

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on July 10, 2019, at 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from July 9, 2019.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Mr. Ned Gallaway, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer and Mr. Rick Randolph (arrived at 1:05 p.m.).

ABSENT: None.

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

STAFF PRESENT: Deputy County Executive, Doug Walker, Assistant County Executive, Trevor Henry, Director, Office of Economic Development, Roger Johnson, Director, Office of Management and Budget, Lori Allshouse, Director, Communications and Public Engagement, Emily Kilroy, and Senior Budget Analyst, Tia Mitchell.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m., by the Chair, Mr. Gallaway.

Introductions

Mr. Gallaway recognized the presiding security officer, Sgt. Roger Snodgrass, Board members and staff at the dais.

Agenda Item No. 2. Meeting Overview.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that in January 2019, The CIP Oversight Committee (OC), which includes two members of the School Board, two members of the Board of Supervisors, a member of the Planning Commission, and a citizen representative, recommended that the OC hold a discussion with the Board of Supervisors and the School Board in May or June to: conduct a shared strategic visioning session, allow both Boards to learn what the capital needs are for local government and for the schools, clarify shared priorities, discuss ways to prioritize the projects in the CIP in consideration of possible revenue fluctuations (such as revenue downturn or unexpected revenue growth) that may occur in the future, and to consider reconceptualizing the way the County approaches planning for capital and operating budgets.

On March 20, 2019, the Board of Supervisors began planning ahead for the FY 21 - FY 25 CIP development process and directed staff to schedule a work session for the Board of Supervisors, the School Board and the OC in May or June 2019 pursuant to the OC's recommendation.

On May 9, 2019, the Board of Supervisors, the School Board, and the CIP OC held a work session and continued working together towards addressing the community's capital needs, identified CIP affordability constraints, reconceptualized the way the County approaches planning for capital and operating budgets, reviewed the Public Private Education Act (PPEA) project guidelines, and approved a new CIP development process for FY 21 - FY 25.

On June 6, 2019, the Board of Supervisors held a joint work session with Charlottesville's City Council. During the work session, the Board and Council reviewed jointly-funded capital projects that have been recently completed, were underway, and those included in the jurisdictions' FY 20 - FY 24 CIPs. Board and Council members also discussed opportunities to connect on capital projects in the future and have planned to meet again for further discussion on September 9, 2019.

Per the FY 21 - FY 25 CIP development process approved on May 9, a work session will be held on July 10 from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. for the Board to prioritize General Government Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects in preparation for the joint Board/School Board Joint Work Session on the FY 21-FY 25 CIP that is planned for September 2019.

Attachment A includes a draft agenda for the work session. Attachment B includes a diagram of the FY 21 – FY 25 CIP Development Process approved on May 9. A packet that includes summaries of the capital projects and other materials that will be discussed during the July 10 Board meeting will be distributed to the Board of Supervisors on July 3.

The County's CIP serves as a planning and implementation tool for the acquisition, development, construction, maintenance, and renovation of public facilities, infrastructure, and capital equipment for a five-year period.

Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors utilize this work session to prioritize General Government Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects in preparation for the joint Board/School Board Joint Work Session on the FY 21-FY 25 CIP that is planned for September 2019.

Ms. Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, introduced the meeting topic, which was FY21–25 CIP priorities on a work session basis. She said that the desired outcome was to prioritize General Government Capital Improvement Plan projects in preparation for the September Joint School Board work session on the FY21–25 CIP.

Ms. Allshouse explained the planned agenda for the meeting. She said she would provide a brief recap of the May meeting with the School Board and the reason for her attendance at the present meeting; provide an overview of today's process; speak about capacity for community initiatives consideration; and review projects with staff members for question and answer panels. She said there would be 12 staff members involved in the presentation and conversation, approaching the microphone at various times and organized in a way to provide good discussion for the Board, and for Board members to have their questions answered before participating in a prioritization exercise at the end of the work session.

Ms. Allshouse provided a quick recap of the joint meeting the Board of Supervisors held with the School Board in May. She said at this meeting, the Board and School Board approved a FY21–25 CIP development process that was very different from the process in the past. She refreshed Board members about starting off the process with a CIP affordability discussion, and that between June and August, the School Board was receiving results from the Long Range Planning Committee on its priorities from their work sessions. Ms. Allshouse said that General Government would be presenting various projects to the Board at today's meeting for Supervisors to prioritize. She explained that this was being done so that when the Supervisors meet with the School Board in September, they can have a joint meeting to share one another's priorities and discuss joint shared priorities for the community, with some planning ahead.

Ms. Allshouse further explained that in October, the Advisory Committee (the Oversight Committee, as far as membership) will take the information from the joint meeting, look at scenarios and perform some modeling. She said the committee would be considering the capacity cap, or the capacity of affordability piece of the process, as they model the scenarios.

Ms. Allshouse said there would then be a joint work session again in November, at which point the Board of Supervisors would also be considering the long-range operating plans for the County, as well as long-range capital planning. She said the Board would finalize the recommended five-year CIP and adopt its FY20–FY 21 capital budget in April with the regular budget process.

Ms. Allshouse noted that one thing she wanted to add to the process, which was not seen at the May meeting, was meeting with the City Council (which was done in May) again in September. She explained that the September meeting was added to the process. She added that the Board has spoken with the City Council about capital projects, planning, and budgeting.

Ms. Allshouse suggested that, because the Planning Commission was very interested in the process, so staff plans to meet with them in August to share the new process. She said that after the joint work session in which priorities are shared, information would be shared with the Planning Commission. She said that the Commission may have another role in the Board's process in the future, based on their long-range planning and how they like to think ahead, and think of the County in the longest planning horizons. Ms. Allshouse asked the Board to consider this as they move forward.

(Note: Mr. Randolph arrived at 1:05 p.m.)

Ms. Mallek suggested the Planning Commission be invited to attend the joint meeting with the School Board. She said this would not necessarily mean they all are present, but that they would be invited and could have representation there if they chose to attend.

Ms. Allshouse continued her presentation, stating that in May, the Board had a conversation and established a CIP affordability cap. She said the Board looked ahead and based on modeling scenarios and assumptions built in models, working side by side with the School Board, looked at where things should be in five years. She noted this was for planning purposes, and the guidance received by staff was to not add more than \$61 million in capital projects over the next seven years. Ms. Allshouse reminded the Board that they had looked at a seven-year window at that point, and there would be an equivalent tax rate potential (based on assumptions) of up to 4.5 cents to 6 cents on the tax rate. Ms. Allshouse said that, speaking to a five-year window, for the FY21–25 CIP time period, based on the modeling, it would be about \$55 million in that five-year period. She said she wanted to share with the Board the affordability conversation they had at the beginning and how important this was to staff as they consider the CIP moving forward.

Mr. Richardson said that in the spirit of conversations he has had with Mr. Bill Letteri, Chief Finance Officer, they are modeling and making assumptions. He said looking at the parentheses of the equivalent tax rate increase estimated (between 4.5 cents and 6 cents), this is simply an approximation, but even within this number, a better than expected performing economy could move the figure down, and things that are beyond their knowledge base as it relates to the economy (both nationally and at a local level), the picture over the next 12-24 months could change. He said that positive growth and vibrancy has been experienced in the community over the past several years. Mr. Richardson said that he believes if Mr. Letteri was at the podium, he would caution the Board on viewing those numbers as concrete, as there are things that could happen that could move the numbers in each direction, and he does not wish for the numbers to sway the Board unduly.

Ms. McKeel said that, from a positive direction, this is one of the reasons why there is a focus on

economic development.

Ms. Allshouse also noted that there was currently a FY20–FY 24 CIP, with \$207.6 million in it. She said the current CIP has certain projects in it, and there would not be discussion today about taking anything out or exchanging anything in the plan, though it could be considered in the future. She referred to Appendix I, with the current CIP, reference document that includes maintenance and replacement, courts project, \$6 million in Parks and Recreation projects that was approved as part of the last process, \$6 million in bike-ped projects, four years of ACE funding, \$2 million reserve for advancing strategic priorities, evidence storage facility study (funded in 2019 and being done currently) which would be discussed later in the meeting, one year of transportation leveraging funding in the first year, and a bridge year of water resource funding. Ms. Allshouse noted that these were the highlights, and the document contains other replacement and projects in it.

Ms. Allshouse next discussed FY21–25 CIP Program and Projects. She said before beginning, she wants to share a quick overview of phrases that would be used as well as ways they would be working in the work session together. She said the term “project” could be a program or a project, and more technically has a start date and an end date. She said sometimes there are programs in the CIP, such as the transportation leveraging program, but when the CIP refers to a “project,” it is referring to both projects and programs. She said with regard to costs, there are broad price tags associated with the items, explaining that these are initial broad estimates over a five-year period; they are not annual costs. She said the costs are very initial and scalable, meaning the programs could be moved more quickly or slowly, the dollar amounts can be changed. She also noted that many of the projects can be phased without necessarily going to a final phase. Ms. Allshouse said there would be conversation about phasing in the Parks and Recreation time period.

Ms. Allshouse noted that a star may be seen on some of the presentation slides, as well as in the booklet. She said the gold star indicates a connection to a very specific strategic plan priority. She said the priorities are listed in an appendix in the booklet, and if a star is seen on the right top portion of the page, everything on the page supports the Board’s strategic plan priorities. Ms. Allshouse said there are some places on the presentation slides where a star can be seen beside a certain item.

Ms. Allshouse mentioned that there would be comments from many staff members, and the panels are for questions and answers. She said there would be four panels, with a total of 12 staff members who would be interacting with the Supervisors. She explained that this would be an interactive conversation with discussion and question and answers, with little emphasis on presentation. She also said these panels would be timed carefully to ensure everyone has a chance to ask questions and approach the podium, as well as have time at the end for discussion and wrap-ups. Ms. Allshouse advised that the panels would be moved along to keep with the timing.

Ms. Allshouse asked if there were any questions on the process before getting started.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the star could be clarified as to whether it appears in the booklet or presentation. Ms. Allshouse responded that the stars are not actually used in the booklet, but at the bottom of each page, there is a note called “Strategic Plan Priority” and a description of how it hits the priority. She explained that this is more narrative in the booklet, and the stars would appear on the slides.

Mr. Randolph said he hopes that during this time, given the staggering limitation of the capital capabilities of the County over the next five years, there could also be discussion about ways the Board and County can leverage funds through private-public partnerships and State funding to try to achieve some of the goals and objectives that are part of the strategic plan, so they are not limited by the capital figure. He said the County should look for every way possible to achieve a multiplier effect with the funds projected they will need over the next five years. Ms. Allshouse responded that on each page in the booklet, when staff has identified grants and the like, these are noted.

Ms. McKeel thanked Ms. Allshouse and said that she was glad to find the strategic plan priority listing at the bottom of the booklet, and it was really helpful being able to connect this information.

Mr. Gallaway said he wants to reinforce the process to help guide Supervisors, as any of the topics listed could easily throw the planned timing off the rails. He said that the Supervisors typically ask quick, clarifying questions but if there are real questions that would involve a thorough answer, these might be noted with answers brought back to the Board at a later time. He said the idea is to get the Board’s input out without necessarily receiving all the feedback immediately.

Ms. Allshouse started the presentation. She pointed to the Guiding Principles listed on page 4 in the booklet, noting that these are the principles that led to an old process in which the TRC used a scoring matrix based on the principles that were used in the County for a long time. She said that these guiding principles have been used to select projects by the County in the past and are still very relevant today. Ms. Allshouse said the principles talk about maintaining public safety; supporting the strategic plan; quality of life; the maintenance of critical County investments; providing facilities and enhanced customer service and employee productivity; incorporating energy efficiency and technology into projects; pursue innovative funding approaches, such as public-private partnerships, collaboration with schools, and shared space with non-profits; and leveraging federal, state, and other local funding. She stressed the importance of these principles as the Board considers projects.

Agenda Item No. 3. **Work Session:** Review and Discussion of Capital Project Request Submittals.

Ms. Allshouse introduced Ms. Emily Kilroy, who would be sharing consideration for reserving capacity for community initiatives.

Ms. Kilroy, Director of Communications and Public Engagement, said that before taking a deep dive into the projects that staff has flagged as capital needs over the five-year planning horizon, she would take a few minutes to talk about a group of capital stakeholders that sometimes comes before the Board. She said these stakeholders are broadly described as community, whether they are residents themselves, agencies, or community partners. She said that from time to time, capital requests come in outside of the CIP process, and over the years they have included projects such as the YMCA, library projects, and Claudius Crozet Park (coming before the Board next month). Ms. Kilroy said the NIFI program could perhaps fit into this category, if there was interest in doing a similar process in the future. She said these types of projects can bring matching funds, and even multiplier funds, along with them.

Ms. Kilroy stated that these requests are somewhat distinct from what comes inside of the traditional CIP process. Ms. Kilroy said that for five-year CIP planning purposes for FY21–25, staff recommends consideration for reserving some capacity for this category. She said staff recommends a range of \$2 million to \$5 million to achieve this, which would allow some capacity for when these types of projects come forward. She said if the Board endorses identifying capacity for community initiatives, staff would come back with a process by which these types of requests could be evaluated. Ms. Kilroy said whether this looks similar to what is done with agency funding through the ABRT process or another model, there would be some process in which to receive and review these types of requests.

Ms. Kilroy asked the Board if it would like staff to identify some capacity for these types of projects.

Mr. Randolph said his comment is that the cart is being put before the horse. He said the “horse” that needs to go out on the track is a SWOT review of NIFI from 2016, and to look at strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and risks associated with it. He said it was extremely staff intensive and before the Board ventures into this, there needs to be some analysis, because it will send a significant message if the Board says “yes” right now and it would raise expectations that this would be followed up with funding commitment. Mr. Randolph said he thinks there would be a huge benefit for the Board to hit a pause button and take a close look at how the program works, its strengths and its weaknesses. Ms. Kilroy clarified that this was one illustration of the types of things that might be looked at for this type of funding, if it was available, and it does not mean another NIFI process would necessarily be moved forward.

Ms. McKeel asked if the Board decided they wanted to have some sort of capacity like this, and later decided to pursue a NIFI, the Board could do what Mr. Randolph is suggesting. She said that what Ms. Kilroy has said was not being ruled out. Ms. Kilroy responded that as the County is halfway through its implementation of the NIFI projects, she believes further analysis of what it looks like on the other side would be planned.

Mr. Richardson said that several years ago, there was discussion of budget strategy and sustaining high-quality organization, which has to do with looking at day-to-day foundational work, volume, and customer service. He said the second point in that discussion was reserving dedicated funding in the budget for moving strategic initiatives forward, and the third point was retaining some level of capacity. He addressed Mr. Gallaway specifically, reminding him that he had said to ensure that the Board does not commit all of its capacity. He said what drove this discussion was Biscuit Run, during which the Board was working diligently with the state, and this was an emerging opportunity.

Mr. Richardson stated that there are several other examples like this, and this was something for the Board to consider. He said at the end of the last budget, and recently discussed, there was \$2 million reserved for strategic initiatives meaning that, after July 1, the Board can look at how to wrap up the strategic plan and finish the year. Mr. Richardson said that the Supervisors are all considering things they may want to dedicate some of the one-time \$2 million portion to that is more Board driven. He said these projects are somewhat like this, but different in a sense that the Board was planning for those in the future, and there could be opportunities that come that require match money or leveraging money and would be more prepared to discuss it.

Mr. Randolph said he agrees with that goal and objective described by Mr. Richardson, but the way this reads with community-initiated capital requests and potential future program such as NIFI that could be funded with year-end funding if available, it looks very much like NIFI. He said he believes government is very good at replicating programs that are initiated, but not always good at analyzing programs to determine if they should be replicated in the same way the second time through. He added that the Board must be very careful to not unintentionally send a message to various CACs that there is money that would be heading in their direction because looking at this program it may be determined that if, in fact, the Board want to do something similar in terms of neighborhood based, it may be done much more competitively the next time around, rather than having a dedicated sum per each master plan area. Mr. Randolph said it could be more competitive, as it often is in the funding world, and the Board must be very careful about the messages it is sending so that people do not jump to conclusions based on that.

Ms. Palmer said she would agree with Mr. Randolph’s assessment of the slide, but she appreciates Mr. Richardson’s comments. She said perhaps towards the end of the meeting, the Board

may be able to give more direction about \$2 million to \$5 million, but that it is important to have a reserve for contingency for things that come up.

Mr. Randolph said he thinks everyone could agree to that.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would also be supportive of the idea.

Ms. Mallek said this is something that is dealt with after the audit, and she is not ready to decide about this priority.

Ms. McKeel agreed and said she does not wish to simply put the subject away without revisiting it again.

Mr. Dill said he agrees that flexibility should be kept. He said the two NIFI projects in his district did very well, and he leans towards NIFI as a positive thing, adding that they are hard to analyze in terms of dollars and cents as they have much to do with community spirit and giving the community a voice in planning. He said he sees this as dealing with much more than just NIFI, and it deals with other community initiated projects that could come up in many different ways, with ever-changing technologies and the like. Mr. Dill said he thinks the Board should particularly look at projects that have some kind of payback or solves a problem, such as environmental projects that have return on investment, with energy savings, rather than simply having ongoing expenses to take care of.

Ms. Mallek said that while she was not sure which category that Mr. Richardson described it belongs in, for places that are not in the growth areas or the community CAC areas. She said both she and Mr. Dill have raised a safety issue at the intersection in Earlysville where VDOT finally, after five years, came up with the idea that if the County can contribute \$80,000, they would be able to implement something outside of the normal program to prevent fatal accidents. She said this type of project is not on the list but is an appropriate way to talk about ways to improve safety in the community. Ms. Mallek said that citizens have certainly brought up the idea, making it community driven in that regard as opposed to something that originates from County staff.

Mr. Dill added that he agrees with Mr. Randolph's concern with replicating programs without analyzing them but noted that the Board could also fall into the trap of only following programs that are currently in existence. He said the capacity gives the Board more flexibility and ability to react at greater speed if something comes up that does not rise to the emergency level (which is what the reserves are for) but is a pressing need that could be addressed. He said when he sees community initiated capital requests, these are the things that come to mind, and not necessarily the process of the community taking on an endeavor to come up with something, but that there is something that comes up that the Board must address.

Ms. McKeel agreed.

Mr. Randolph said he agrees, and that "reserved for contingency" is a good spot to have available.

Ms. Allshouse said that Mr. Walker would come forward to move into panel discussions, with the first topic being public safety.

Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, said he would be introducing two public safety projects, the first of which was Police Evidence Processing and Specialty Vehicle Storage Facilities (page 6). He said this project is to construct a 7,200 square foot covered facility to store police specialty and seized vehicles, material, and to provide a place for forensic vehicle processing. He said that Deputy Police Chief K.C. Carr would be able to answer any questions on this project.

Mr. Walker introduced the second public safety project, a fire-rescue training center Phase I, to replace the burn building. He said the project is to replace the aging, existing residential burn building, including improved parking and connection to utilities including water, sewer, gas, and electrical utilities (page 7). He said that Deputy Chief John Oprandy would be able to answer any questions on this project.

Mr. Gallaway asked the Supervisors if they had any questions.

Ms. Mallek asked if a location has been determined for the vehicle storage project. She said that years ago, the CIP committee had ideas about making a covered deck over the current area by the police building, since the parking lot is already there. Ms. Carr responded that the study has not yet been done to determine the location.

Ms. Palmer noted that the identification of the location would affect the price, and it was unknown at this point how it would affect the price. Ms. Carr responded that they do have an estimate, but not firm costs.

Mr. Randolph commented that the Police Department received \$50,000 in the previous fiscal year for the design for the storage facility.

Ms. Palmer said that in regard to the fire-rescue training center, there are often comments that the Fire Department should practice on old barns and buildings. She asked how often this actually happens. She also asked if the training center existed, should the Board assume that the Fire Department

would be looking for older buildings that people in the community may want to have taken care of, that meet the qualifications he specified. Mr. Oprandy responded that finding a live burn building was always beneficial. He said this project would replace the existing burn building that is in a considerable state of disrepair, is high maintenance and not functional, and has associated safety concerns. Ms. Palmer said she assumes if it was replaced, it would be replaced by a better one with more opportunities.

Mr. Randolph asked if Mr. Oprandy could explain, given this is Phase I, how many phases would be needed, and what exactly Phase I would entail. Mr. Oprandy said there was a study done last year and the study broke the project down into four phases. He said the Department is actually suggesting five phases. He said the first phase would be both site work and replacing the existing residential burn building. Mr. Oprandy said the site was never master planned, and so it has been used in an ad-hoc manner. He said there are many safety concerns in terms of a lack of parking and of facilities, as well as runoff was a problem. He said they have students that have problems parking and have been stuck in ditches many times. Mr. Oprandy said this phase would take care of all the of existing site prep, and replacing the existing building. He said the next phase would involve a classroom storage building that would be specific to all the training requirements, with all equipment necessary to conduct classes. He said another phase would add a commercial burn building, and the last phase would be finishing the outdoor training areas that are necessary all on the existing site.

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. Oprandy thoughts as to if the fire rescue training center was completed, it would be an opportunity for regional counties that may not have as elaborate of training center to be able to use at a per diem. Mr. Oprandy responded, "yes" and said that the study looked at regional possibilities and concluded that Nelson County and Greene County do not have their own facilities and may be more interested in using Albemarle's. He said the City of Charlottesville also was interested. He said at this point, there has been discussion about usage fees, but have not been involved in the projects in terms of committing CIP funds.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarity in the remark about \$5 million total, and if this was only for Phase I. Mr. Oprandy responded that it was \$13.5 million total over a five-year period. Ms. McKeel asked if the five phases totaled over \$13 million. Mr. Oprandy responded, "yes".

Mr. Randolph asked if Mr. Oprandy would like to achieve the goal of having the entire \$13.5 million expended over the course of the next five years. Mr. Oprandy responded, "no", it would be over the next ten years, and the \$5 million would be looked at over the next five years.

Ms. Mallek asked about the trailer that was bought on the CIP that was then discovered was not needed because the accreditation had been achieved on the new building, which was surprise. She asked for a present-day status on this. Mr. Oprandy said the building itself is inspected every five years. He said they inspected another building around the same period of time and found that another significant renovation would be necessary. He said last year, they anticipated that this might have to be done, considering the condition of the building, and it was suggested that a new facility be built, with the mobile facility to use in the meantime while the existing burn building is being replaced. Mr. Oprandy said this would serve two purposes: to use while the existing building is being replaced, and to have a mobile facility to move around town. He said they found out that they could do a minimal amount of renovations and have the burn building done in another five years. He said inevitably, the new building will come and, in the meantime, the mobile facility is available.

Ms. Allshouse said she has just been told the microphone was not connected to the system, and that the speakers would have to come up to the podium.

Ms. McKeel asked for the cost of the mobile facility. Mr. Oprandy said the cost of the mobile facility was around \$100,000, but he would have to find out for sure.

Mr. Gallaway said he has a general comment and was not necessarily looking for a response. He asked what the lifespan of the evidence-processing and specialty vehicle facility would be if \$3 million was spent on it. He asked if, in the analyses of the projects, there was a way to determine how many years would a certain cost buy before a facility is outgrown. Mr. Gallaway said this has come up in the past where school projects were reduced during bad economic times, and then the County suffers because they did not get the capacity timeframe they had hoped for with the original scope of projects. He said this thought came up in considering the storage facility, where there is currently a place now that has been outgrown. He said that while he understands the need to build a new facility, it would be helpful to understand what a cost would buy as far as a timeframe. Mr. Gallaway said he hopes this kind of thinking would be put as a through line in all projects and for future planning.

Mr. Randolph said the only problem with something like police evidence processing is that all things must be done equal, because if the Board and the Police Department said that body cameras were absolutely a value, then the whole process of storing video tape and recording where the tapes are and cataloguing them is a significant increase in terms of evidence processing and facility requirements. He said the Police Department currently cannot project those kinds of things, and that there may be other similar technology-based expectations in police work that are currently unknown but could become a requirement in five years. He said Mr. Gallaway's point was well taken, but the dynamic of public accountability for police departments was subject to change and subject to altering community perceptions and expectations of police work and a need to be responsive, with tremendous burdens on local government as a result.

Mr. Dill commented that some kind of estimate needs to be made, however.

Ms. Carr said this would be something to look into in the feasibility study when it is ready, because there is possibly an opportunity to have specialty vehicles from the Sheriff's Department stored at the facility, as well as possibly at the Fire Department. She said trying to anticipate the future, whether it is technology that would necessitate using the current facilities at the Police Department and shifting some of the evidence stored there to that particular site. She said there is a focus on the vehicles, and the vehicle maintenance facility was actually established as a temporary fix for accreditation but is not serving the Police Department well at this point.

Ms. Allshouse said the presentation would move on, as there are several more projects to discuss. She said Mr. Henry would come forward to discuss facilities and environmental services, with seven projects to discuss.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Assistant County Executive, said that Mr. Lance Stewart, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services, and Mr. Greg Harper, Chief of the Environmental Services Division, would be available to answer any questions. He said he would provide a surface level view of the projects, and noted that while there are many projects listed, many are actually programs that request recurring funding that would then drive actual projects, and many of them are scalable.

Mr. Henry said the first project is the Climate Action Plan Implementation, \$5 million (page 8). He said Climate Action Plan work is underway, and the plan update would be in front of the Board in the fall, with decisions made hopefully later in the fall on Phase I. He said the funding is programmed to enable work with partnering agencies and incentivize private investment, as well as to find low-hanging fruit to add energy efficiency to County-owned facilities.

Mr. Henry said the second project or program is the Total Maximum Daily Load, (TMDL) \$2.5 million (page 9). He said this program has been in place since 2014, and great strides have been made in reducing the pollutant load as mandated by DEQ and in the Chesapeake Bay. He said that there are programming numbers to continue the effort. He said there has been great success with drawing down some matching funding from the state, and that he anticipates being able to continue doing this.

Mr. Henry said the third project on the list is the Drainage Infrastructure Maintenance Repair Program, \$6.3 million (page 10). He said Mr. Harper and Mr. Stewart would be in front of the Board next Wednesday to have a work session and a deeper dive into this program. He said this is looking at the development area analysis, and the bridge year funding is covering the video of the current gray infrastructure happening now, and options are being developed on levels of service. He added that this is a programming number that would reflect it.

Mr. Henry spoke to the street sweeper machine, \$375,000 (page 11). He said a year ago, the strategic plan identified increases in levels of service within the development area. He said one of the things that was proposed and funded by the Board was some money to do a pilot on our street sweeping. He said staff has been working urgently with the City of Charlottesville to partner on a pilot in one piece of the urban ring area. Mr. Henry said that while progress is being made, they still have not been able to get the program across the board. He said this acknowledges what would be the County's first step into public works where they would purchase their own equipment and have control over where that service is provided. He said this is reflected in the material, based on the Board's discussions from previous strategic plans.

Mr. Randolph remarked that the presentation says, "purchase of a street sweeper," and asked if there has also been thought into leasing a street sweeper. He also asked if any counties or cities are utilizing a private company and contracting with them to provide a street sweeper service. Mr. Henry responded that he believes the answer to be "yes" and added that Mr. Stewart would elaborate.

Mr. Henry continued his presentation and said a programming project has been added for what would be the third recycling center in the region, \$1.3 million (page 12). He said that the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RWSA) is designing one for the Ivy location, and this new facility would be an opportunity to look north or south in the County.

Mr. Henry said the Facilities Master Plan work is underway, and there is much involved as far as the County Office Building, \$4.5 million (page 14). He said this plan anticipates recommendations to approve facilities and better optimize the County's customer service interaction with the public.

Mr. Henry turned the presentation over to questions and answers and asked if Mr. Stewart could answer Mr. Randolph's earlier question.

Mr. Dill said it seems as though many of the public works projects intersect with VDOT and wondered how much oversight VDOT has over activities such as street sweeping. Mr. Henry responded that VDOT does have a street sweeping program, and they come into Albemarle County about once a year and manages infrastructure throughout the state. He said there has been contact with VDOT to determine if their resource can be leveraged. He said they have also talked with the City about leasing. He said from a VDOT perspective, the street sweeping program could be augmented without any issues. Mr. Henry said the County does have a permit with VDOT that allows them to enhance the landscaping and mowing within the urban ring areas, and that it would be a matter of coordinating with VDOT on any expansion. He said VDOT would let the County do as much as they wanted to do in terms of maintenance of our infrastructure. Mr. Dill said he wondered if the County gets any credit for these types of activities, citing medians and landscaping on Rio Road. Mr. Henry said the County does not necessarily receive credit, but more frequent interaction allows better customer service and feedback

from the community.

Mr. Lance Stewart, Facilities and Environmental Services Director, introduced himself and offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Randolph noted that water quality is implicit in the Climate Action Plan, and one of the things to achieve is to improve the quality of the water that is flowing out of the County's tributaries and into the James River and the Chesapeake Bay. He said it is intrinsically linked into drainage infrastructure as well. He said his hope going forward is that water quality and TMDL would be treated similarly to the other projects as part as the first objective in terms of an action plan to address an environmental issue. Mr. Randolph said this is a project in which results could be dramatically presented in a short order. He added that he was intrigued to see in the local news this week that the James River Association attributed the increase to nutrient loading into the Rivanna and thereby into the James River, and held the cities mainly responsible, indicating that there was runoff coming from urban centers. He said the reality is they are not phosphorus and nitrogen loading centers for the most part. He said there is some fertilizer that comes from the suburban complexes, but there are also agricultural contributions there. Mr. Randolph said he believes water quality is very important and would hate to see TMDL left out in prioritization as it is also important.

Ms. Mallek added that all four of the projects at the top of the list are linked together, and all the investments come back to benefit other parts of the categories.

Ms. Palmer asked if the County was still discussing the street sweeper with the City of Charlottesville.

Ms. McKeel said she has been involved with the program along with Mr. Stewart, and her impression is that this would be something good for the Board of Supervisors to push in its joint meetings with the City Councilors to get the City staff to work with the County. She said the County was hopeful, but did not get exactly what they were hoping for. She said, however, that she did speak to two City Councilors who were very interested, and Mr. Stewart has some thoughts on the program. Ms. McKeel said that one of the problems in the urban ring and what the street sweeper would address is litter. She said there was also trouble with unsightly grass and weeds growing in intersections and in the middle of the road. She said Mr. Stewart explained to her that there is a way to hire a company to seal the cracks of the road to avoid this. Ms. McKeel suggested that this be looked at as a greater partnership with the City, but that their attention has to be captured on the matter.

Ms. Mallek said that perhaps in the next six months, a partnership could be worked out, but otherwise the County needs to move on with the work.

Ms. McKeel said there has been a struggle for a while, but her hope is that there is a new City administration and things would change. She said this would be something to discuss at a joint meeting in the future.

Mr. Randolph said he thinks it would be useful, when discussing this program in greater depth, if the Board could be provided with some insights as to if there are any counties or cities that have a lease arrangement on the street sweeper vehicles. He said he was not so concerned about purchasing the vehicle, but rather was concerned with maintenance of the vehicle, having grown up in Philadelphia and watching these types of vehicles regularly break down, and noted they are also subject to getting clogged. He suggested looking at a lease and a third-party contract arrangement for a company to come into the area to perform the work.

Mr. Stewart said that before the staff knew they would receive funding for the program, one of the first things they investigated was outsourcing. He said that though it is rare for localities to hire street sweepers, there are firms that do this work and they are primarily located in Northern Virginia and on the coast. He said that the time for these firms to travel, haul and set up machines, would incur a \$72,000 cost at only one frequency a year for a small subset of roads.

Mr. Randolph said that if the County sought to do a lease arrangement or third-party contract, it might be an entrepreneurial opportunity to set up a street sweeper business to meet the needs, and especially if the City was to participate with the County. Mr. Stewart said he has approached contractors who he thought might be well suited to this type of work, and they all said they could not find enough people to stay to keep their current jobs going in this market, and that taking on an additional commitment was not interesting to them.

Ms. McKeel said this is an area where the County has borders with the City, and that the County needs to press working with the City, as the City has a lot of equipment and crews. She said she does believe there is interest from the City, but that it is a matter of capturing their attention.

Mr. Stewart said that he was meeting with the City on the following day to discuss this program and expressed the hope of getting at least a preliminary run through some key parts of the County to test some assumptions that they may base the pilot on. He said for the City, it is a matter of opportunity costs, and that all the work the County would want them to do is early in the morning, as street sweepers go 8 to 10 mph and would not want to stop traffic. He said the City's street sweeping program starts at 3:30 a.m., so anything they would do for the County would need to be done either in overtime or on a weekend, or they would have to sacrifice the frequencies to which they sweep their own street. Mr. Stewart said the opportunity costs are being explored.

Ms. McKeel asked if it would be helpful if the Board wrote a letter to City Council requesting a partnership with the County. Mr. Richardson said he would make a point to reach out to the City Manager. He said that Mr. Stewart is meeting with the City staff later in the week, and they would make the City aware that the Board of Supervisors would like to speak to them about it again in September.

Ms. Palmer said she would like to speak about the recycling center. She said when she read through the description, she saw nothing about collecting trash, and for several years she has been speaking about a facility that would take recycling and trash. She said the County has a 720+ square mile county with one place to put trash, which is why this project was important to do. She said she wants to be clear that it is her expectation and if it is the Board's expectation, this should be cleared up.

Ms. Palmer noted that in speaking with Mr. Phil McKalips at RWSA, she does not believe the size of the facility would change much based on what was given in regard to price, and that is part of the County's interest in giving residents another place to drop their trash so that the County may possibly reduce illegal dumping. She added that the price, especially the operational costs, would be reflected in where the County decides to put the facility, and even in the quantity of material, be it recycling, or trash picked up, would be different depending on the location chosen. Ms. Palmer said she understands there would have to be work done to determine the best location, but wants to note that it is a priority to her in that there is only one place to dump trash, versus Augusta County, which has 11, and Nelson County, which has 6, without the locations necessarily being staffed.

Mr. Randolph observed that once a commitment was made whether the new center goes north or south, conflict would ensue because whichever of the two sections does not get the center will be urging the Board to provide funding for a center in their area. He said the County needs to be realistic that this initiative would not be finished with only one center, and that two centers would likely be required as indicated by the study done for the Board in 2015.

Mr. Dill said 29 North is a designated growth area, and there should be no question that the center should be located in the northern part of the County.

Ms. Palmer said she believes this would be reflected in the size.

Ms. Allshouse said there are nine more projects to present and asked if the presentation could continue.

Mr. Gallaway said he would like to make one comment about the Climate Action Plan. He said when looking at the scope and reading the description, the piece on "improve efficiency of County-owned assets" is clear as to where money gets directed and how it is spent. He said the specific strategies, however, are less clear in that regard, and since this is the top strategy, it should be abundantly clear where the money is going and how it will be used. He added that it was very easy from a political standpoint to support or deny climate action planning, and the County should be able to show that the dollars are spent in a way that makes sense and achieves results.

Ms. Mallek said that some of the money being included in the plan is for public buildings and public facilities, and the number one bullet is for helping people so that someone with limited means can be able to pay for improvements to energy efficiency by reducing their utility costs. She said it is not just wealthy folks who get to experience the benefit, but the people who need it the most.

Mr. Gallaway noted that the County should be extra careful to tell the story of the dollars.

Ms. Mallek added that since this has been going on for four years, there are many documents that have been amassed in regard to what others are investing in, and the County can be expected to have the same.

Mr. Stewart said the staff would be coming to the Board in late August or early September with the initial findings of the Climate Action planning process and they discussed earlier in the process that there would be opportunities that were immediately actionable. He said when he comes back to the Board, he hopes to have a dozen or more opportunities that are well-defined in terms of what would be required to implement them, as well as the return on investment, to give guidance to the Board in determining whether to proceed with some or all of the projects in the near term.

Mr. Henry introduced Bob Crickenberger, Director of Parks and Recreation, and Amy Smith, Assistant Director, and said they would be able to answer questions. He noted that the Board found in work sessions in the past year approximately \$2.2 million towards Biscuit Run to allow access to the park. He said it was an entrance with limited parking, would allow for a soft opening, and it would follow the phases of the master plan. Mr. Henry also noted that under the Greenways and Blueways projects, one of the items was the connector from Biscuit Run to the urban area. He said staff was looking at the potential for carry forward money, about \$260,000, that they may be able to use to accomplish the connector.

Mr. Randolph asked about the figure under Phase IB and II, and Phase IB, II and III are cumulative, and does not add up to a total of \$57 million over \$62 million, but that the total cost for full build out was \$36.4 million.

Mr. Henry said this may be confusing, but staff wanted to be sure the Board understands that the way the phasing is laid out, Phase II cannot start without completing the previous phase.

Ms. Mallek said she wants to clarify that Buck Island was in process for the driveway for FY 2019 money. Mr. Crickenberger responded, “no”, that was scheduled for 2021 for the driveway access and for a launch as well.

Ms. Mallek said there has been talk over the past four to five years about improvements to access at Sugar Hollow to control the crowding and impedance of emergency vehicles, with a possible parking lot and gate closure for the northern road, etc. She said she was unsure of which category this work would belong in, because it belongs in public safety as much as it belong in parks. She said to put this in a list so that when, if there are shared costs that need to come forward for that with Rivanna and the City, this has already been considered. Ms. Mallek said there are continually 300 cars on a Sunday afternoon completely blocking emergency and ambulance vehicles, and apparently a new rope swing has been put up there, too.

Mr. Richardson said that he has a meeting scheduled with the County Executive Office and the Police Department for the following Saturday to go out and refamiliarize themselves with the layout of Sugar Hollow. He said he also has a discussion scheduled with the Rivanna’s Director and the Police Department was also seeking to learn from the trip that would be taken that weekend. He said their findings would be reported back to keep Parks and Recreation in the loop and come back to the Board of Supervisors at the appropriate time with some creative solutions.

Mr. Crickenberger said it would also be helpful at some point to engage the City in the discussion as well, as there has been previous discussion, but no progress was ever made.

Ms. Mallek said the house is gone now, which was a step that was taken. Mr. Crickenberger recalled that this was where a proposed parking lot would be located and would block off the entrance from that point on.

Ms. Mallek noted the section of the report about pickleball courts and asked if fundraising for the users had been successful. Ms. Smith responded, “yes”, and the pickleball club formed about 2.5 years ago, raised \$6,000 and have done a design for pickleball courts at Darden Towe Park. She said they also ran a 2-day-per-week indoor program at Agnor Hurt for the Department, so no supervisor was required to run it, and about \$4,600 was collected through that program. She said there are about 2,300 participants in the program over the past 2.5 years, with about 30 pickleball players per night to play on three courts and long queues. Ms. Smith said this is an expanding group of people.

Ms. Mallek observed that there was tremendous fundraising ability for the group and noted that the tennis courts at Darden Towe Park has been paid for by the tennis players. She said she wants to be sure the public understands that this was very much a total community engagement activity as opposed to a taxpayer initiative that can move these projects forward.

Mr. Dill remarked that baseball players do not pay for all their costs, for example, lighting.

Ms. Mallek said she was referring to the tennis courts specifically as the original plan was to convert the courts, and the tennis players had raised the money for the courts. She asked if there could also be an update provided on the public-private partnership for Western Park, for which some negotiations are in process. Mr. Crickenberger responded that the details are being worked on and negotiated. He said Bill Letteri may have more information.

Ms. Mallek said that when looking at the costs in the documents, it would make sense to see them in phases. Mr. Crickenberger said that now the principles are in place for the public-private partnership, which previously held up the process, so there is now the ability to move forward. Ms. Mallek said the Board looks forward to news on this matter.

Ms. Palmer asked for the soft opening timeline for Biscuit Run. Mr. Crickenberger said tentatively, design will begin in August or September of 2019 with construction beginning in April of 2020, and a soft opening in 2021.

Ms. Palmer said that she assumes there are already people working on the trails and asked how much of the trail Mr. Crickenberger thinks would be completed by the volunteers and staff. Mr. Crickenberger said that he does not have an exact mileage of the current trails on the ground now, but it is a tremendous amount. He said what staff and volunteers would do is begin to make improvements to the trails and decide which trails would remain open and which would not. He said there will be a significant trail system already in place when the soft opening occurs.

Ms. Allshouse said there was one more group to present and she wants to leave time at the end of the meeting for discussion.

Mr. Randolph commented on Phase IB for Biscuit Run regarding invasive plant removal. He said as far as potential neighborhood connections, there was interest for Southern Albemarle residents to be involved with the Natural Resources Committee to assist the County on identifying and removing those invasive species. Mr. Crickenberger said that was correct, and they are currently working closely with Rivanna Master Naturalists to help Parks and Rec develop the invasive species management plan, as this would have to be submitted to DCR. He also said that some of the control and removal would be out of the Department’s hands as well as volunteers, as some areas have become overgrown and out of control. Mr. Randolph said if Mr. Crickenberger needs names of these people to let the Board know. Mr. Crickenberger said this was already in process.

Ms. Allshouse moved forward to the last part of the presentation.

Mr. Doug Walker, Executive County Executive, introduced the last panel, Community Development and Economic Development projects. He said these are divided into three categories, the first of which is the Transportation Leveraging Program to which Kevin McDermott would answer questions. Mr. Walker noted that this has been reflected in choices, with a number of opportunities the Board has to use local money to leverage it against state and federal money, and generally this was talked about in the context of the Transportation Revenue-Sharing program and the Smart Scale program. He said the amount of local money that was attached to these leveraging opportunities determines how many of the projects move forward and how quickly. He said it is entirely scalable, but the projects are represented in choices in order to provide context. Mr. Walker said Mr. McDermott could speak in detail to this, but it is represented that for \$10 million over a five-year period, or \$2 million a year, the County should be able to advance its top priorities as identified by the Board most recently.

Mr. Walker said questions about the Implementation of Master Plans and the Rio29 Small Area Plan could be answered by Rachel Falkenstein. He said Roger Johnson could answer questions regarding economic development and funding for public-private partnerships, more specifically reflected as obtaining site control over key properties, implementation of the Broadway blueprint, and the economic revitalization plan.

Ms. McKeel commented that when she was reviewing the projects, the transportation leveraging program was the only one that meets four of the Board's strategic plan priorities. She said that reviewing the economic development funding for public-private partnerships, it was the only one in the booklet that meets three of the Board's strategic plan priorities. She noted the high value associated with those projects.

Ms. Mallek said that Mr. McDermott's presentation at the last Board meeting was well organized, and she continues to review the presentation. She said that other counties have chosen to draw many more state dollars down. She recalled that there are some years that Albemarle County did not even put up \$1 million, much less to do more than that. Ms. Mallek said that a very high priority for her, if feasible, would be to have more than two projects done per year, because the top three things that Mr. McDermott proposed on the revenue sharing are all very important. She said one was for economic development, pedestrians, and connectivity and delivery of emergency services north, south in Crozet.

Ms. Mallek said she hopes there could be a way to move more than one project forward a year in order to get the ambulances moving south of the Creek more quickly, because waiting another five to seven years in addition to having more bridges in Crozet taken out while that is happening could make everything come to a screeching halt. She said this was scary to her and encouraged that it be considered. Ms. Mallek said she was happy to see the \$5 million annually, and she would be happy to see it expanded to address safety concerns, even if some of it was borrowed and leveraged.

Mr. Randolph said he agrees, and noted that the County was able to get funding for the programs potentially out of the TJPDC and the MPO. Ms. Mallek responded that those projects would not qualify, and she has been seeking funding for five years but has been rejected each time because it does not meet the criteria.

Mr. Randolph said that overall, the County is advantaged by the fact that it has three different approaches to take. He said that he does agree with the first point that there needs to be more than just one project a year.

Ms. Mallek said there are buckets to seek after, but if money was not put in them, they would not be getting any back.

Ms. Palmer asked if Mr. McDermott could explain why the Eastern Connector was ranked as such. Mr. McDermott said that on the ranking, the Connector scored the highest under the Land Use category because of both the existing residential development and the up and coming residential development in the area of Eastern Crozet that currently has very few access points. He said relative to that, transportation impact analyses for Barnes Lumber showed that Crozet Avenue was experiencing fairly high levels of congestion, particularly in the AM and PM peak hours, as well as in the Route 250 corridor area. He said all these result in safety issues and there was a fairly high number of crashes in that area as well. Mr. McDermott said that providing an alternate access point, some of these issues off Crozet Avenue would be relieved, with access provided to the homes that currently have very few points of access. He said this includes bike-ped facilities and received points for building out the bicycle and pedestrian network. He said with Barnes Lumber coming up and other existing factors, there are economic development opportunities in the area. Mr. McDermott said that clarifies why the ranking was so high.

Ms. Mallek said that before there was a more sophisticated ranking system, the Connector was ranked #2 for about 20 years.

Ms. Palmer noted that the ranking has gone down.

Ms. Mallek said that page 19 was confusing because of the different categories. She said, for example, it was difficult to determine how #7 in one category compares to #2 in a completely different category.

Ms. Palmer said Mr. McDermott did an excellent job ranking the projects, but could not remember where the project was on the ranking as far as when it should be done. Mr. McDermott said that Eastern Avenue was ranked as #8 on the list of all the projects in the County; the item on the list referred to only the southern portion of the Eastern Connector. He said it was ranked high predominantly because of the high levels of residential growth and development in the area.

Ms. McKeel said that the page detailing the transportation leveraging program is the page that shows the projects that the community has given the Board the most feedback about. She reiterated that the page contains four of the Board's strategic plan priorities. She said economic development pairs with the program because it helps pay for it.

Mr. Gallaway said he would like to echo comments from the previous night as it relates to the Rio29 Small Area Plan catalyst projects, and then the next item, Economic Development for Funding for Public-Private Partnerships. Referencing the previous joint meeting with the Planning Commission, and reinforcing Economic Development's input into the Rio29 catalyst projects, Mr. Gallaway said Mr. Julian Bivins made an excellent point about the location of the library, where the current neighborhoods are and access to that. He said that relative to this, he was thinking about how to get people to move through the quadrants even with the current state of businesses from those residences. Mr. Gallaway said this could be a catalyst project, and he wonders if there is scope or room for that in this type of work. He said he does not think the transit for the Willow Tree is a part of the CIP but rather, part of a different program, but he wonders if it may have to be through something similar to get something like this into existence. He said mobility around the four quadrants could be the very thing that helps stimulate some things that could come into existence.

Ms. McKeel said looking back at the meeting from the previous night, the priorities reflect Mr. Gallaway's comments. She said she and Mr. Bivins were both writing on transit, transportation, multi-modal on their priority cards because with the Rio intersection, nothing can be done there unless those are prioritized.

Mr. Gallaway said that the success of the Rio29 Small Area Plan depends upon Economic Development and Community Development working hand in hand on the matter. He also asked for a reminder of how the Strategic Property Acquisition works and whether the Board waits for opportunities to come to it, or if they should be more proactive in searching for opportunities. He also wondered how the funding for this would connect to the Rio29 Small Area Plan relative to greenways and greenspaces that could be catalyst projects.

Mr. Randolph expressed his hope in the Board not getting so focused on how people get transported, but to look more at the infrastructure that is necessary for them to be transported because otherwise, there would be a lost opportunity. He said the real issue is the "no-man's land" that gets constructed with Route 29 cutting through the whole redevelopment area, and building bridges across this can be the means by which connectivity can occur. He said Minneapolis and St. Paul, for instance, built bridges across the interstates and then had connectivity established with bike trails. Mr. Randolph said that once they had the bridges built across, they were able to expand the bike trails and open up communication and bike-pedestrian access. He said he agrees that while how to get there is certainly an issue, the fundamental issue is ensuring the infrastructure is in place. He mentioned Zan Road and said there is another bridge needed further to the north where Rio Road is dedicated just to cyclists and pedestrians to be able to get across and ensure safety and transit from east to west. Mr. Randolph said this could be discussed in the future, but wanted to stress the importance of the infrastructure being in place.

Mr. Gallaway said to be able to get out of the fixed route transit mindset is important, because it was unknown when the County would be able to get any kind of pedestrian or bicycle only bridges or tunnels. He said with the current setup, a different view of how transit could work now could entice what Mr. Johnson is looking for in public-private partnerships and what Community Development is looking for in catalyst projects.

Ms. McKeel said that possibilities should be looked into outside of the fixed routes and at an additional model that will work.

Mr. Gallaway said that fixed routes would not work in the Rio29 Small Area Plan.

Ms. McKeel agreed and said that they do not work right now in other areas in the urban ring. She reiterated the need to look at other models.

Ms. Mallek said that creating the destination that people want to go to was what came to mind the previous evening when Mr. Bivins talked about the plaza amenity and how it needed to be on the east side where there was space for other things to be around it. She said to have it at the library means you take out the only handicapped parking there, which did not seem to make sense to her. She stated that more thought was needed as to where the plaza would be located, and even with having a small business in the back and beyond, people will find a way to get there. Ms. Mallek said that creating the location with the public amenity investment is needed for the plaza gathering place, because that is not something that private enterprise can be expected to do as they cannot borrow from the bank on it. She said she wants to be sure other locations are being considered other than the one that has been suggested.

Mr. Dill asked Mr. Johnson for the three or four most effective ways to get site control. Mr. Roger Johnson, Economic Development Director, responded that there are numerous ways to gain site control

other than outright purchase. He said there are extended due diligence periods where one would have the ability to purchase at a later time, with a three- to six-month window to conduct due diligence before purchasing. He said that one would have site control during this window of time. Mr. Johnson said there are also lease-to-purchase options, as well as putting money into an escrow account and locking in a price-to-purchase at a future amount of time. He said should the purchase not occur, those escrow accounts usually get lost to the property owner, because the rights to the property and the dollars have been forfeited if the right to purchase is not exercised. He said conversely, a price can be locked in whereby the properties can be flipped over to the future developer to build the environment desired.

Mr. Dill asked if it would be revenue-neutral to use these techniques. Mr. Johnson responded that it depends most importantly on public elements, meaning that if additional public elements are desired, these techniques do not always operate in the black. He said a built-in environment can be operated in the black, but this usually requires fewer public elements. He said it has been his experience that Albemarle County expects a high degree of public amenities, and that the County would try to go cost-neutral in most cases while concurrently build the transformative projects that are already in plans, i.e., Rio29. Mr. Johnson said as it was laid out for public-private partnerships, those could occur in conjunction with already-planned activities, like small area plans, or it could be a willing partner that comes to the County that may be unknown today.

Mr. Dill asked if there was ever a time when working with one developer, there was a piece of commercial property that was underused and someone was talked to about buying it, but for some reason they cannot negotiate directly in a comfortable way that he acts as an intermediary and perhaps participates financially. Mr. Johnson responded that historically, he has not pursued that option. He said economic developers try to stay out of competition with commercial brokers and try to be a catalyst for future development. He said he has worked with master developers, one developer for a large number of projects that results in a campus-style investment, where he helps the master developers find potential partners to develop under a campus-style development.

Ms. Mallek commented that she hopes the Broadway Blueprint would be allowed to organically grow and not have something swept in to make a radical change. She said it is a unique working place much like Crozet Square, and hopes that this would be appreciated.

Ms. Allshouse asked if the Board would be fine with moving on to the prioritization piece of the meeting. She thanked everyone and acknowledged they likely have many other questions. She said she appreciates the dialogue and thanked staff for spending the time on putting together the packet and being present.

Agenda Item No. 4. **Work Session:** Board Discussion and Ranking of Capital Projects.

Ms. Allshouse noted that this part of the work session would be difficult, as everything that has been heard was compelling. She said this time was set up for the Supervisors to have more discussion as they like, and also if there was something that the Supervisors did not hear that they would like to have considered, to please identify it and staff can add it to the board. She pointed to a board list with 18 of the projects listed, noting that the first project was not listed as that was thought about in broader terms. Ms. Allshouse asked the Supervisors to do the prioritization and said this would lead into the conversation with the School Board about their prioritized projects. She explained that the Supervisors would be receiving dots from Ms. Tia Mitchell, and that she would give each Supervisor nine dots (three green, three yellow, three blue) to designate high, middle, and third priorities. She said that after the discussion, the Supervisors would go to the board to place their dots, and then there would be discussion about results before ending the meeting.

Ms. Allshouse asked the Board if there was any general discussion or CIP projects or programs that should be added to the list prior to voting.

Ms. Mallek asked if the terms on the board would be the same as the titles listed in the packets. Ms. Allshouse responded, "yes" and noted that the Parks and Rec projects Mr. Henry spoke about in phases were listed as separate phases. She said that the Supervisors should place their dots next to the subcategory phases they believe would be the appropriate phase for the next five years. She offered transportation as an example, explaining that there were Options 1 and 2, and on the two parks (Western Park and Biscuit Run) there are phases listed.

Ms. Mallek asked Ms. Allshouse to explain what she meant by "\$10 million", and "\$10 million and above," referring to the Transportation Leveraging Program on page 19.

Ms. Allshouse said that Mr. Walker would share a suggestion on that.

Mr. Walker said it is an order of magnitude that reflects an annual contribution per year over five years. He said the \$10 million represents \$2 million per year over five years. He said the "above" was the amount originally contemplated, \$25 million, breaking down to \$5 million per year over five years. Mr. Walker said the thought was to put the Board in a responsible position to understand that this is scalable and that the more local funds that are available to pull down non-local funds to more projects can be accomplished in a shorter period of time. He said there are many priorities that are competing for those limited dollars, and to consider what is the right level of investment. He said the more local money invested, the more these transportation projects can get accomplished in a shorter period of time, and that more than \$10 million is where the Board may want to consider putting their dollars.

Ms. Allshouse commented that other projects are also scalable, but they were not actually broken apart on the board.

Ms. Palmer asked for the total cost of the year estimates for all the projects listed in the booklet. Mr. Stewart said the numbers may have changed since the initial draft, but that he believes they are about \$108 million over five years.

Ms. Palmer noted they would be cutting out a little less than half.

Ms. Allshouse responded, "yes", and also that this would be a conversation with the School Board. She said the money is very important, but because it was scalable and phase able, staff wanted to give the Board a perspective on the money but also wants to know what the Board feels its top priorities are.

Ms. McKeel said Ms. Allshouse is looking for the priorities and that the funding and phasing would be figured out later.

Ms. Allshouse asked if there was anything the staff did not present that should be a Board priority. Hearing none, she said that the dots would be distributed to the Supervisors and they could place their priorities, leaving time for wrap-up.

Agenda Item No. 5. Summarize Work and Discuss Next Steps in the FY 21 – FY 25 CIP Development Process.

Ms. Allshouse thanked the Board for working with staff on the prioritization exercise. She said they just received a high-level summary of some of the top priorities: Transportation Leveraging, Economic Development Public-Private Partnerships, Climate Action Plan, and the Water Quality Program. She said the details would be provided to the Board at a later time, with all the priority numbers totaled up and provided. Ms. Allshouse again thanked the Board for participating in the exercise and she would summarize next steps if the Board was ready to proceed.

Ms. Allshouse showed a previously viewed slide and said the information would be summarized and given back to the Board. She said staff would also be updating the Planning Commission about the process in August, and the Board would be meeting with both the City Council and the School Division in September. She said this information would be pulled together for the Board for the next meeting in the process.

Ms. Allshouse noted that this was very different than how the CIP planning has been done in the past, based on the Oversight Committee and the Board's direction. She expressed her appreciation for the Board's involvement and support.

Mr. Richardson thanked the Board, noting this was the third meeting in a stretch of fourteen days, and that the Board has been asked, in addition to what the Supervisors ordinarily do, to spend additional time at various Board meetings. He also thanked the staff for their significant and difficult work to get the presentation ready for the meeting and said they would be open to hearing from the Board if there was anything the Supervisors would like to see done differently.

Agenda Item No. 6. Meeting Wrap Up.

Mr. Gallaway asked if there were any comments about the process.

Ms. Mallek expressed admiration for the preparation put into the process and said that she loved the dots because it allowed the Supervisors to share their priorities without having a debate over them. She added that at 4:30 p.m., this afternoon, the Brookhill River Park would be opening, and she encouraged everyone to attend.

Mr. Dill said that although he does not have a solution for it, structurally there must be a better way to handle things like the police and fire facilities. He said these are the types of things that will always come in just below the line, and there must be a way to which the Board can commit to doing them within five years. He said that there seems to sometimes be imbalances in the priorities.

Mr. Randolph said that even though some projects may not receive a three, two, or one priority does not necessarily mean they would not get funded in the CIP in the next five years. He observed that in the past, going back eight years to up to three years ago, anything related to master planning or economic development did not get funded in the CIP. He said now, the Board is seeing funding for programs that are not only critical, as public safety is the number one objective for local government, but that contribute to enhancing the quality of life of people living in the community and attracting people to it to help it continue to grow in a productive manner.

Mr. Randolph said those investments are absolutely critical, and he believes the priorities identified with three, two, or one reflect a shift in the way the County looks at priorities that are dramatically different than where they were eight years ago when he was first involved with the CIP. He said the County has come a long way, and he attributes much of the work to Ms. Allshouse, who he

thanked for all the work she has done on the CIP and the Oversight Committee in working with the Board, the Planning Commission and most critically, the School Board as the County is now in a position where all portions of the community understand the imperative of the CIP and its primacy.

Mr. Randolph said nothing like this has ever been done in the past as far as the prioritization exercise that was just done, and they are teeing up now to incorporate the Comprehensive Plan with their strategic goals and objectives for the next five years, with objectives with the City and their capital program, so there is a synergy between those that indicates where the Board's energy needs to go.

Mr. Randolph added that this does not mean that the County would ignore the other projects, and he believes they will be funded out of the Oversight Committee and the Board. He said, however, that there is a shift being seen which is overdue and a much better equilibrium of balancing urban ring issues and the need for the County to plan its future rather than looking to a by-right future by which it previously operated in investing their good faith and economic prosperity on strip mall development. He said it is a different world and they are playing by different ground rules, which are welcomed.

Mr. Gallaway echoed Ms. Mallek's comments on the homework done by staff, especially how the summary sheet in the packet was done. He said this was incredibly helpful to dive in at the level shown. He said Mr. Randolph comments were very well said and that he should be proud of the stewardship he provided to improve the process.

Ms. Allshouse said she thanked Ms. Tia Mitchell and gave much of the credit to her for putting together the homework and the packet.

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn to July 12, 2019, 1:00 p.m., Court Square.

At 3:01 p.m., Mr. Gallaway adjourned the Board to July 12, 2019 at 1:00 p.m., Court Square.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 01/15/2020
Initials CKB