

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on September 9, 2019, at 4:00 p.m., at CitySpace, 100 5<sup>th</sup> Street NE, Charlottesville, Virginia, for purposes of a joint meeting with Charlottesville City Council. The meeting was adjourned from September 5, 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, and Clerk, Claudette Borgersen, Senior Deputy Clerk.

---

CHARLOTTESVILLE CITY COUNCIL PRESENT: Mr. Wes Bellamy (arrived at 4:54 p.m.), Ms. Kathy Galvin, Ms. Heather Hill and Ms. Nikuyah Walker.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: City Manager, Tarron Richardson, City Attorney, John Blair, and City Clerk, Kyna Thomas.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. At 4:01 p.m., Mr. Gallaway, Chair, called the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors to order. Ms. Walker, Mayor, called the Charlottesville City Council to order.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. Welcome and Introductions.

**Note:** At this time, meeting participants introduced themselves.

Ms. Walker welcomed everyone to the meeting, noting that the City and County have decided to hold these meetings more frequently in order to accomplish more.

Mr. Gallaway echoed Ms. Walker's comments, acknowledging there would be an abundance of information shared.

Mr. Tarron Richardson addressed the Board and Council. He said there was a full agenda of items for discussions, noting that at the last joint meeting, there were three topics that the group wanted to revisit: affordable housing, transit, and climate action. He explained that all three of the items can be found on the agenda under the "Joint Discussion" section.

Mr. T. Richardson recalled that the group also requested follow up on the following items: Hydraulic SAP Implementation, Sunset Bridge Maintenance, Housing Voucher Programs, Minority Business Support, Equity Collaboration, and the Rivanna River Crossing. He said these items will be discussed within the "Information Items" section of the agenda. He added that memos were distributed to both City Council and the Board of Supervisors for their review pertaining to these items.

Mr. T. Richardson said that joint boards and commissions, joint CIP projects, and revenue sharing were other topics up for discussion. He noted that whatever topics they do not have time to address today could be addressed at a later meeting, as the joint meetings are intended to occur more frequently.

---

Agenda Item No. 3. Joint Boards and Commissions: Consolidate or Amend.

Mr. John Blair, City Attorney, addressed the Board and Council. He said that over the summer, he and Mr. Kamptner discussed a question that had been brought forward about an appointment to the Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail. He explained that this has been an informal process through the years with a number of regional bodies. He said there are specifically six bodies that have joint appointments through the Board of Supervisors and through Charlottesville City Council: Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail, Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport Authority, Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport Commission, Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, Rivanna Solid Waste Authority, and CACVB. He said none of the documents, however, actually describe a procedure as to how these joint appointments take place. He said in the past, one body would appoint the joint member for one term, and the other body's responsibility was to concur and then once the term completes, as with recently the case of the Regional Jail, the other body makes the appointment and sends it to the corresponding body for approval.

Mr. Blair said he and Mr. Kamptner discussed the process, discovering that it was historically not well defined and therefore, they have a recommendation to put before both bodies which involves having the County and City Attorneys draft a Memorandum of Understanding in which the City and County agree to provide at least 90 days to the other body to consider a joint appointment recommendation. He said the reason for this recommendation is that the Memorandum should also memorialize each one of the public bodies that has a joint appointment and document whose "turn" it is to appoint. He said the 90-day period gives each body an opportunity to discuss possible objections and creates an atmosphere that does not lead to one body feeling as if they have to appoint or feeling hesitant to ask questions. He said the 90 day period also provides an opportunity for both bodies to discuss if there are multiple candidates under review, rather than one body making an appointment and sending it to the other body with only a two week notice.

Mr. Blair said that if both bodies agree, he and Mr. Kamptner would work together on drafting the Memorandum. He said this could help clear up some of the joint appointment process questions that have been unwritten for 20 to 40 years. He said they were happy to either take questions or to proceed if both bodies concur.

Members from both bodies concurred that this was a good idea and agreed that the Attorneys move forward.

---

Agenda Item No. 4. Obligations mandated by State Code: Revenue Sharing.

Mr. Ryan Davidson, City of Charlottesville Budget Office, presented. He explained that he would provide an overview of the agreement, FY 2019 and FY 2020 amounts and distribution, and regional partnerships and services that benefit both the City and the County. He said he would also highlight how the revenue sharing dollars make joint activities possible.

Mr. Davidson said the City/County Revenue Sharing was a jointly signed agreement put in place in FY 1982-1983. He described a formula that is focused on many factors, including both the City and County assessments, City and County tax rates, overall population, and population growth. He said the funding is allocated between the City Operating and Capital Improvement Budgets. He added that he would also focus on support for regional activities. He said within the City allocations, the City does not allocate or designate the dollars specifically to programs or projects. He said in the past they have taken the County allocation each year and allocated it between the City's General Operating Fund Budget and the Capital Improvements Fund Budget. He stated that for FY 19, the City/County Revenue Sharing was about 8.7 percent of the total general fund revenue coming into the City, and for FY 20, it was about 7.5 percent. He added that since 2011, a steady decrease has been observed in the amount of revenue-sharing dollars coming from the County going to the City and, on average, there has been about a \$340,000 decrease on an annual basis that is coming over to the City. He said since the City does not allocate to specific projects or programs, he would review some of the areas to which the general funding dollars go. He explained that he would also review capital efforts but as stated before, he would be focusing on regionalism and general joint activities.

Mr. Davidson said that within their fund, regional services and programs include shared park operations and regional recreation programs, such as Darden Towe, noting that regional parks are not considered City-only parks but there are plenty of parks and programs that are open to both City and County residents and everyone within the region. He stated that transit is a regional activity as well, which would continue to build. He mentioned public safety agencies, such as ECC, the jail and courts, and the dollars go to support police, fire, and other activities that benefit both City and County residents. He said it also included housing and employment in regional activities, as well as regional youth and children's activities. Regarding capital projects, he said there were many joint activities and facilities owned by both the County and City, such as Darden Towe Park, Ivy Creek Recreation, and buildings within the portfolios of both the City and County. He said public safety items such as ECC and fire equipment are included, as well as roads, infrastructure, and bike and pedestrian trail connections. He said it included other joint governmental projects such as the Senior Center and PVCC Advanced Technology Center, noting that revenue-sharing dollars go towards funding these efforts.

Ms. Mallek recalled mention of the City not allocating to specific programs. She asked if the reason for this was a legal one or if it was the City's policy or custom to operate in this way. Mr. Davidson responded that as policy, the City has been dedicating the money to these two fund sources.

Ms. McKeel expressed her confusion, noting that the City and the County have many jointly-administered projects they both allocate funding to, many of which Mr. Davidson has listed. She said they also have, for example, the Regional Transit Partnership, which currently determines how much money Albemarle County pays to the City for transit service. She said she wants to straighten out the information for the public because the way it was presented, it looks as though many of the programs are paid for through revenue-sharing money when, in reality, they involve a payment from both the City and the County and are actually separate from the revenue-sharing money. She clarified that she understands revenue sharing and she was not going to fight it because, in all fairness, she drives on City roads and uses City parks. She expressed that for clarity for the public, the topic needs to be better presented and not folded into one presentation, as it adds to the confusion.

Ms. Walker responded that she does not think it was adding to any confusion. She said regarding the Regional Transit Partnership, for example, there was discussion early on about removing revenue sharing and coming up with what the new criteria would be for how Albemarle County would present those dollars. She suggested there be a discussion about how the Board can influence how the money is spent, as this was the real conversation. Ms. McKeel agreed this could very well be the case. Ms. Walker recalled that from the City's end, they had declined.

Ms. McKeel clarified that she does not believe the City's residents spend much time thinking about revenue sharing, but the County's constituents ask the Board questions about it frequently. She said she wants to ensure that when describing jointly-owned facilities, such as the Regional Jail, that the County is paying a certain amount of money per population, as well as the City. She said perhaps the City is using its revenue sharing money for this, but this was not relevant to her. She said she was concerned that the community in Albemarle will get a takeaway from the presentation that perhaps would not be as accurate as it could have been if presented differently. Mr. Davidson responded that he understands what

Ms. McKeel was saying, and his intent in presenting the information in this way was to focus on the regional and joint activities between the bodies.

Ms. McKeel agreed that this was why the City and County are meeting, to focus on the joint activities they do together. She noted, however, that the presentation started out with revenue sharing and was presented as if it were all joint, it did not accurately portray the way some of the projects or facilities are being paid for.

Ms. Mallek said that she thought the Boards would hear something based upon the legislation, which did direct how things are allocated in specific terms. She said that when constituents in the White Hall District hear this discussion, they will say that they have to pay for each one of these things when they go to town. She said it was not as if revenue sharing money is being provided into these activities and then somehow that service is being provided to County residents, having already paid for them once in their taxes and then again in the revenue sharing.

Ms. Walker noted that the City pays too, and that there was not anything on the list that City residents get for free that County residents do not have to pay for.

Ms. Palmer acknowledged that the County and the City both put money into the joint activities and they are all worthwhile and should be continued. She said the presentation seems to be disconnected from the revenue sharing agreement and the point was that the activities are all positive ones, but it was not necessarily answering any questions about the revenue sharing agreement.

Ms. McKeel said she thought this was what the issue was about and that the two bodies were going to have a discussion on it.

Ms. Walker asked for clarification from the attorneys on what the legislation says.

Mr. Kamptner said he believes the report does meet the minimum requirements, which are to report the uses of such funds of either locality. Mr. Blair concurred, stating that the report does meet the statutory obligation.

Ms. Mallek and Ms. McKeel stated that this was done in a very general way.

Mr. Dill said he was unclear about an example of how it should specifically be done. He said the City puts together a budget for what they think is important and many things overlap. He asked what an example would be of something that is exceptional. He said it was so muddled to him that he cannot see how anything could be specifically pulled out to note that it was part of the revenue sharing. He pointed out that the legal obligation is being made and added that the County seems to be trying to influence the City's projects.

Mr. Gallaway noted that this was very similar to a conversation they had had a year prior. He said that the minimum requirement has been met, from what the attorneys have said, and to provide something beyond this would be up to the City Council to do. He said he disagrees that the County was trying to influence the projects, noting that the prior year, they were hoping for a more specific accounting of where the dollars go to help field questions from County residents about how the money is used. He said the report would have to be more specific for the Board to do this, but this request is different from the County trying to influence where the dollars should go.

Ms. Walker stated this was different than changing the narrative, because if it is an agreement and the County does not think it should have to pay, the conversation it has with the residents may be influenced by the way the Supervisors feel about the payment annually versus explaining the agreement that is in place.

Mr. Gallaway said he does not disagree that the County has to make the payment and he has accepted this. He said the County residents may not all agree on this, but it is an obligation and was voted on and passed. He said the County knows this payment will occur each year, but it was a matter of knowing, when the dollars go over, where they go. He explained that the County does not want to say it should go one place or another, but they would simply like to be able to tell residents where the money went. He said Ms. McKeel was trying to express that the presentation was very general in nature and it would be ideal to have information for County residents to be able to say that a certain amount of money was spent on a particular activity. He reiterated that the County does not get a say in where the money goes, but it was the City's decision.

Mr. Randolph said the question some of the Supervisors were struggling with was the expectation with the new State Code that there would be greater transparency. He said what they are finding is when constituents ask where the revenue sharing money goes, the Board does not know any more than they did one, two, or five years ago about where the money went. He added that he does not think it was unreasonable for the Board, as the government that pays the revenue sharing, to have a way to have some signage that says a project was partly funded with Albemarle County revenue sharing dollars. He said this was the kind of thing people in the County are looking for as far as accountability and transparency of the money they donate. He said none of the Board members are questioning the revenue sharing agreement, but they all believed that with the State Code changes, there would have been a greater degree of transparency created. He said that instead of receiving a general report of joint activities the County and City participate in together, they would have liked to see where some of the money that is directly attributable to revenue sharing might be going into certain categories and functional

areas that are beneficial to people in the County.

Ms. Walker said that the agreement finalized the annexation for the County. She said that to go through the projects to determine what the City would possibly pay if revenue sharing dollars were not part of the equation, in order to verify a direct benefit to the County, would be a cumbersome effort that the County was asking the City for. She said if the County was not trusting the process for some reason, asking the City staff to go through "what if" scenarios was not acceptable. Mr. Randolph responded that he was not asking them to go through "what if" scenarios.

Ms. Walker said in the Regional Transit Partnership meeting, there was a different discussion about what was being asked for. She said what Mr. Randolph was asking for was just one small part of what she has heard asked for in the short time she has been a part of City Council.

Mr. Randolph said that if the City hypothetically directed \$10 million to RTP and could say that \$5 million of it is actually coming out of what is received by revenue sharing, this would be beneficial for County residents to know. He said the City does not need to account for it, but all they have to do is publicly agree, as a City Council, on how to divide up the money to make it clear to County residents where it went. He said the presentation inadvertently presents the Board with a situation that is like a "fog machine" because they cannot differentiate between revenue sharing and the joint activities that are already customarily jointly funded between the City and County for the benefit of all residents. He said the Board understands the agreement but was trying to get to the attribution of where the dollars go, generally speaking, and they did not have to be accounted for down to the penny.

Mr. Signer said that with all due respect to Mr. Randolph's comments, the "fog machine" can be actively constructed as opposed to something he is reflecting or hearing about in the past. He said what the presentation does is accurately depict how broad the investments the City makes serve County residents so frequently as the geographic center of the community, and how the City has frequently made choices to invest in a broad range of infrastructure and services that do not draw any geographic boundaries. He said that in considering how broad the investments are with general fund receipts, which is what the revenue sharing plan was set up to do, it goes into one of the highest per capita parks programs that does not draw a distinction between County and City residents. He said it also included schools, roads, public works, and other regional programs. He said when the City hears political representations that there is a "fog machine" and the whole program should have been designed differently, this was not what the referendum was, but that it is about general fund revenues going into a broad program. He suggested looking at the City's budget because almost every area they invest in is available to County residents, which is why the report is as broad as it is.

Mr. Gallaway acknowledged that Mr. Signer's point about the budget was a good one, noting the budget numbers were in front of him, and he read aloud that \$10.4 million went to the Operating budget, just short of \$4.9 million went to Capital Improvements, and \$400,000 was transferred to the Facilities Repair fund. He said that seeing those three details was all the County needed, but to break out further details in these categories would also be great. Ms. McKeel agreed that this was all that was needed.

Mr. Gallaway indicated on a slide with the breakdown of the General Fund Operating Budget versus the Capital Improvements Fund Budget for FY 19 and FY 20 made him question what the details were inside of those numbers. He apologized for not noticing the \$15 million number on the screen.

Ms. McKeel echoed Mr. Gallaway's comments, explaining that she was focused on the other numbers and also did not see it.

Ms. Galvin noted that this was a source of revenue, just as real estate, sales, and meal taxes are sources of revenue. She said the County and the City do not break down, by source of revenue specifically, what the project is being funded with. She said for example, they do not say that a program is funded with a sales tax or real estate property tax of a certain percentage, but that it was simply a revenue stream. She said what the County was asking the City to do is very different than what they do for any other revenue stream, noting that revenue sharing is a revenue stream. She asked if other revenue streams are broken down between Operating Funds and Capital Funds. Mr. Davidson responded, "no". Ms. Galvin pointed out that the report has a level of specificity than other reports.

Mr. Gallaway said he does not disagree and he was not asking for anything additional. He added that this topic could get the meeting off track and suggested they move on.

Ms. McKeel said this was very helpful to her. She reiterated that the County's citizens seem to be much more conscious of revenue sharing than those in the City and the Board is always seeking ways to help explain the revenue sharing agreement to its citizens. She expressed appreciation for the presentation and acknowledged that she became caught up in the lists of other projects that are funded between the County and City. She suggested that when this information is presented the following year, it would be helpful to break out the information differently.

---

Agenda Item No. 5. Information Items:

- Hydraulic SAP Implementation.

Mr. Alex Ikefuna, Director of Neighborhood Development Services for the City, said that last year, the City and the County, together with VDOT, initiated a joint 29 Hydraulic Small Area Plan. He said the primary intent of the plan was to prepare a small area plan that includes land use and transportation

components. He said in March 2017, the project began and an advisory panel was formed, which included representatives from the City and County Planning Commissions, City Council, the Board of Supervisors, and businesses along the corridor. He said that some residents and environmental groups were also appointed to the panel. He said in May 2018, the plan was completed, with City Council approving the plan and following this, the City's Comprehensive Plan was amended so that the Small Area Plan would become part of the Comprehensive Plan. He said the County Board of Supervisors endorsed the plan and are also in the process of amending its Comprehensive Plan currently.

Mr. Ikefuna said in terms of implementation dates, the City, MPO, and County made a considerable effort to submit a Smart Scale application in 2018. He said a commission of projects was submitted by the MPO, and the City submitted its application for the 250/Hydraulic intersection to improve the sidewalk and the outlet from Michie Drive and Brandywine Drive. He said unfortunately, the projects were not funded. He said the MPO and City are currently considering an alternate approach for implementation of the projects, and a discussion took place a couple weeks prior regarding the next steps in terms of consideration for funding requests, revenue sharing, and the next Smart Scale application coming up in 2020.

Mr. Ikefuna then presented a combination of transportation projects, noting that there are two major transportation project recommendations specially distributed within the project activity area. He recalled that last year, when the MPO submitted the application for funding, there was a combination of projects estimated between \$130 and \$158 million. He said the City submitted the project for the 250/Hydraulic intersection with a price of \$6.5 million. He said unfortunately, this was not funded, but that the City is considering resubmitting for the next round of Smart Scale funding. He said there are key issues related to the particular project activity area that both City Council and the Board needs to know about. He said the 2020 Smart Scale application could not score well enough to be funded and meet Small Area Plan considerations. He said there is about \$18 million left as part of the Route 29 Solutions that the Board and City Council need to take into consideration, noting that the \$18 million could act as a down payment or leveraging for obtaining Smart Scale funding. He said that where the funding goes depends on which project they come up with in terms of submission for the next application cycle.

Mr. Ikefuna said as part of MPO Long Range Transportation Planning (LRTP) effort, one of the proposed projects is to have a bridge across from Zan Road going to Costco. He said this project is expected to cost \$38 million to \$40 million. He said as part of the LRTP MPO completed, the City Council and Board need to weigh in on how the \$18 million will be used as part of the Smart Scale application to fund the project. He explained that the project does not score well in terms of Smart Scale and the only way this project would be implemented is through revenue sharing. He said that revenue sharing itself would cost about \$10 million, \$5 million from the City, and \$5 million from the County.

Ms. Galvin asked that the \$18 million can actually be used independent of a Smart Scale application, or if it has to be used for Smart Scale. Mr. Chip Boyles, Executive Director, Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, said his understanding from VDOT is that the \$18 million could be used if it is a revenue sharing project. He said this is the only way in which a project would not have to go through Smart Scale, as revenue sharing projects are legislatively excluded.

Ms. Galvin said this was helpful and asked how much building the Zan Road bridge would cost. Mr. Ikefuna responded it would cost about \$38 million. Ms. Galvin asked if they needed revenue sharing for this. Mr. Ikefuna and Mr. Boyles responded, "yes", in order to keep it out of Smart Scale.

Mr. Gallaway commented that as a body, the Board of Supervisors sent a letter in support of the Zan Road project to the MPO.

Ms. McKeel asked if Mr. Boyles could address her understanding that VDOT is looking at how they could reduce the cost of that connection with a possible tweak in the location, noting that this work was not yet complete. Mr. Boyles responded that the County has received a development application for a commercial building that would be in this footprint, which would likely exclude that change from happening. He said the alternate location had been considered that could have been more cost effective, but if a building gets put there, the acquisition costs go up and eliminates the possibility. Ms. McKeel said they had been looking at an area where there was a stub-out, but from what Mr. Boyles was saying, this would not work.

Ms. Palmer asked if the project cost \$38 million and \$18 million was put down, if they would then have to come up with another \$20 million. Mr. Boyles responded, "yes".

Ms. Palmer asked if there would be no other revenue sharing from anywhere else. Ms. Mallek responded, "no"; the revenue sharing is the leftover \$20 million divided in half. She said the \$18 million was just a down payment from another funding bucket.

Mr. Ikefuna clarified that the \$18 million was already allocated and Mr. Boyles informed him last week that it is possible that if the money is not spent or committed in the next year or two years, they could lose it, so committing the funds to that project was critical.

Ms. McKeel commented that they do not want the money going to another community.

Ms. Palmer asked if the funds have to go towards that intersection in some way. Mr. Ikefuna responded, "yes". Mr. Boyles clarified that the money must go to one of the identified projects that was on the map. Ms. McKeel said there are many projects included in the Hydraulic work and the Zan Road

bridge was one of them. Mr. Ikefuna said there were a total of eight projects.

Ms. Walker asked if the "ask" from the bodies was to each commit an additional \$5 million. Mr. Ikefuna said this was correct in terms of funding the Zan Road bridge.

Mr. Boyles said the MPO staff, as well as in partnering with the City and County, was trying to work up some scenarios because another thing that could bring down the costs slightly is if it goes through Smart Scale, they would be looking at FY 26 dollars, which is inflated for the cost of money between present time and when the construction would take place. He said if it is a revenue sharing project, the construction could take place quicker and, therefore, cost less. He said the MPO is trying to figure this out in order to get an accurate cost estimate.

Ms. Galvin asked if they would be hearing more information in order to drive the decision. Mr. Boyles responded that the MPO would have a dollar amount for the bodies to consider contributing.

Ms. Galvin said that the way they were talking about it in the MPO, if the Zan Road project could shift over, it could be one component of the Smart Scale application that could stand alone. She said everything else depends on two to three other investments, which makes them cost in the \$50 million to \$60 million range. She said the reason the crossing was so important is because the Hydraulic interchange with Route 29 is so deadly dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists as well as drivers, and this was an alternative route across Route 29 that would be safer for all modes of transportation and actually facilitate redevelopment in the Hydraulic and Stonefield areas. She said in addition to having a redevelopment aspect, it also has connectivity and public safety aspects.

Mr. Boyles said this was true in both jurisdictions. Ms. McKeel agreed that this project would be a win-win for both jurisdictions.

Mr. Boyles explained that the concern with it in a Smart Scale application was that it did not score well when they applied before, and even with the \$18 million contributed towards the \$38 million price, it will likely not score well again because while it does offer some benefit to the congestion at the intersection, it is not significant. He said it would rank much better in revenue sharing than in Smart Scale.

Ms. Mallek asked for the timetable for getting the report back. Mr. Boyles responded it would be March or April when a letter of intent has to go to VDOT. Ms. Mallek asked as far as what MPO is working on to come back to the Board, if this would be in November. Mr. Boyles responded, "yes", and they would come to the Board and City Council about the fiscal impact.

Ms. Galvin asked about the letter of intent for this project from the County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Boyles clarified that it was a letter of support. Ms. Galvin asked when he needed something similar from the City. Mr. Boyles responded that the letter from the County was only "extra" and was to simply show their support for the project. He said it is the MPO member's vote on the MPO that gives this support. He said how MPO members get support from their Board is up to them.

Ms. McKeel agreed that the letter was to only show the County's support of the project.

- 
- Housing Voucher Programs.

Mr. Mike Murphy, Deputy City Manager, explained that he and Ms. Stacy Pethia, Principle Planner, County of Albemarle, would be presenting two slides from the general affordable housing presentation. He said that part of the reason for this was because in the history of collaboration between the City and County, and one of the topics was about possibly combining offices, with discussions about fire services, social services, schools, housing offices, etc.

Mr. Murphy said that in the City, the Housing Voucher program is administered by the Housing Authority and is not technically under the local government control. He said the City previously administered this through a housing office and it is currently done through Department of Social Services staff. He said the key takeaway was that rent is high in the area, and that while HUD and the Feds believe that there are over 500 vouchers available, they end up only leasing up under 400 people per locality, and it is almost identical who was able to lease up for the program.

Mr. Murphy described the Supplemental Rental Assistance Program that the City has funded for two fiscal years and is programmed into the five years of the CIP, with \$900,000 programmed into each of the next five years. He said when it was originally envisioned, it was thought that it would provide some relief to some of the people waiting on the vouchers or the public housing list, which is thousands of people. He said this was on the collaboration list and they would discuss this as part of affordable housing. He said currently, there are about 89 people leased up and with the funding that City Council has allocated, there is the opportunity to lease up about 110 families at a time with the investment from the City Council.

Ms. Hill asked how determination is made as far as the number allocated to each area. She said for example, the City has 533 allocated and the County has 530, noting that their populations are very different. Ms. Pethia responded that this was set up by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and she does not know how they determine how many vouchers each area gets, along with how much funding. She acknowledged that it is a strange situation and, in this case, the allocated vouchers are almost equal, with funding likely being equal as well. She said that housing authorities or

voucher program administrators either need to lease up all of their vouchers or use the majority of their funding. Ms. Pethia continued that HUD sets the vouchers at a strange level, and as it comes out to about 533 vouchers, they see the voucher assistance being about \$540 a month per household. She said in smaller areas with lower rents, they can actually use all these vouchers and in the City and the County, they are using approximately 96 percent of their budget authority.

Ms. Galvin asked about the utilization rate. She asked if this means that only three-fourths of what is being allocated can be used because they cannot find the units.

Mr. Murphy responded, "no". He said they spend 96 percent, which means instead of averaging \$540 per household, they have to give much more than this. He said that what would have gone for \$533 in a low rent community only goes for \$398 in this area.

Ms. Pethia explained that part of that is due to federal regulations requiring 75 percent of the individuals and households receiving voucher assistance to have incomes at or below 30 percent of Area Median Income (AMI). She said the more extremely low income households that are present in the program, the higher the rental assistance payments would be. She said HUD set that requirement because in the beginning, housing authorities were renting out their vouchers to higher income families who may not need as much assistance, so they switched the program regulations to help the folks that have the most need in the area.

Ms. McKeel asked if the two localities has ever looked at this issue as something that needs to be discussed with Congressional representatives. She noted that Ms. Mallek said this has not been done in 12 years. She suggested that perhaps it would be difficult to get some action, and perhaps there is not enough of a critical mass of communities. Ms. Pethia responded that each year, HUD sets fair market rents through all metropolitan areas and this is what drives the funding. She explained it then depends upon how much is allocated to the overall voucher program each year through Congressional actions. She said they are not increasing as much as they need, explaining that they are rapidly decreasing funding for public housing but only incrementally increasing money for the voucher programs. She said Housing authorities are always talking to legislators about funding and she was not sure if Ms. McKeel's suggestion would make a significant difference.

Ms. Palmer asked that when a fair market rate is established for an area, how small the area would be and if it includes TJPDC, Fluvanna, Nelson, etc. Ms. Pethia responded that they consider Louisa County to be a different metropolitan area, so it is not included; but Greene, Albemarle, Charlottesville, and Nelson are all included in the area.

Ms. Mallek asked if there has been a federal combination of the funding buckets for a jurisdiction such as Charlottesville because six to seven years prior, the Board was told that the County's program is in a different category than the City, and so the County would not logistically be able to combine. She asked if this is still the case. Ms. Pethia responded that they are technically not under a different program. She said that the Office of Housing for the County is considered the Public Housing Authority for the County. She said the difference between the Office of Housing and the CRHA is that CRHA can provide public housing and the County cannot. She stated that for the voucher program, the two localities are considered the same.

Mr. Murphy recalled that from that time period six to seven years ago, it was staff's view that there would be a risk in going to the federal government and requesting to combine the two entities. He said with the number of vouchers that is now 1,071 total, HUD may drop it down to 800, for example, if the entities were to combine. He said they are better off operating as independent entities for this reason.

Mr. Bellamy asked if, on a much smaller scale, considering their own independent housing authorities, there should perhaps be joint sessions between the two to learn about what they are each working on. He said he does not think the County was briefed on what the City's Housing Authority is doing, and vice-versa, and a joint meeting could create some synergy between the two. Ms. Pethia responded that because the County does not have an official housing authority like the Charlottesville Redevelopment Housing Authority, the County has instead a board. She said it would be a board meeting with County staff.

Mr. Bellamy asked if, with some creativity, a joint session could be set with the CRHA and City Council to provide an update while inviting the County to attend. He suggested this as an alternative way to keep everyone in the loop. He said the plans are great and the data is great to see, but it would be good to hear from the Housing Authority about what is going on in the community day to day.

Mr. Murphy said he would be happy to hold further discussion on housing redevelopment. He said the County's housing staff perhaps needs a collaborative relationship with Mr. Grant Duffield and his staff. He suggested this may be a better solution than Board to staff contact. Mr. Bellamy agreed that this would be appropriate. He stressed the importance of having alternative ways to collaborate and communicate so that both entities know what is going on, noting that the voucher totals from each locality affect each other.

Ms. Palmer noted that the County was currently developing a new housing policy and that this could be discussed. She said the County has similar issues to the City, as well as a separate set of issues, as they have many rural citizens. She suggested that the Board discuss the needs and the new policy with the City Housing Authority, noting that the County is at a slight disadvantage as the policy has not been fully developed.

Ms. Mallek said in the staff report, it discussed the Memorandum of Agreement, which was the regional approach. She asked if the City officials would be discussing this again during the meeting or at another time. Ms. Pethia explained that the regional agreement was set up and designed to allow voucher families to move across jurisdictional lines without having to go through an extensive affordability process. She said this saves time; if someone receiving a voucher from CRHA moves to the County within the urban ring, the County will continue to administer the voucher, and vice-versa. She said this cuts down on wait times and the problems in getting people moved. Ms. Pethia explained that the way it had originally worked is if someone from the CRHA wanted to move to the County, then CRHA would have to send the paperwork to the County, the County would issue a voucher, and they would have to be in agreement as to if the County would absorb the voucher or if the City would send the monthly assistance payments to the County. She said the CHRA worked with a consultant last year, who indicated to CRHA that this was against program regulations. She said he was correct on one level but incorrect on another. She said that CRHA pulled back on that process and that she does not believe there was any intention to going back to it.

Mr. Murphy commented that this could be revisited in the report to the Council and Board. He said that looking at one of the last points, the City-funded Supplemental Assistance Program, residents end up looking for assistance in the City, but about one-third of them end up in the County.

---

- Minority Business Support.

Mr. Chris Engel, Director of Economic Development, for the City, presented, as well as Ms. Siri Russell, Director of the Office of Equity and Inclusion, for the County.

Mr. Engel said that in July, the City hired for the first time its Minority Business Development Coordinator, who would be working in concert with a part of a position in the procurement office that is focused on increasing supplier diversity. He said these two roles are working in tandem with the Minority Business Development Commission, which is a citizen group that provides guidance to both activities. He said a key event taking place soon is Minority Business Week, running September 14 through September 20. He said there are six events that were included that week to highlight the minority businesses in the community as well as support agencies. He said there was a flyer with event details and invited everyone to attend. He said in recent months, there was the establishment of a Business Equity Fund, which is a loan fund that is operated for the City by the Community Investment Collaborative. He said the Council allocated \$100,000 to be deployed for this, it was currently up and running, and six loans have been issued, with payments being received on the other end.

Ms. Russell highlighted City and County cooperation. She said that while the County is currently exploring how to support its own small and minority owned businesses, and through informational interviews with County business owners as well as through multiple meetings with the City to learn more about what they do, they are working with the Economic Development Department to explore how they might expand their own support in the coming year.

---

- Equity Collaboration.

Ms. Russell said both the City and County currently are on independent, but parallel, transformative journeys to begin to incorporate equity into their work more closely. She said that while they are not in exactly the same place, they are on the same road, and there have been and will continue to be many opportunities for shared experience. She said one of those is shared commitment, noting that it has nearly been a year since the County opened an Office of Equity and Inclusion and the City was considering opening a similar office. She said there have been shared conversations and participating in partnerships and community conversations regarding equity, and a breakfast series has been started in the community focusing on equity. She said in regard to shared ownership, the City and County have been looking for opportunities to partner around equity and furthering that goal with other partners such as the TJPDC. She noted that less than one in ten local governments in the nation have offices of Equity and Inclusion. She said the work done in the County to share resources, connections, and tools has been important and impactful and they look forward to a future state in which they perhaps have shared priorities and goals throughout the region.

Ms. Russell said there are opportunities for collaboration. She said in October, the City and County will be discussing equity and the work they have been doing together at the Virginia Local Government Managers Association Conference for deputies, assistants, and others. She said they have also worked together on the Albemarle-Charlottesville Community Remembrance Project, which was successful in the community. She said the County is currently developing an equity profile for Albemarle, which is potentially an opportunity for partnership in the future. She said going back to shared knowledge around joint training opportunities around equity and inclusion, regular connection and communication with organizations is important, and the City has done well with making sure the County is at the table during discussions on equity regionally. She said shared engagement with partners has been a driving point, as they recognize that equity is not something that either locality does alone, but it is something they do together.

Ms. Russell presented some pictures, one from the Community Remembrance Project, and a few from the breakfast series, which the City, County, UVA, and Martha Jefferson Health System, and non-profit partners have participated in.



Mr. Bellamy said they are working together in terms of programming and looking at different ways to partner. He asked if the Minority Business Week was something that County residents could participate in and if the County could invite its residents to do this. Mr. Gallaway said this could be easily incorporated.

Ms. Russell noted that this was something that was discussed with Mr. Ingall's office.

Ms. Mallek asked if they have ongoing conversations with County businesses so that they can let the County know what they need. Ms. Russell responded, "yes".

Ms. Mallek added that focusing on the opportunity for all is something she hears the most from residents in her district in regard to hiring and access to programs.

- 
- Rivanna River Crossing.

Mr. Chris Gensic, City Parks Department, introduced himself and Mr. Dan Mahon, County Parks Department, explained that much of their work deals with bridges along the City-County border. He said the Rivanna River Crossing project is a long anticipated Rivanna River bicycle and pedestrian bridge, which is being vaguely discussed in the Woolen Mills to Martha Jefferson Hospital area. He said the status is that through the Planning District Commission and through VDOT, VDOT has the ability to use its own on call consultants to move projects from the dream phase into conceptual analysis of engineering to consider flood plains, connections, and development. He said VDOT would be kicking off a study with both City and County staff participating, but in this case, VDOT would be doing the heavy lifting and paying its consultant to get it started, with the notion that they will know where in the area the bridge will realistically go, how long the bridge will be, and what kinds of constraints they will have to work around in order to get the bridge built. He said the study would be going on for about nine months, with the end result being an idea of what kind of cost the project would incur and where they might receive grant money to fund the project. He said the estimate for the McIntire Railroad Bridge was about \$2.3 million, and they estimate this project to cost about \$3 million. He noted it was a longer bridge with different constraints than a railroad bridge involves, but that there are constraints involved.

Mr. Gensic presented a map of the general area, indicating to Woolen Mills on the south end, and the old dam, I-64 and Free Bridge. He clarified that the project is only for a pedestrian/bicycle bridge at this time and is not directly associated with the Free Bridge Study for the Planning District that deals with vehicular traffic. He said this would be positive for transportation as well as recreation and tourism and with the hospital having moved, and with many people in the City who commute to the hospital, it would help them stay in their houses and get out to the hospital. He presented another map that shows the possible locations for the bridge and the possible constraints. He noted the bridge location and heights and mentioned flood plain rules as well. He said the County recently acquired some land on the County side of the river that makes the project much more realistic in terms of land and where it may be located. Mr. Gensic said he anticipates a report result in about a year, as well as some thoughts about where funding would come from to move into the construction phase.

Ms. Galvin thanked Mr. Gensic for his presentation. She asked with regard to the potential businesses that would benefit from this if there was any plan to have them convene to discuss it, i.e., State Farm, Martha Jefferson Hospital, and Willow Tree, as examples. Mr. Gensic responded that some of the businesses are vaguely aware of it, but they should be engaged more directly as the study begins.

Mr. Dan Mahon mentioned that Martha Jefferson and State Farm have been working with them on the corridor itself and there has been interest expressed about the bridge. He said in regard to Willow Tree and Woolen Mills, and the development on the other side there is a rich opportunity to have something happen, as well as the connection on Moore's Creek to the Southern Urban Connector, which would run ultimately all the way to UVA.

Mr. Randolph asked that when the project is brought before the Board and City Council, if they could also put in a 500-year flood plain and 1,000-year flood plain, given the precipitation last summer into the fall, with two 500-year flood events in the Rivanna River. He said it would be important for them to have an indication of what both flood plains would look like when they do more planning in the area.

Mr. Gensic said they know it will be at least as high as Free Bridge, noting that this is why it could be costly, but it was a much needed connection.

---

Agenda Item No. 6. Joint CIP Projects:

- Traffic Signalization on U.S. 29 from Ivy Road to U.S. 250.

Mr. Ikefuna said the project is designed to coordinate synchronization of all the signals on Route 29. He said that once one gets to Hydraulic Road into the County, the signals tend to synchronize as one drives in that direction. He said the City is working with VDOT to improve the synchronization of the signals from Hydraulic, on Emmet Street to Ivy. He said at this time, the signal plans are being finalized in order to bid the project. He said they are looking at right-of-way acquisition sometime next year, with construction beginning after that and completing sometime in 2021. He said once the project is complete, the City will have an agreement with VDOT so that VDOT will take over the management and maintenance of the traffic lights.

Ms. McKeel said that she was pleased to hear about this project. She noted that one of the problems the City and County has together is the shared intersection that goes by the north wing of the Barracks Road Shopping Center, at the two lights that drivers must go through before getting to the 250 Bypass. She asked if there was any thought of connecting those lights, as VDOT controls and has put in much better signals on Barracks as one enters the County. She said in solving the problem at Emmett and Preston, more congestion is actually being pushed as traffic is not flowing well past the shopping center up towards the 250 Bypass, which is where many people are trying to get to. She asked if these lights can be considered in totality of the area instead of focusing on just one intersection. Mr. Ikefuna responded that VDOT is trying to make sure there are synchronized lights from the City into the County and they should be considering this.

- 
- Bike/Pedestrian Connectivity on Old Lynchburg Road.
  - Sunset Bridge Maintenance.

Mr. Ikefuna presented a list of bike and pedestrian CIP projects that have been planned and funded by the City. He said the projects presented were: Monticello Avenue Bicycle Lanes, East High Street Bicycle Lane and Pedestrian Improvements at 250 Bypass/East High Street/Long Street, Melbourne Road Bicycle Facility, Barracks Road Sidewalk, and Market Street Sidewalk.

Mr. Gensic spoke about the Sunset Bridge Project. He said in the southern urban area, there are many joint City-County activities going on. He said the City owns a great deal of park land on the north side of the interstate; Region 10, the County Office Building, commercial activity, and residential development are all located on the south side of the interstate. He said the City and County have been working together to consider how the sidewalk network can be completed through the interstate exchange. He explained that this was a multi-piece project that includes not only the on-road pedestrian pieces at Old Lynchburg Road to include a crosswalk and sidewalks, but also a greenway trail that would connect Azalea Park to the Sunset Avenue Bridge near Eagles Landing and Jefferson Ridge, as well as a study of the Sunset Bridge itself to see if it can be rehabilitated or potentially reconstructed as a bike-ped bridge.

Mr. Gensic presented a map showing the area in question for the three different projects that would connect into one bicycle-pedestrian network (Sunset Ave. Bridge, Moore's Creek Trail, and Old Lynchburg Road Sidewalk), noting that this was a high priority for the City and County. He said the County is proposing to submit a VDOT revenue-sharing grant in the 2019 cycle to fund the projects. He said there have been three conceptual studies, all separate but connected, that have engineering review and cost estimates and that they may consider a joint application, as well as an agreement as to who will take over maintenance and ownership of the facilities.

Mr. Gensic presented a slide showing the cost estimates for the projects: Old Lynchburg Road/Azalea Park Segment: \$435,000 (local share); Moore's Creek Greenway: \$465,000 (local share); and Sunset Bridge Rehabilitation: \$20,000.

Mr. Gensic provided a history of Sunset Avenue. He explained that the City closed a portion of Sunset Avenue in the 1990s because, with the number of development units coming in and the size of the Sunset Avenue, they determined it could not be able to handle the traffic. He said the City closed its road, and the bridge over the creek is still part of the secondary road system maintained by VDOT, but there is an assumption it is closed as well. He said with recent floods, the bridge was knocked around and it had been unclear who would fix it, but VDOT did some repair work to it. He said as part of the studies, it was concluded it could be rehabbed without having to build a new, expensive bridge. He said this also goes into the consideration of who mows the greenway and maintains the bridge once the facilities are constructed.

Ms. Palmer asked to see the cost estimates again. Mr. Gensic showed the costs, noting that some of them are local shares and the revenue sharing is 50:50.

Mr. David Benish, Chief of Planning, Interim Director of Planning, for Albemarle County, said that revenue sharing is a 50:50 match, and the Board of Supervisors adopted a Resolution of Intent to fund the full, local match to get the application in. He said the County would be working with the City as to further agreements to share the costs.

Ms. Palmer said there are several affordable housing areas on Old Lynchburg Road as it goes into the City. She acknowledged the City has many traffic issues going there. She said she has single mothers in Timberlake Apartments who expressed their fears that they are afraid to make a left-hand turn from anything but a car to come out of the complex, noting that most people there work in the City and it was completely unsafe. She said these people are looking forward to a safe way to walk or bike, and some are interested in getting electric bikes. She noted many of them are having trouble affording cars to take them to their jobs in the City.

Ms. Galvin asked if there was an action item being requested, noting the section of the presentation said, "The City and County may consider a joint agreement." She asked if this was something that would come back to the Board and Council later on. Mr. Gensic responded that this was something that staff is discussing at multiple levels as to how this would come back, and he imagines it would come back to the Board and Council at some point with a staff recommendation.

Ms. Galvin asked if, relative to what Ms. Palmer discussed, the costs of the various pieces could be fleshed out in the event of any kind of shared investment on the parts of the City and County. Mr. Benish responded that the County is fully committed to building the sidewalks on Old Lynchburg Road and are hoping for participation in the whole project with the City in order to effectively move forward and figure out the long term maintenance of the project, which would likely require a Memorandum of Agreement.

Ms. Galvin asked if Mr. Benish would be preparing these kinds of documents. Mr. Benish responded yes.

Ms. Palmer noted that the County wanted to get the revenue sharing application in.

---

Agenda Item No. 7. Joint Discussion (City Council/County Board):

- Affordable Housing.

Mr. Murphy showed a slide representing the funding for the current year for the City and County, noting that the investments come in through a variety of different funding streams. He said the affordable units to date are a representation of since they started the affordable housing fund in the City and what their 2,196 unit total is. He said Ms. Pethia could speak to the 4,200 proffered units in the County.

Ms. Pethia said that the County has legislative authority for inclusionary zoning. She said any residential or mixed-use development with a residential component that is approved for a Rezoning or for a Special Use Permit must include 15 percent of the residential units being affordable housing. She said the presented totals represent the number of proffered units that have actually been completed. She said the 4,200 units include those proffered units that have been built and occupied by income qualifying families. She noted that these units were located all throughout the County.

Mr. Signer asked if this was since the beginning of time. Ms. Pethia responded that she does not know when they started counting the units and she simply obtained the full count.

Mr. Signer noted that usually, these totals are for a period of time that ends. He asked if the units were not all currently online as affordable. Ms. Pethia said they are all actually online currently as affordable at 80 percent or below of AMI. She said it also includes Low Income Housing Tax credit units.

Ms. Galvin asked for what duration are they affordable. Ms. Pethia responded that the rental units that are proffered are affordable for 10 years, the low income housing tax credit units are affordable for 30 years, and the home ownership units are affordable for the first-time homebuyer. She noted that outside of the totals listed, there are many more in the pipeline.

Mr. Murphy presented a slide showing a funding summary of the City's investments in the CIP and the General Operating Budget. He said the first column relates to the year they are currently in, and the second column lists the projections in the 5-year plan for the CIP. He said the items that are to be determined are items that either happen as a part of the Council budget decision each April, or as part of the Agency Budget Review Team or Vibrant Communities Fund.

Ms. Pethia presented a summary of the County's money for affordable housing, noting that the Housing Fund is money that comes through the housing proffers; instead of providing units, they provide funding for it. She explained that this feeds into some allocations through the budget process. She said most of the other projects that have been funded are through the budget process and Agency Review process. She noted that there has been an additional \$3.2 million that has been awarded to the Southwood Mobile Home project, explaining that this was not included in the presented list because it is going to be dispersed over a period of time.

Ms. Hill asked about the Federal Housing Assistance Fund. Ms. Pethia responded that this is how much money the County has been awarded through HUD. Ms. Hill asked if it was not County money. Ms. Pethia responded that this was correct; it was federal money.

Ms. Hill asked if the City has something similar to this. Mr. Murphy responded they do, but it is not in the City's budget.

Ms. Pethia presented some areas she and Mr. Murphy discussed in terms of potential collaborations between the County and City. She said this includes the Charlottesville Supplemental Rental Assistance Program (CSRAP) and expanding it to include funding throughout the County, as well as helping County recipients. She said the Regional Housing Choice Voucher Program was another possible opportunity for collaboration, and as explained earlier, this was a "tricky business." She said both of these programs contribute to a permanent supportive housing process, with projects such as The Crossings, noting that there was talk about building a Crossings II, as well as jointly-funded evaluation of nonprofit housing providers, a joint land bank or property acquisition fund, or a joint affordable housing fund.

Mr. Bellamy brought up the potential project, Crossings II. He said effectively, the goal with Crossings II is to build off of Crossings I, located across the street from McDonald's. He said the City is looking to end chronic homelessness and this is a potential 80- to 90-unit structure supported by Virginia Supportive Housing. He explained that 40 to 50 of the units would be for the chronically homeless, and the list of the chronically homeless for both the City and County is at 43 persons. He said if the structure

is built, not only would it effectively end chronic homelessness, but it would also provide affordable housing units for individuals at 30 percent AMI or lower. He said the City hopes that, as they continue to work out the details and the project comes before both bodies, there will be support as it would benefit both entities.

Ms. Galvin asked if the County is aware of the City's discussions about the form-based code with the height bonus and the synthetic tax increment finance district as a way to raise revenue for the Charlottesville's affordable housing fund. She said if not, this may be another example of a need to have the planning departments and budgetary people from each entity talk. She said the County is also talking about form-based codes in the Rio Small Area Plan and wondered if any of the actions around form-based code are happening collaboratively, or if they are simply happening in parallel. Ms. Pethia responded that in working on the County's form-based code, they are also keeping track of discussions in the City.

Ms. Galvin pointed out that it was directly related to affordable housing strategies as well as to raising revenue. She expressed that this would be a good idea, if others agreed. Ms. McKeel responded that the County would like to hear about this. She noted that Ms. Pethia indicated that there has been some communication. Ms. Pethia responded, "yes", adding that she believes there was some communication and that she was aware the City recently had an open house or community talk about this. She commented that the planners that are working on form-based code have tuned in.

Ms. Galvin added that she did not see any County planners there, and she was sure that the City is trying to tune in on efforts with the County's codes, although she has not been kept abreast of it either. She said that both bodies should be aware of what each other is doing, and it is a goal that was stated in 2012 that the City and County would be doing land use and infrastructure planning together and was integrated in the latest Comprehensive Plan. She underscored this point, stating that it was something that has been an aspiration for a long time between the two bodies.

Ms. McKeel commented that they would continue to discuss together. Ms. Galvin responded that she has sent around documents from 2012. Ms. McKeel noted that she has the document in front of her, but perhaps not everyone has seen it because it had come in late. She added she printed it out and everyone should have it in their email.

Ms. Mallek asked if the City has found some solutions for any of these programs. She said in regard to the first bullet, what her mostly rural, low-income and elderly constituents worry about is an increase in tax rate that would drive them out of their homes in order to provide supplemental housing for others. She asked if other solutions of funding have been found for the programs that large investments are being put into to help urban residents. She said the goal was laudable, but often the burden is carried by very low-income residents who are either retired or elderly and do not have the resilience to deal with an increase in tax rate.

Mr. Murphy clarified that the Supplemental Rental Assistance Program is the City's locally funded replication of an HCV voucher. He said that what Ms. Mallek was referring to was something that the Mayor advocated for in the last budget process and that the City put many additional dollars behind the CHAT program. He presented a slide listing City funding activity and indicated to the housing affordability tax grants as well as tax relief for the elderly and disabled, noting that there was about \$2 million in the type of relief that will keep those people in their homes. Ms. Mallek pointed out that these dollars coming in as revenue to the City are coming in as taxes from other residents. She said there was a fine line between maintaining the affordability of the people who are presently there as well as helping others. She agreed that it is a monstrous issue and that she does not know how to fix it.

Ms. Walker noted that the programs are geared towards helping the City's lowest income residents. Ms. Mallek responded that her question was about preventing them from experiencing tax increases. She said if the City is raising 2 cents on the tax rate to provide for the programs, the residents are paying more to stay in their existing homes.

Ms. Walker explained that under CHAT, if someone's income is under \$25,000 per year, they do not pay taxes and the City's grant covers it 100 percent. She said if their income is up to \$35,000, they receive \$1,000 in tax relief, and up to \$45,000 in income receives \$750 in relief, and then \$500 for up to \$55,000 in income.

Ms. Palmer said that the State tells the County how much tax relief they can give its citizens and asked if this was a case where the City and County have a different ability to do this. Mr. Kemptner responded that he would be looking into this, acknowledging that the question came up at a Board meeting several months ago and thinks the answer is the County is doing as much as it can.

Ms. Palmer noted that the County has been asking about this for years and their attorney keeps telling them that they are capped. She said that it will be interesting and they will have to continue to find out if there is a legislative issue that makes it different between the City and the County. She thanked the group for bringing it up, as it was a good question to understand.

Mr. Blair added that there is a specific provision in the City of Charlottesville Charter that offers more authority for the City than for the County in this sense.

Ms. McKeel agreed this was an issue in which there was a big difference between the City and the County.

---

Transit Strategic Plan (Introduction of Garland Williams (CAT); Role of Regional Partnership.

Mr. T. Richardson introduced the new CAT director, Mr. Garland Williams.

Mr. Williams said that he was looking forward to having individual meetings with everyone to better understand their goals for CAT. He said he was looking forward to also improving the ridership and the system.

Mr. Boyles presented on the Regional Transit Partnership. He explained that the City Council and Board of Supervisors created the partnership about two years ago and in the Memorandum of Understanding, set the mission for the partnership to provide recommendations to decision makers on transit related matters. He said since that time, the partnership has gone through a strategic planning process and created a vision to "create an efficient, high-quality, regionally integrated network of transit services." He said the RTP's first meeting was held in October of 2017. He said the strategic plan, through working with SIR Consultants of Richmond, namely, with Mr. John Martin, was established in August of 2018. He said that Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville entered into a funding MOU, which was the first written MOU for funding services since the two entities have been partnering, and there were unanimous votes from both entities. He said both entities agreed in the FY 20 budget to begin to fund some additional work by the partnership, creating some training and educational activities as well as administrative functions. He said that most recently, they anticipate UVA to become a voting member in October 2019.

Mr. Boyles said the engagements that have taken place are the strategic planning session, two different educational opportunities with Jarrett Walker Associates, one of the largest transit planning agencies in the nation, and coming up later this month, on September 26, the RTP is partnering with the Chamber of Commerce on a listening tour for Chamber businesses and other local businesses to hear specifically about the opportunities and needs for the business community around public transit. He said one of their current strategies is in partnering with the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation for a joint regional strategic plan. He said in the past, both CAT and JAUNT have been required every five years to conduct a Transit Development Plan, which talks about current and past activities in planning for the future. He said the State now requires CAT alone, along with other public transit agencies like CAT, to conduct a transit strategies plan. He said JAUNT is not required to do this, and the University Transit System is self-funded and are not required to do any of this. He said the RTP is proposing to the City Council and Board of Supervisors is to conduct a regional transit strategies plan that would include JAUNT, CAT, and the University Transit System to look at both current and future conditions, as well as both current and potential ridership. He said this would involve interviewing people as to why they do not ride the system as well as the people who do ride the system. He said the State helps to fund the required amount but in order to do a regional plan, it requires additional local funds to include both UTS and JAUNT. He said work is currently being done with DRTP to estimate what that amount would be, but to give an idea, a study like this in total is likely about \$600,000 to \$700,000 and takes about a year to complete. He said that when the estimates are made, they will come back to the bodies, but the DRTP would fund most of it.

Mr. Boyles said some other activities coming out of the strategic plan include creating a unified marketing system. He said one of the long term goals is to consider a Regional Transit Authority and as an interim step to begin to market all of the systems, CAT, JAUNT, UTS, and the Rideshare Program. He said the state is currently accepting RFPs from bus providers to create a system from Danville, Virginia to Washington, D.C. that would stop in Charlottesville, and to market all these under one heading and title and create a website and information system where potential riders can go to one place and find out how to go from a ride share, bicycle path, to a bus, to a train, and to come back would be one-stop shopping. He said another thing that recently came up at the partnership which the technical committee was considering for FY 21 is that the operating budgets of both CAT and JAUNT provide driver compensation, recruitment, and appreciation and making sure all of the systems are working collectively and together with their driver compensation.

Ms. Galvin explained that the reason the last item came up was because the City was hearing that it was very challenging to recruit drivers for both CAT and JAUNT. Mr. Boyles agreed and added the school systems to the challenge. Ms. McKeel agreed as well, noting that both school division transit systems are part of the ridership in the community.

(Note: Ms. Mallek and Mr. Signer left the meeting at 6:00 pm.)

- 
- Climate Action.

Ms. Kristel Riddervold, Environmental Sustainability Manager, City of Charlottesville, noted that 2019 has been the year in which the City, County, and UVA are all positioned and involved with various activities, action, and commitment regarding climate action, which include setting greenhouse gas reduction goals, climate action planning collaboratively, and the implementation of those climate action plans would be key. She said the City and County are working together on the planning and implementation efforts and would be looking to explore strategies with regional benefits, looking at what would come out of the plans and what would be more effective when working collaboratively. She said some of these actions are aligning and working with their non-profit partner LEAP to align the types of services being offered; considering financing or funding mechanisms or tools that will work for people who

work in the City or the County together; thinking about opportunities with waste management or landfill diversion that makes sense across the jurisdictions. She said there are many joint outreach efforts and events, noting that as recently as this past Sunday, there was an event at The Paramount called "Climate Action Together" in which that message was being shared.

Ms. Riddervold said a major update was that City Council adopted an updated emissions reduction goal this summer, which was 45 percent reduction by 2030 and carbon neutrality by 2050. She said this was from a 2011 baseline and these are the kinds of goals in which they know the County and other communities around the state are considering as well. She said the directives coming from City Council about moving forward were to front end the reductions instead of waiting until 2049 to wait until acting on carbon neutrality but to soon begin a process that will get them towards these significant reductions. She said the City is at about 21 percent reduction now, and about 24 percent left. She said there is a directive that the Climate Action Plan addresses equity along with financing and funding strategies for the private sector. She said there is also a directive to work with regional partners to implement seamless programs and services that make it easier for their citizens to participate and access the tools and resources they put together.

Mr. Lance Stewart, County Director of Facilities and Environmental Services, provided an update, explaining that staff would be coming before the Board of Supervisors in the coming weeks to talk about their efforts since their last update in the spring that includes a host of outreach efforts in collaboration with the City as well as a Climate Mondays series of meetings that ran from May to the first part of June. He said every Monday night, they held public meetings and had five sector work teams with cross-collaboration between the City, County, UVA, TJPDC, and members of the public. He said more than 50 people worked on recommendations and listening opportunities. He said they would be summarizing the recommendations from these work teams as they move into drafting the Climate Action Plan in the coming week. He said their stated intention has been to adopt ultimately the same goal that Charlottesville just adopted. He said that at the next Wednesday Board meeting, they will be discussing the timeframe for formally adopting these goals sooner rather than later so that there is additional clarity as they draft the Climate Action Plan.

Mr. Stewart said County staff are also asking to rejoin an organization called Using Common Greenhouse Gases Reporting, explaining that is a tool Charlottesville has used, and Albemarle did use in the past but was directed by the Board nine years ago not to be a member of this anymore. He asked that the County be a member of this again so that they are on the same page with the City as far as looking at their inventories from year to year. He pointed out that the County is working under the same set of assumptions that the tools provides them. He said they hope that once they have the common tool, in the future they will coordinate requests to utilities to obtain the data for the report, noting that it is very time intensive and combining the efforts on this could save staff time, as well as overall time. He said County staff also wants to coordinate on outreach and education, even globally, similar to what Mr. Boyles discussed with transit, with the City, County, and UVA, coordinating together to have a single brand or branding approach for the opportunities that they all can benefit from, and that it would make sense for the community to hear one message going forward. He said the County was excited about having more conversations about this moving forward.

Mr. Stewart said that both the City and the County are looking forward to including discussions on equity in their investments and programs. He said typically, many programs are geared towards people with elective income to make investments in their homes and businesses and not all people have the choice to use extra income to save energy. He said the County wants to be sure that they meet the needs of that constituency and emissions sector group and achieve housing affordability goals as they do this work. He said generally, as they look at all the benefits and co-benefits of the opportunities the County assesses, whether this is from housing affordability standpoint or economic development, there are many ways in which there can be co-benefits to programs. He said the County wants to make sure that they look at elements other than strictly greenhouse gas reductions in terms of achieving the community's goals.

Ms. McKeel suggested that it would behoove both localities to make sure, in doing climate work, that they pull in both school divisions and the leadership in those schools, as there was not a better place to reach portions of the community than families with children in schools. She said they also operate large transit systems and she suggested they be pulled into the climate action work to understand what the localities are doing and so that they are not operating separately. She said perhaps this is being done, but that there was a need to increase this partnership and awareness. Ms. Riddervold agreed with Ms. McKeel and said it is important to keep in mind that when they look at what is called the "government carbon footprint," it is usually within three to five percent of the overall footprint, which is why so many of the actions, initiatives, and strategies that the localities pursue need to engage the rest of the community.

Ms. Riddervold said that they cannot simply do climate action as an aside, but that it needs to be integrated in everything they do, because they will never reach the goals without talking about the impacts on housing, land use, transportation, etc. She said this presentation was not only an update, but a plea moving forward that they do not ever only discuss climate action whenever there is extra time to do so. She said the community expects the localities to make the goals.

Ms. McKeel again asked that the two school divisions be engaged as much as possible, explaining that Albemarle County public schools drive about 13,000 miles per day and that this was a major impact.

Mr. Stewart noted that they have had great participation from Albemarle County Public Schools,

and they have a member of their Executive Team on their steering team. He said they have engaged with Mr. Jim Foley, head of the school bus system and fleet manager for the County, but they have not yet interfaced with the School Board or Long Range Planning Committee, and he would like to do this.

Ms. Riddervold commented that the City School Board adopted resolutions around energy and water performance, and this was in line with the climate action commitments coming up.

Ms. Galvin asked if there was any information about the initiative regarding Dominion Energy funding electric buses for the school divisions. Ms. Riddervold responded that they are scrambling to coordinate on pursuing that. Ms. Galvin noted that they would also need to have the infrastructure for the new charging stations. Ms. Riddervold responded that this was where they engaged the transit director to collaborate on what Dominion Energy is planning to do in the Central Virginia area.

Ms. Palmer mentioned that they would be discussing compost momentarily, and when discussing schools, their food program is significant. She said that given that 30 percent of waste is estimated to be food waste, and in discussing landfill diversion, this was something to consider.

- 
- Ivy Road Composting Report.

Mr. Bill Mawyer, Executive Director, Rivanna, explained that the Rivanna Authorities provides composting services of organic waste to the community at three locations. He said one is at the McIntire Recycling Center on McIntire Road, where about 50 tons per year of compostable food waste is collected. He explained that a contractor carries these away to a composting facility in Waverly, VA, and this costs about \$12,000 per year of which the City pays for 30 percent of the cost and the County pays for 70 percent, in accordance with their Recycling Agreement. He explained that Waverly is located south of Richmond near Petersburg and it goes to the McGill Compost Facility.

Mr. Mawyer said the second location is the Ivy Material Utilization Center. He said an ad-hoc convenience center is located there until they get a new one built, and yellow containers are used to collect compostable food waste from residents at no cost, and from businesses for \$178 per ton. He said the major user of the center is UVA, which has a contractor, Black Bear Composting, which collects about 500 tons per year from UVA to Ivy, where the compost is weighed and Black Bear is charged a fee, then Black Bear is paid to take it away to Crimora, where they have a composting facility. He said Crimora is located in the Shenandoah Valley, about 28 miles away.

Mr. Mawyer said the third facility composts wastewater biosolids that come from the wastewater treatment plant. He indicated pictures on a slide, describing how in the biosolids handling building, the waste comes off a conveyor chute and into a truck and the organics are at the end of the wastewater treatment process. Mr. Mawyer presented a picture of a trailer filled with the products, noting that they send about 10 to 12 of these trailers each week to the Waverly Compost Facility. He said this was more expensive, explaining that there are about 14,000 tons per year and it costs about \$600,000 per year to ship the biosolids to Waverly, where compost is made. He said the City and County share the cost, currently at about 50 percent each. He presented a picture of large trucks of loading the biosolids in Waverly. Mr. Mawyer said there was a Master Plan under consideration where the RSWA is taking a new look at composting and how they might improve those services for the area. He said they expect to make a presentation to the RSWA Board later that month on the topic.

Ms. Palmer stated that this was considering placing a composting facility at Ivy. Mr. Mawyer responded, "yes".

Ms. Galvin expressed appreciation for presenting all the locations, because it is counteracting their goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the transportation sector by driving to remote locations. Ms. Palmer agreed. Mr. Mawyer responded that this is part of what the study would look at as far as how to optimize the program.

Ms. Galvin also thanked Mr. Mawyer for oyster shell collection. Mr. Mawyer explained that there was a new program in which they collect oyster shells at McIntire, where they are shipped to Richmond through VCU and then the recycled shells are put back into the river.

Mr. Randolph asked if Mr. Mawyer could explain who operates the facility in Waverly and what they specifically use the biosolid materials for. Mr. Mawyer responded that the facility's company named is McGill, and they make and sell compost. Mr. Randolph asked if the compost was then commercially available. Mr. Mawyer responded, "yes" and explained that McGill mixes the biosolids and food waste and make compost, then sells it.

---

#### Agenda Item No. 8. Wrap-up and Next Steps.

Mr. T. Richardson thanked the staff from the County and the City for putting the meeting together. He gave a special thanks to Ms. Emily Kilroy for assisting him in his first joint meeting on the City side.

Mr. J. Richardson said this concludes their fourth joint meeting with both boards and staff for afternoon work sessions within the last 12 months. He said the time they spent together today reflects 25 speakers, a number of topics, and next steps, and he will be asking both the County and City staff to

coordinate and put together action minutes of the things they will need to follow up on over the next several months. He said there has been specific direction given by both the Board of Supervisors and City Council on a number of topics, and staff, over the next one to two weeks, would be collecting action items and putting them together. He suggested to Mr. T. Richardson that a memorandum be co-drafted that would go to both City Council and the Board of Supervisors to outline the action follow-up items, due to the number of discussion topics that were presented.

Mr. Richardson thanked Mr. T. Richardson and his staff for hosting the meeting, and thanked County staff for its hard work. He said that when he met with Mr. T. Richardson several months prior, they discussed what they believed success would look like for the joint meeting. He said one of the things they discussed was trying hard to make sure the boards know that their respective staffs are trying diligently to communicate intentionally and work hard collaboratively on things that make sense. He expressed his hope that both boards could see that there was a significant amount of intentionality in both staffs working together on a regular basis. He added that the four joint meetings have created momentum and he hope the boards will be impressed with the co-authored memorandum they are sending out later that will state the follow-up items.

Mr. J. Richardson commented that both boards would be undergoing elections over the next 90 days. He said that when the memorandum is received, they will see that there is much work to do, and suggested that he and Mr. T. Richardson reconvene in January 2020 and discuss what makes sense as far as the next joint meeting, indicating that the two boards would likely meet again in early 2020. He asked Mr. Gallaway and Ms. Walker if this meets their expectations.

Mr. Gallaway and Ms. Walker each responded yes.

Mr. Richardson invited comments from individual Supervisors and Councilors before adjourning.

Ms. McKeel and Ms. Galvin expressed their appreciation of the meeting.

---

Agenda Item No. 9. Adjourn to September 17, 2019, 3:30 p.m., Room 241.

At 6:18 p.m., Mr. Gallaway adjourned the Board of Supervisors to September 17, 2019, 3:30 p.m., Room 241.

Ms. Walker adjourned the City Council.

---

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 03/04/2020
Initials TOM