well together and he believes the MOUs are a great guide. He said the seriousness by which

the two boards approach the issue indicates that the boards want staff to produce results. Mr. Richardson said he hears that message and that the two would explore opportunities.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Murphy if he wants to add anything. Mr. Murphy declined.

Ms. Beauregard said she agrees with what Mr. Richardson and Mr. Murphy have said. She said she has met with Ms. Lori Allshouse and others to discuss ways about how the processes might look different looking forward. Ms. Beauregard stated that there was a lot of discussion with budget staff during the development process, but there could be opportunities to have strategic discussions in the summer and the fall. She also said the City is about to refresh its strategic plan, and the MOUs could serve as some of the foundation for that discussion. She said that would then allow departments to show results, and that way the MOUs would not be an afterthought but built into the strategic plan process as well as the budget development process.

Mr. Gallaway noted that Albemarle does a strategic plan on a two-year cycle and Charlottesville does a three-year cycle. He said that could make it difficult to line up strategic interests.

Ms. McKeel said this is something to keep in mind.

Mr. Signer said there was a lot of very general and important discussion and it might seem like they are spinning their wheels, but in some other areas there are specifics. Mr. Signer said he wants to put forth a big picture of how the MOUs fit into the notion of growing regionalism. He stated that regionalism is a big topic around the country, and policymakers were to set the big picture outcome of more regionalism after the MOUs were in place and enacted. Mr. Signer said regionalism means different things in different places, with Washington D.C. being different from Seattle or the Research Triangle Park. Mr. Signer said the intent here was to mean something more robust, especially after the two jurisdictions had been at odds and how prevailing that image was. He stated that the intent of the MOUs was to grow together and work together more and have regionalism as a default. Mr. Signer said that it is still his belief that the two governments ought to be more regional in approach and they ought to be more closely aligned.

Mr. Randolph said he thinks that one of the issues is affordable housing and that it has been recognized that there are different needs for rural and urban areas, and the best way to approach is through the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission. Mr. Randolph thanked Mr. Chip Boyles for the use of the building for the meeting. Mr. Randolph said the TJPDC could help kick some subjects into a regional level so that perspective could be gained from the outlying counties. He stated that solutions come from a broader approach, but there are issues such as education that could be solved through cooperation. Mr. Randolph said in the environmental field, there was no question there would be a value to approaching it regionally, but he questions the buy-in from surrounding counties that may be more skeptical of the importance of addressing environmental issues and skeptical of climate change. Mr. Randolph said that economic development and education could be addressed through the dyadic relationship between the City and County.

Mr. Bellamy said he was reading the MOU and noted that the TJPDC was intended for regional issues. He asked if there is anything that prohibits the City and County from asking the TJPDC to figure out how to build a 200-unit structure, complete with cost, site selection and funding sources. Mr. Bellamy said that is the kind of tangible project that constituents want to see on a regional level. He commented that government could come up with concrete plans to let constituents know that action is being taken, and elected officials could direct staff to do that.

Agenda Item No. 5. Future Collaboration Efforts.

Ms. Kilroy said that is a good transition point and she has heard from elected officials that they feel the MOUs set shared expectations in the five areas, and the expectation was that the staffs are working in partnership on those five items, which are still good to work on regionally.

Ms. McKeel said that she is only speaking for herself, but when they were talking about regional affordable housing work together, it seems they decided they wanted to participate in that and need to give it time to evolve. She stated that from the transportation angle, they have said that the Regional Transit Partnership was critical to Charlottesville and Albemarle, which also involves the University, but that piece touches on their work around affordable housing and equity, and those areas are pivotal to making everything else work.

Ms. Galvin commented that they have shared values of sustainability and equity, with the environment and equity both being goals for the City, but they both would do well to look at everything through an equity lens and a sustainability lens. She stated that transportation and housing would get both of those.

Ms. Palmer stated that another reason to wait to see where they are with the TDJPC-formed housing study group was doing is because they have to know where their affordable housing is now, and they do not want it all in one place. She said that she is very sensitive to this because a lot of it is going into one small area in her district, and former staff member Ms. Elaine Echols was a big advocate for recognizing where affordable housing needed to go, how much it had in different areas, etc., to make sure it was planned, and Ms. Echols would point out that there were only so many properties in the community that was not developed at this point that would lend themselves to those kinds of projects.

Ms. Walker stated that she has not been in her role for very long, but they seem to have a lot of conversations about other conversations that need to happen, and she recognizes that a lot of planning has to go into how things got accomplished, but that could also prevent things from actually getting done. She said that City Council has to have a conversation about housing within the City of Charlottesville, Albemarle is having a conversation within the County, then they start discussion collaborations, and the regional TJPDC group is also talking about surrounding communities, which would need to be included. She commented that she understands why it is important, but it also prevents them from coming up with an actual plan. Ms. Walker added that she has concerns about how to get moving and going and the activity to start producing the things that are needed, and if they have to wait until a county like Louisa is part of the conversation, it could be delayed. She emphasized that the City and County are aware that there is a bigger picture, but they may need to have discussions about joint projects without involving localities that are not involved.

Ms. Walker stated that the conversation of race and equity have not been happening in some other localities, and some of those discussions need to be out front. She added that there is still work they would have to continue that the County may just be starting, but there has to be a way to make an action item list for both the City and County jointly. She noted that there were MOUs signed between them in 2016, but what elected officials at the time thought would come out of that has not occurred because they have gotten bogged down in process.

Mr. Bellamy commented that he shares that sentiment completely because he fears if they just continue to push what is needed for both jurisdictions through committees and regional groups, it will take a very long time to address the needs they know they need today. He stated that they need near, middle, and long-term strategies, and he wonders what will emerge from their meetings and what they might tangibly come up with to share with the public as strategies for addressing issues, whether it be revitalization, school space needs, etc., as well as a timeline for working on them.

Ms. Galvin stated that in looking at the MOU, which has some tangible items on it, a recommendation for education was to consider recommendations of the pre-K task force. She asked if there are recommendations from that task force that would warrant funding from the jurisdictions, as it would be very helpful to know. She emphasized that this was identified in 2016 as something they were interested in tracking, and the question is whether there was something concrete from the task force that would compel both the County and City to jointly fund and locate somewhere.

Ms. Palmer provided another example, under transportation: "The City and County Long-Range Bicycle Vision Network," part of the City Bicycle Master Plan, examples of cooperation. She stated that she would raise the issue again of getting under I-64 safely from the County to the City at Azalea Park, and that could have been something tangible to work on that they could apply to the transportation alternative grant program if they expanded it. She said this would mean people could get into the City via the land the City purchased for a trail to allow access.

Mr. Bellamy asked what it would take for the City to make that happen, whether they need to designate a route, advise CAT, etc. Ms. Palmer responded that staffs from both localities have been working on that, and all they need to do is ask Mr. Kevin McDermott of the County and Mr. Chris Gensic of the City how this would be accomplished and what it would look like.

Mr. Bellamy stated that he would be interested in hearing from Mr. Murphy and other colleagues what they need to do to accomplish that, from the City's perspective, and he would request getting a report of sorts to determine what they need to do to make that happen, as what Ms. Palmer said makes sense.

Ms. Mallek added that there had been an offer earlier for a written report regarding all these questions, and she would like to have that as this provides the information needed in order to take the next step. She said they are talking about a lot of different things that may already be in process, at least the initial parts, so they need to find that out first so they can make more meaningful conversation about which ones to prioritize. She added they also need to remember that there may be some different approaches in the two jurisdictions, and affordable housing is one where the County's focus for decades has been working with private industry to leverage their efforts, as well as it being dispersed throughout the County. Ms. Mallek said there is interest in maintaining the small and affordable places in the rural area where individuals live, as well as in growth areas where people are living more closely together, so it is not just one silver bullet, and they need to think about how to bring the biggest value for citizens who all have different needs.

Mr. Gallaway commented that it is a useful exercise for the Board and City Council, and it is his hope for this meeting that more strategies for implementation will come out because it is useful for staff and leaders to hear the officials to brainstorm ideas, as it can serve as a catalyst for them too. He noted that Mr. Bellamy has already taken an idea and moved it forward, which is what he was hoping would happen.

Ms. Galvin mentioned the pre-K task force.

Mr. Gallaway said there was that, the units, and one other.

Mr. Dill stated that there was senior low-income housing somewhere near the center at Belvedere and Rio Road/Route 29, which they are trying to redevelop. He said there is an obvious need there for

public transportation, and going downtown already exists from that area, so something in that area for low-income seniors is critical in terms of a priority. Mr. Dill noted that there is no question they would find out from a study that they need low-income senior housing, so finding the right spot for it is a top priority for him.

Ms. Walker said that in the City's ABRT revamp process, which was usually a collaborative effort, and this year is the first year in a while that the County was on its own track and the City's application process was frozen this year, so they could explore it. She stated that she wants to hear back from staff how they get that process back on the same track, if possible.

Mr. Signer stated that this discussion has been about the MOUs, and they were written to be very general – with the specifics on all of them being virtually identical, with exception of the environmental development, they all have the same bullets: designate a staff member assigned to promote success; identify potential resources available to both localities; identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization; identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction of acting without information sharing; identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate where possible. He said with the five priorities that they had, there were four and then one added, and this was meant to mandate by the governing bodies the two staffs to work in that way going forward regardless of what the input was and how it was obtained. He added that they were also intended to be measurable, and they had a few good meetings within the first year after the MOUs were passed wherein staff came in and did a full PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Signer stated that if they just did an update, that would be a fairly useful thing compared to where they were three years ago. He added that it was meant to require staff to cooperate in a new way on those five approaches, and the pre-K initiative was unusual, with economic development also being unusual because it said "focus on maintaining jobs and capital investment; share referrals to new business projects; and not to actively solicit or initiate discussion the relocation of any business from one to the other." He said that this has 10 specifics, which was unusual, but the others are the same, and that was what they agreed to require as a matter of policy.

Ms. Galvin commented that they did not just want policy outcomes, they wanted tangible outputs through those policies.

Mr. Gallaway said that for the next meeting to take place in the fall, the outputs are what the focus of the meeting was intended to be.

Mr. Signer pointed out that it could be sooner.

Ms. Mallek agreed that they could have it whenever it is possible to read, as they do not need it here in this room.

Mr. Dill stated that they could get a report on some specific aspect of that without it having to be six months.

Mr. Signer said that he would add the Rivanna River, because they have a new plan that takes a lot of resources to put together, which definitely crosses both jurisdictions, and there are a lot of actionable items there for each of them separately and together, and the bike/ped plan, which is at a whole new level with all kinds of expenses that could be shared.

Ms. Galvin added that in talking about these projects, both staffs need to inform the Board and Council of what the resource needs are to make these things happen. She stated that regarding climate change, which the City just met about earlier in the day, involving the Office of Sustainability and climate change community activists, and the City has the Mayor's contact, with the County having LCAP. She said the City has greenhouse gas reductions it wants to achieve, and the public was telling them it was not happening fast enough, so that would require resource and it needs to overlay with equity additions. Ms. Galvin noted that when they are asking staff to follow through with the MOUs, staff has to be candid and say they do not have the personnel to get this done so they need to invest more to accomplish it. She added that the City has that challenge with greenhouse gas reductions, but the same thing could be said about the Rivanna River Plan.

Mr. Gallaway commented that the Rivanna piece, the trails piece, and some of these other things speaks to why the CIP process also should be in synch, but they might have a project listed lower on a priority list and the City might have one listed as five. He said that they may be analyzing how those two connect, and a joint effort might move it up on the priority list because of efficiency. He stated that it was important to identify how that came to be.

Ms. Palmer stated that this was what happens with the item she keeps raising, but she was being told repeatedly that it was not for three more years on the City CIP.

Ms. Walker noted that the City and County are both wrapping up budget cycles, but perhaps if there are recommendations from staff about potential dollars they need to set aside for initiatives that need to happen before the next cycle so when they reconvene after the report, there would be potentially funds allocated.

Mr. Signer asked if there might be a possibility for a joint session of the two bodies on the CIP and considering the implications for each other's jurisdiction for multi-million-dollar projects, it could be a

productive exercise. Ms. McKeel responded that it is a good idea because their respective CIPs connect in some ways. She added that she would be remiss if she did not point out that if they are actually going to move forward on some of these initiatives, they have to be able to move people around the County. She said that would mean that CAT would need to increase some of its services and there would need to be a serious conversation around whether they would be rerunning busses more often and how they would structure this, and it could mean money for transit. Ms. McKeel commented that when a constituent is having to change busses eight times round trip to take a job, he would not take that job.

Mr. Gallaway stated that he does not think budget has to wait a year, and staff is in the process to bring it forward to the Board, but if the Board members bring something up that the County Executive did not plan for and they want information on it, they need to work it into the conversation. He added that they are going out and talking to the community and having meetings, and they start doing that during the budget process for that very reason. Mr. Gallaway emphasized that there is the opportunity for both of them to pause and evaluate items, with the understanding that to fund them they might have to reallocate, but that is part of the budget process.

Ms. McKeel said that this goes back to what Mr. Signer was saying about the budget and the CIP, because a lot of this was around those sorts of expenses.

Mr. Gallaway stated that it is harder for a \$40 million CIP project or big-ticket item, but not about allocating for something that would let them be nimble to work together, perhaps in a situation where it is not a big allocation of funds.

Mr. Murphy commented that there might be a leaner way to add into a budget session an invitation to a quorum of the other body, then having an additional half hour for there to be some joint discussion.

Mr. Gallaway clarified that he was referring to the next fiscal year that they are budgeting through.

Ms. McKeel said it would be an exercise in what they are looking at and what is coming.

Ms. Palmer stated that if they want to talk about some of the smaller projects and things like bus routes and bus stops.

Mr. Gallaway commented that the timing of a meeting like this could be scrutinized, but the benefit of a meeting and the timing of it is that it would be fresh in all of their minds as they go through their budgeting process.

Mr. Randolph stated that there is real value after the budgets are passed to sit down and look at the two different CIPs, and they also must understand that as they have been reminded at this meeting the City operates under a three-year strategic plan and the County operates under a two-year plan. He said the City's process of developing the CIP and the way it is vetted and reviewed and discussed and recommended to Council may be different than the way it gets vetted to the Board. He emphasized that the two processes are not necessarily in symmetry and there is a different culture around the development of the CIP, and every budget reflects the values of the community so there is not the ideal budget, just the one that fits according to the priorities of that community.

Mr. Randolph stated that those priorities are not always strategic. He thinks there is value to reconvene in July and look at the two CIPs to see where their projects match up and where going forward they could look at more collaboration based on that level of potential seen from what they already passed and figure out how they can build on that. He added that he likes the idea of getting everyone together, but it is a hard thing to do timewise, and perhaps a member of the County could be present when the City is establishing its CIP, and a member of Council could be present when the Board puts together its CIP so there is dialogue back and forth. Mr. Randolph commented that there are many ways to build this, but there is an opportunity to have much more awareness of how they both develop a significant portion of their budgets for the long-term capital needs of the community, which meet the same citizens needs in some cases across jurisdictional lines.

Mr. Signer commented that all of these ideas would have strengths and weaknesses, and the challenge with that suggestion is that it is hard for one person to represent, so perhaps they could have invitations extended, but just as they contribute to a legislative letter where they state support for those bills, they could say they are each stakeholders in each other's community and each body could compose a letter to the other based on its budget priorities and could weigh in. He added that this could become a routine process.

Ms. Walker said that if they get the reports back and there is an agreement to work on a specific area, City staff is already indicating that there is not room to add anything else into the budget, which goes back to the strategic planning and the broader picture of what they could agree to that is the best use of resources and joint efforts. She stated that if they are saying that the end of 2019 is an ideal time, and these are plans that date back to 2016, she is not hearing a clear mandate as to whether to move forward now or wait another year. She added that if there is going to be a budget impact, they need to be realistic and not ask staff to find money throughout the year.

Mr. Dill stated that it would help them to set priorities if they could agree on a few things now.

Ms. Walker said that this could happen once they get the report from staff.

Ms. Hill stated that it has been brought up a few times that they have different budget cycles, but this is one way she wished they could find some alignment, and perhaps they could get on a similar cycle and have these conversations. She said one of the bodies may have to adjust their cycles, and constituents who come to City Council meetings are often from the County and do not know where the boundaries even are. Ms. Hill emphasized that the more they could try to combine governments and do things more in synch, with more conversations, they could show the community that they are collaborating and are trying to address the needs of the region, which would make them more successful.

Ms. Galvin commented that Ms. Walker's point is well taken in that introducing new budget items at this late date is going to have quite a severe impact, and they just learned from a School Board meeting the previous week of a \$50 million cost. She stated that it is important that they get a calendar together, and she understand Ms. Palmer's need about taking advantage of grants, so perhaps a grant calendar of funding issuances could help them make decisions at different times, based on when they can match them. Ms. Galvin added that it is very challenging right now to start changing the budget.

Ms. Palmer said that with the transportation initiatives, they have their respective parks and transportation departments working hard to make everything synch up. She noted that one of the things she would like to see is alignment of CIPs, and perhaps the City Manager and County Executive could direct them in a way to come together at the same time because everyone is working on the same thing and wants the same thing.

Mr. Murphy stated that they are in constant communication between budget offices, parks and rec, etc., and he and Mr. Richardson had some conversations about whether they need to put money in the budget for the lighting at Darden Towe. Mr. Murphy said he does not know how many years he has been part of the budget planning process at the City in which they were not sure if an item was going in for the County. He noted that when he heard the lighting was going to be in the budget for the County, he said this was a time for them to be a partnership and keep it in, so he called Mr. Richardson to confirm it and the item stayed in. Mr. Murphy added that there are a lot of examples out there where they are trying to have that communication.

Ms. Palmer said that maybe some of the priority transportation issues such as multi-modal, if the elected bodies understand that they were all done on both sides, they could move them forward. She added that somehow there was not some coordination that was getting it done as fast as some of them would like, and projects languish for years waiting for money.

Ms. McKeel responded that it is sometimes just a matter of revenue, and part of the advantage is just for them to have the ability to look at their CIPs as a group, and it may be useful for them to go through that exercise at some point.

Ms. Kilroy provided a recap, stating that there should be some reports on the MOUs and their current state and an opportunity for recommendations that would have a joint City-County component to come forward to the two bodies to demonstrate the resources required to move them forward; there would be a CIP meeting potentially in the summertime where the two elected bodies could get together and review their CIPs. She stated that they indicated a desire to look at getting on the same cycle for strategic planning and to explore a joint calendar for some grant opportunities to be able to advance regional projects, and there does seem to be a question about opportunities for collaboration in FY20.

Ms. Palmer stated that Mr. Bellamy brought up the Old Lynchburg Road project and possibly expanding that, because for a transportation alternative grant, they would want a more expanded project, which staff on both sides probably has great ideas about.

Ms. Hill said that as the Mayor stated earlier, there is some interest in understanding what role the County would be willing to play as they move forward in the ABRT process.

Ms. Mallek responded that the Board is waiting to hear what the City comes up with, as she is satisfied with the current approach and if they have changes to propose, the Board needs to hear them as it is not the Board's role to be part of the Council's deliberations.

Ms. Galvin said that this is an invitation to come to a City work session.

Ms. McKeel stated that the Board has not talked about theirs yet.

Ms. Mallek clarified that they have talked about it to the extent they want to do it the same way, and that is a very affirmative decision for this year.

Ms. Walker said that the question is more along the lines of whether they are willing to discuss the possibility of looking at a new process for the ABRT.

Ms. McKeel responded that it would probably take a work session and some understanding of exactly what was proposed, which is what Ms. Mallek alluded to – and the County has not yet discussed the ABRT process to know what the allocations are and what has happened.

Ms. Walker asked if there were any final thoughts or comments. There being none, she opened the meeting to public speakers.

Ms. Mallek asked if anyone wanted to invite staff members who could answer questions or if they just want to do it through the report. Ms. Walker responded that they have said it would happen through the report.

Mr. Randolph agreed that they would not want to get too far into the weeds at this point.

Mr. John Hall, of the Fry's Spring neighborhood, addressed the group and stated that he is running for City Council. He stated that he is very interested in workforce development and working with the Superintendent of Charlottesville City Schools. He said that he is interested in developing an interaction with CATEC and being able to have students apply themselves in the community to have hands-on work with contractors who are working on housing developments and putting the students to work to move Charlottesville forward and help them develop skills.

Regarding affordable housing, Mr. Hall said he has been out in the community and involved with Carlton Views, which is a situation where there are bedbugs. He also talked about how he assisted Mr. Mark Briggs, a community resident with health issues, to move and other needs.

Mr. Peter Krebs, from the Piedmont Environmental Council, addressed the group, thanking them for recognizing mobility needs. He stated that he has talked a lot about bike/pedestrian transportation, but transit was also raised, and this is really important. He said that Board and Council members have spoken about the fact that residents do not know whether they are in the City or the County, and both localities working together on shared projects. He stated that he has had the privilege of working with both staffs, and he has observed a lot of good collaboration between the two groups.

Mr. Krebs said that he also likes the idea of the two groups working together on CIP funding. He added that currently he is trying to create a set of recommendations for the County and trying to make it understandable for the lay reader as to how those things fit together is very difficult because they do not really fit. He suggested that coming back together in the fall and working from a list of fairly good projects in the forthcoming Jefferson Area Bike/Ped Plan, and seeing how they, as a community, can work together and actually collaborate, because that is how they come together as a community.

Mr. Michael Monaco, of Albemarle, addressed the group and said that he was heartened to hear that climate change was such a priority, as it is something that regionally the County and City could work together on – especially when it comes to issues of transportation and greenhouse gasses, but also things like divestment as it is an area where learned lessons could be shared between both jurisdictions. He mentioned that countries such as Ireland have divested from fossil fuels and these are frameworks that exist, so he hopes the County and City could both use these existing frameworks and work together on those things to make the region a positive force in the state and country for climate change.

Ms. McKeel thanked all participants and said she appreciates the opportunity for discussion, noting that she wishes they could do it more often but understands the challenge of getting them all together with their calendars.

Ms. Hill commented that there is a benefit to them getting together in pairs and getting to know each other, sharing priorities and mutual, as well as, individual interests.

Ms. McKeel said that one of the things that has been most informative for her was when she and Mr. Dill took a road trip in their respective districts so they could point out their concerns.

Ms. Palmer noted that in some of their districts, it takes an hour to get from one end to the other.

Ms. Galvin said she wants to make sure the County Executive and City Manager know what to do next.

Mr. Richardson responded that he believes that he and Mr. Murphy have good notes, and there is a report that will come back to the Board and Council. He said that he heard from them that they want a summertime opportunity for them to get together, with the reports provided far in advance of that.

Ms. Walker thanked everyone for attending.

Mr. Gallaway expressed appreciation for everyone taking the time to participate in the meeting. It has been productive.

January 30, 2019 (Adjourned Meeting)
(Page 11)

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn to February 6, 2019, 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 8:00 p.m., Mr. Gallaway adjourned the Board meeting to February 6, 2019, 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

Ms. Walker adjourned the City Council meeting.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 06/05/2019
Initials CKB