

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 11, 2020, at 3:00 p.m., Room 241, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from March 5, 2020.

PRESENT: Mr. Ned Gallaway, Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J. S. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer, and Ms. Donna P. Price.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeffrey B. Richardson, Deputy County Executive, Doug Walker, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette K. Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m., by the Chair, Mr. Gallaway.

Item No. 1.a. Update on Coronavirus.

Mr. Gallaway said that with the changing information and events, they would be receiving an update on the Coronavirus first.

Mr. Walker introduced Deputy Fire Chief John Oprandy, who is taking the lead from the Fire Rescue department and emergency management function for the County. He also introduced Dr. Denise Bonds, Director of the Thomas Jefferson Health District.

Deputy Deputy Chief Oprandy said Fire Rescue is planning and taking action on a daily basis, and that all of this is coordinated through their regional partners, through the Thomas Jefferson Health District with Dr. Bonds, and also with the Albemarle County School Division.

Deputy Chief Oprandy said the actions and planning steps were all in support of the goals they have established. He said there is an Incident Action Plan (IAP), with goals that have been recommended through the CDC as well. He said these goals are to reduce transmission amongst staff, protect people who are at higher risk for adverse health complications, and maintain essential services for the public.

Deputy Chief Oprandy said there is an Incident Management Team (IMT) that is established in order to carry out these broad goals. He said this structures allows for efficiently directing and accepting resources throughout the region, not only within Albemarle County, but within the City of Charlottesville and beyond (e.g. State resources). He said this structure is useful for this kind of expansion as well.

Deputy Chief Oprandy said the IAP is a phased approach. He said they were currently in Phase I, and that the Board would see this change over the next couple weeks. He said moving from one phase to another is done with strict coordination with the Thomas Jefferson Health District, receiving information from them as well as from the CDC.

Deputy Chief Oprandy said Dr. Bonds was there to talk with everyone, and is also on the IMT, so she is meeting with Fire Rescue regularly, on top of many other COVID-19 teams.

Dr. Bonds said there were now Coronavirus cases in Virginia. She reminded that Albemarle is in the Northwest region, and that there is one case in the Northwest region, though not in their district. She said the case was in Spotsylvania and that she could share this information, as it was put out in a press release.

Dr. Bonds said to date, Virginia has 9 cases. She said they know where all the cases' risk was, with the exception of the Spotsylvania case. She said they have not been able to trace that case back to either a known Coronavirus case, or travel to a high-risk area, so this one is still under investigation. She said she was assisting that health district, as their health director was out ill.

Dr. Bonds mentioned they are moving into a three-phase plan, which is what the CDC recommends at this point in time. She said they need to think about mitigating the impact of this infection in the community. She said the reason is that they need to keep the epi-curve (or curve of infection) below that healthcare capacity.

Dr. Bonds said if they do not do any of these mitigation strategies, the risk is that on the epi-curve, they will have a huge number of infections that will rise, then quickly fall. She said while, in some ways, this seems like it might be desirable because then, they get it over with quickly, what will end up happening is what happened in Wuhan, China. She said they had a very rapid rise in the number of their cases, which completely overwhelmed their healthcare system, which is probably why they saw such a high fatality rate.

Dr. Bonds said they are fortunate to have two hospitals in the community, which are extraordinarily well-resourced. She said they must, however, be able to keep the capacity of individuals going in and needing treatment below their threshold.

Dr. Bonds said they are still in the preparation phase and didn't have a case in Albemarle County

yet. She left for the Board a handout that was on the CDC website, which anyone can download. She said it breaks out actions by different community settings so individuals, schools, etc. know what to be doing at which stage. She said it contains great practical strategies.

Dr. Bonds said that at this point, in their community, they would consider them to be in the preparatory phase. She said they would then move into the mild-to-moderate spread (where they begin to have cases), and finally into the widespread phase.

Dr. Bonds said she met with the School Superintendents that morning to talk about the next steps, noting that UVA was moving to distance learning, which she believed was a wise decision, on their part. She said this will help reduce the risk in the community, as the students become exposed on Spring Break.

Dr. Bonds said she was always willing to come and speak to the Board. She said she was working very closely with all incident management teams across the district. She said at some time, the Board may see Mr. Ryan McKay, who is her liaison officer under the ICS structure and knows everything she knows. She said this enables them to cover the broad swath of groups that need information.

Dr. Bonds said there would be a meeting tomorrow with law enforcement and first responders to work on strategies to keep them safe, as they begin to have community cases. She said there would then be a community meeting for vulnerable populations, and all the groups that work with vulnerable populations, as they want to protect that group of people who are at high risk, but also individuals who are currently experiencing an episode of homelessness or unstable housing situations. She said they will be meeting and coming up with strategies so that, as a community, they can have an appropriate response and protect those vulnerable groups.

Ms. Palmer asked about the hospitals' capacity to isolate patients.

Dr. Bonds said they had both isolation wards and negative pressure rooms. She said there is one of the State's special pathogen units at UVA, and that they are well-trained to deal with all kinds of bacteria, viruses, and other illnesses that would require special isolation procedures.

Dr. Bonds said if they start to get a large surge in the number of cases, there is the concern that this will get quickly overwhelmed. She reminded that they are still in flu season and are beginning to approach the tail end of the season, and that people still have other things that happens such as heart attacks and accidents. She said this is where they need to be mindful of the surge capacity. She said she wasn't in the right situation to talk about what the absolute capacity of the hospital is, as she is not a hospital employee, and they would have a much better idea of that.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if, at the end of flu season or going into the summer, Dr. Bonds would see this virus dissipate.

Dr. Bonds replied that she didn't know. She said the big question was if this virus would act like many other respiratory viral pathogens, and that they would see a gradual waning as warm weather comes; or, if this was so different from other viral pathogens that they continue to see a big outbreak. She said they could certainly hope that the warm weather would help in their favor, which would allow them time.

Dr. Bonds said she didn't think this was going to go away, and was not going to be like SARS or MERS where there is a big outbreak, it goes away, and they don't see it again. She said it has proven to be a tenacious virus, and what they need to do is buy some time to build up treatments and vaccines, and think about how to deal with it, should they have another outbreak next year. She said they could hope the warm weather would help, but that they were not planning on it happening.

Mr. Gallaway said at the last Board work session, a question had come up about capacity and resources for something like this. He said for the public and for the Board, there were some requests. He said next Tuesday, March 17, they would have their budget work session around the Boys and Girls Club with the School Division, and that they would build in some time for the Coronavirus topic as well, as it relates to resources.

Mr. Jeff Richardson (County Executive) said on March 17, there is a 3:00-6:00 p.m. placeholder that had previously been identified and held, and at the last work session, the Board made a decision to take a topic that had been briefly discussed and put it there for formal consideration. He said they have invited the School Division to join them on March 17. He said neither he nor Ms. Allshouse believed that this discussion would take the entire three-hour session. He suggested holding time for an update on the Coronavirus with Dr. Bonds and staff, and would also like to give the Board any budgetary technical adjustments over the next six days.

Mr. Richardson said they have a finance component of the planning team, both from finance and budgeting, who are keeping close track of what is going on with the local and national economies. He said at that time, this would be an opportunity for the team to give the Board any considerations. He said this would have some time limits related to the budget consideration, and that they could also answer any questions the Board has and be ready to look at Board consideration for anything that could happen between now and then.

Dr. Bonds added that the Health District is also reaching out to the business community through

the Chambers of Commerce in their various areas. She said they recognize that this will potentially be a big financial hit for them, and they want to talk to the businesses about how to continue their operations in the safest manner possible. She said the Health District has not forgotten that this will impact the businesses as well. She said in fact, CDC has recognized that reducing economic impact on the community is one of the three goals.

Mr. Jeff Richardson extended a welcome to their counterparts with the City of Charlottesville, Dr. Tarron Richardson (City Manager) and Ms. Letitia Shelton (Deputy City Manager).

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** Transit.

Mr. Gallaway said he appreciated the willingness of Mr. Boyles, Mr. Sheffield, and Mr. Williams to be there that day. He said transit was a topic of importance to the Board, and that this was the first time they have carved out a work session in the budget cycle specifically to this topic.

Ms. Allshouse reviewed the desired outcomes of the meeting. She said the Board of Supervisors will attain a greater understanding of local transit goals, transit funding requests, and current transit recommendations included in the FY 21 proposed budget. She said the Board of Supervisors would also today, if they desire, provide some direction regarding FY 21 funding allocation of the contingency, included on page 161 of the Transit chapter in the recommended budget.

Ms. Allshouse explained the papers on the table in front of the Board members. She said these included a copy of the presentation. She said there were also two packets, in light blue and dark blue. She said inside the light blue folder, they would find the transit agency contributions, which was taken from the budget book. She said on the other side of the folder, they would see some information provided by Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) to have on hand during the presentation.

Ms. Allshouse said the dark blue notebook included a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that they would be speaking to that day. She said on the other side of the notebook, they would see some information provided by Mr. Bowman earlier about CAT's budget request. She mentioned this information had also been emailed to the Board.

Ms. Allshouse shared the agenda. She said Mr. Boyles would start by talking about the Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) and providing an overview about the MOU. She said Mr. Bowman will be sharing information about what is in the FY 21 proposed budget. She said Mr. Sheffield (JAUNT) will share information about ridership and funding requests.

Ms. Allshouse said they will slow down at each point, as it is a time for questions and answers. She said questions can be asked along the way, but that it was a time for the Board to get answers.

Ms. Allshouse said they would have a break at 4:30 p.m., and then Mr. Williams would speak about CAT ridership and funding requests. She said there would be time at the end of the meeting for the Board's discussion, as well as a meeting wrap-up.

Item No. 2.a. Regional Transit Partnership.

Mr. Chip Boyles, Executive Director of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) and the Charlottesville Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), presented. He said both of these provide staffing for the Regional Transit Partnership (RTP).

Mr. Boyles said the budget request somewhat pales in comparison to CAT's and JAUNT's, not because of importance, but financially.

Mr. Boyles said the RTP is a fairly new advisory committee, but that the numbers are big. He said they hold 24 regular partnership meetings, each of which includes public involvement. He said it includes 30 different service, stakeholder, or technical types of meetings are held to move towards completion of a Strategic Plan for the RTP.

Mr. Boyles said the RTP created the first written funding MOU for transit services between the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County. He said they published the first online public ridership report completed for JAUNT, CAT, Ride Share, and Amtrak. He said three additional service and planning grant applications were submitted to the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT). He said they have worked with JAUNT on the expansion of transit connectivity with Greene County. He said these were just a few of the accomplishments since October of 2017.

Mr. Boyles said two of his staff with the TJPDC and MPO were there with him as well to be able to provide information.

Mr. Boyles thanked the Board for allowing RTP to bring them brief history about the organization and their work with Albemarle County, City of Charlottesville, CAT, JAUNT, UVA's transit system, Ride Share, Greene County, the school bus systems for Charlottesville and Albemarle, and many others (including hospital systems). He said though they have accomplished much in the past few years, much more was expected in the upcoming months and years as well.

Mr. Boyles said the Planning and Coordination Council asked the TJPDC looked at an old

regional transit authority study from 2008 and reevaluated that for direction to consider a more regional approach to the current transit services. He said the updated report came out in 2017, and it recommended to Charlottesville and Albemarle to create a regional transit advisory body, to pursue shared facilities and operations, and to provide more affordable services in reporting and budgeting documents.

Mr. Boyles said that in October of 2017, Albemarle, Charlottesville, JAUNT, TJPDC, the MPO, and Virginia's DRPT all entered into an MOU that created the functions of this regional advisory group. He said the RTP is an advisory group to all of the stakeholders, and the first meeting was held that October.

Mr. Boyles said that in August of 2018, through the help of Mr. John Martin and SIR from Richmond, they completed their first and only Strategic Plan so far. He said following that, in 2019, the City and County approved funding for the RTP for the first time. He said this was the first year the TJPDC financially supported all of the activities of the RTP.

Mr. Boyles said most recently, the biggest activity is, as UVA requested and as the Board, Charlottesville, and Albemarle approved, UVA becoming a voting member of the partnership.

Mr. Boyles said through the Strategic Plan, they developed a mission and a vision for the group. He said the mission is to provide recommendations to the decision makers. He said the vision is to create an efficient, high-quality, integrated regional network that catalyzes equitable and sustainable redevelopment and maximizes the region's reputation as the best place to live, work, learn, and play.

Mr. Boyles said in trying to move both the mission and vision forward, the RTP has produced and published a Strategic Plan, created with the help of SIR. He said they have held their monthly meetings for the partners, stakeholders, and especially for citizen input. He said they have held several public meetings facilitated by the international transit consulting firm Jarrett Walker, which focuses upon learning and trying to teach what they call "Transit 101" within the community.

Mr. Boyles said the RTP has also participated in two different listening tour sessions. He said one was with the Virginia in trying to identify key opportunities and concerns of what transit is within the region.

Mr. Boyles presented two visuals from the Strategic Planning session that took a look at both current feelings and future desires. He said key thoughts of the current system include "confusing," "disconnected," "inconvenient," "slow," and "siloed." He said key desires for future improvements included "accessible," "efficient," "seamless," "coordinated," "convenient," and "regional."

Mr. Boyles said to help move the RTP forward towards the desired vision for the system, recommendations included funding and development of a \$550,000 comprehensive regional visioning plan, of which they have applied to the State for funding. He said it was very similar to plans recently completed in Richmond, Hampton Roads, and Roanoke.

Mr. Boyles said RTP also works to continue publishing monthly ridership reports for all modes of regional travel including CAT, JAUNT, Ride Share, Amtrak, e-bike and e-scooter, Charlottesville Airport, and the UVA transit system, where feasible.

Mr. Boyles said the RTP is continuing public educational sessions for better understanding and public input of public transit services.

Mr. Boyles said additional strategies initiated were rider, non-rider, and stakeholder surveys; developing and identifying marketing and informational systems for regional transit services; learning from peer systems, starting with an upcoming visit to Blacksburg, Virginia to look at their system; working to continue to bring in Greene County transit as a more active regional provider; and coordinating funding opportunities such as the federal Small Transit Intensive Cities (STIC) funding for the region.

Mr. Boyles said for budgeting purposes, if awarded, the FY 20 budget will continue to include funding for the monthly partnership and planning meetings; the peer visit trip to Blacksburg; the committee meetings, as assigned by the RTP, of which they have about three subcommittees; and a grant application preparation for expanded services within the region.

Ms. Allshouse noted that Mr. Bowman would touch on the budget request.

Ms. McKeel said she thought it would be advantageous for Mr. Boyles to spend a few minutes talking about the visioning plan, as the Board was talking budget, and how that is being paid for in local match.

Mr. Boyles said the RTP originally applied for \$550,000 from DRPT for a regional visioning plan. He said this would not be a replacement plan for either CAT or JAUNT and the work that they have to do for the State with their individual systems. He said it will be a more regional approach that includes UVA transit, Greene County, and other modes of transportation.

Mr. Boyles said the best way it has been described to him is that what they would like to do is look at the demographics and needs of the region for transit need as if they didn't have a bus that serviced the area. He said they will determine those needs, then start to overlay what CAT, JAUNT, and

Greene County are doing. He said they will then take a look at where they are either currently servicing areas that may not need it, or not servicing areas that do need it, in order to figure out the best method to provide that service.

Mr. Boyles said RTP requested \$550,000 and that it is a 50/50 match. He said he received word the day before from DRPT that it will likely not be awarded in full, but close to full. He said they have about twice as many applications as they have funding available, which was abnormal. He said it would still be enough to move the RTP forward. He said the particular project, if awarded, would begin July 1 and should take 18-24 months to complete.

Ms. Palmer asked about the planning horizon of that plan.

Mr. Boyles replied that RTP would determine that as part of the process. He said in this case, it is usually a 20-year timeframe, but that this would have to be determined as they move forward. He said that for instance, there are some places that do this and their vision may be rail. He said rail may be a much longer timeframe if that is what they see as the demand. He said bus rapid transit would be a longer time horizon than just having fixed routes in the existing infrastructure.

Ms. Palmer asked if this plan is supposed to provide information about density and where they should do land use planning.

Mr. Boyles replied that he believed this will be the Local Government's decision of how to change land use. He said it will use current zoning and land use as a guide for where transit services are needed. He said the Board may want to use this in their land planning, and change the County's Comprehensive Plan and zoning to make the best use of that, but that this plan in itself would not be a recommendation to Albemarle County that higher density is needed in a particular area.

Ms. McKeel said she knew they were all interested in public schools. She said she had asked if, in fact, school transportation could be included in this visioning plan, and the response was that due to the federal requirements, they couldn't use the word "school" or "pupil" transportation. She said they did, however, include in the visioning plan and application older teenagers who may be using transit to try to travel between tech schools and other programs, which is what they were getting at, anyway. She said this additional verbiage was excellent for Albemarle County Public Schools.

Mr. Gallaway said Mr. Boyles sits in an interesting position, as he is looking at the purpose of the organization and has a regional perspective. He said today, they would get into details with some particular agencies they work with. He asked if with all the things Mr. Boyles listed, what he thinks Albemarle's biggest opportunities are for improvement, prioritization, or focus from a regional perspective.

Mr. Boyles replied that there may be 2-3 priorities and opportunities there. He said he believed one of the biggest current needs is to build the backbone for CAT, to help the fixed route system to be the best that it can be, servicing the real poor.

Mr. Boyles said the second thing would be to take advantage of the opportunities through both current technologies and systems, as well as innovative future technologies and systems, to be able to connect to that, and coordinate (even internally) with CAT's system. He cited JAUNT, Uber, and e-bikes as examples. He said currently, with technology, it is trying to make it easier to get those people from their origination to a point where they can take transit, in some fashion.

Mr. Boyles said another real opportunity was that currently, it was a very good time, as the State was investing in public transportation. He said the State sees this as a better alternative, as they cannot afford to build enough additional roads to accommodate the traffic. He said they are putting money into this and are willing to help the RTP reach these goals.

Mr. Gallaway mentioned there had been a previous work session about route design.

Mr. Boyles said there is competing ridership versus coverage, and that they cannot maximize both.

Ms. McKeel said they cannot afford the fixed route to cover Albemarle County, and that they have to look at all the options.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the RTP was set up for 20 years down the road, and that once they do it, it would be good for 20 years.

Mr. Boyles replied no. He said this would be the regional visioning plan, as the longer term. He said he would love to think that the RTP may sunset, if they build a perfect system and is not needed anymore, but that he did not see that happening.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the vision was for 20 years down the road.

Mr. Boyles replied that the visioning plan will identify how long that vision is for. He said if it starts to identify longer-term investment, then that plan would be for a longer period.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she hoped the vision would include flexibility. She said she has only been in the area since 2007, but from 2007 to current time, she believes the ridership has changed

dramatically. She said she wanted to make sure that the vision is flexible enough so that should the demographics change again and again, they are able to respond to that and not keep fixed bus routes in an area where they are not needed.

Mr. Boyles agreed, adding that technology is changing faster than the demographics are. He said they do not know what automated vehicles are going to do to all transportation. He said they have to build something that is flexible to accommodate that, as no one knows what it is yet.

Ms. Allshouse said they would move on to the MOU, and then key points. She noted these were highlights of the MOU, included in the Board's folder.

Mr. Boyles said the MOU is one of the RTP's bigger accomplishments. He said that in the past, the City of Charlottesville and CAT used a formula for a number of years to make their annual requests to Albemarle County, but that it had never been formalized into a written document, agreement, or process. He said RTP spent a number of months with the subcommittee that worked on that. He said the MOU was to review and update the funding formula that had been used in the past.

Mr. Boyles said the MOU helps to provide a guide. He said it is not a formal agreement, but is a guide so that CAT, the City of Charlottesville, and Albemarle County know what to expect of where the dollar amount requests come from. He said that when they did their additional study, this was not clear to the decision makers of how the dollars were requested in the past. He said RTP thinks this is now very clear, noting that they likely did not get it perfect the first time and that there was some massaging that would go on with it. He said this was a great start, however, because they had never had this in the past.

Mr. Boyles said that between the time budgets are first submitted, budgets are approved, and final funding is actually received, many things happen within the course of the year, and the MOU allows the parties to revise, update, and true up what the final financials are so that those can be adjusted. He said if a one-time grant became available for operating costs, and the RTP was able to take advantage of it, then that could be filtered in to change either the current year's or next year's financials. He said this was the purpose of the MOU, and that he anticipates spending some time with the RTP to massage it in the coming year.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide with some key points that were discussed.

Mr. Boyles said that when it comes to transit services in the region, there are several key points to understand, and especially for the Board, as decision makers. He said better and increased performance requires additional resources. He said this seems simple but is not always well thought out. He said achieving additional and improved service must be planned for and takes extended time to put the infrastructure in place.

Mr. Boyles said having managed a public transit system, if one tells someone today that they want new service somewhere, it can be 12-18 months before a new bus can be purchased and put there. He said it was not as simple as having the cash and starting tomorrow and so must be very well planned and thought out ahead of time.

Mr. Boyles said transit services are very labor-intensive, and very demanding on personnel. He said many of the costs the Board sees are for personnel.

Mr. Boyles said that in the region, CAT and JAUNT are in very different places within their services with regards to the types of services, the performance levels, and immediate capacity for change.

Mr. Boyles said funding is a very complicated formula for CAT, JAUNT, and the RTP. He said there are 5307, 5310, and 5311 funds. He said it is very complicated, and that the RTP is the body in place to help the decision makers become more familiar with those funding formulas, and how they apply to each one of the agencies.

Mr. Gallaway said he didn't disagree that sometimes, in some ways, better performance equals additional resources. He said in maximizing current resources, however, to effectively make sure that the current performance is good, he might follow that train of thought. He said across the board, perhaps if there was more money, things could be better, but they need to consider their high level of performance at the current state, with current resources. He said it was important not to lose sight of this.

Ms. McKeel said this is what they do with all of their departments.

Mr. Boyles said they were also referencing the fact that better performance equals additional resources that could come down to the area (such as outside grants) as well that are needed for better performance, but equates with additional funding.

Item No. 2.b. FY 21 Proposed Budget.

Mr. Andy Bowman (Budget Manager, OMB) said he would highlight the funding that is included in the County Executive's recommended FY 21 budget related to transit.

Mr. Bowman said the budget for transit, with relative amounts, totals \$4.1 million. He noted on the

chart the relative size between JAUNT, CAT, the RTP, and others. He said at the top of chart was the contingency, which was one of the items that the Board would need to consider in the budget process.

Mr. Bowman said the RTP recommended to continue \$25,000 for existing support that is provided by the plan's tradition. He said they have included funding for the Regional Transit Vision Plan. He said at the time of the recommended budget, it was based on an estimate they had from a December RTP meeting, which was a \$100,000 contribution in FY 21 and FY 22. He said as Mr. Boyles alluded to, based on the information that was shared in an RTP meeting in February, the update now is \$69,000 in FY 21 and FY 22 that would be provided.

Ms. McKeel asked if this \$69,000 was additional.

Mr. Bowman replied that it was a decrease from \$100,000 to \$69,000.

Ms. Mallek asked if it was in addition to the \$25,000.

Mr. Bowman replied yes.

Ms. Palmer asked if it was \$69,000 in FY 21, and \$69,000 in FY 22.

Mr. Bowman replied yes.

Mr. Bowman said if there was additional information from the State, they would come back and revise that information.

Mr. Boyles said he had just received new information the day before.

Ms. McKeel acknowledged there were numbers already changing, and that this was fine.

Mr. Bowman said the next item was the Afton Express, which is a commuter route that is proposed to run from the Valley to the Charlottesville area. He said the County share of this for FY 21 is only \$770, and in the out years, they estimate would be in the \$5,000-6,000 range. He said this is a partnership with the City, UVA, and other partners in the Valley.

Mr. Bowman said CAT was another item where staff had an update. He said at the time of the recommended budget, they had included level funding for CAT, pending further discussion. He said as Mr. Boyles alluded to, and as the Board was aware, the County's budget process is ahead of the City's budget process, as the County Executive's recommended budget was released on February 19, and the City Manager released two Fridays ago. He said at the time they review the CAT budget with CAT staff and City staff, there was essentially a draft budget. He said in January, the request of the County was a total of \$1.4 million to existing services, which was approximately a \$380,000 increase in existing services.

Mr. Bowman said now, several weeks later, because of the City Manager's proposed budget being available, and taking the MOU and refining that formula, the cost of the existing services for the County would now be \$1.2 million, for an increase of around \$203,000, or almost 20%, compared to the original budget for existing services. He said this is a number that could continue to change as they receive additional information about funding from the federal or State government. He said it is always possible they could make additional changes to point out through the City budget process. He said on transit, they would continue to watch that in the coming months to see if there are other changes.

Mr. Bowman said a very high-level explanation of why that is an increase for existing services is that CAT has seen a decline in related revenues that are not the County and City. He said as State, federal, and farebox revenues decline, the relative share of the City and County is increasing. He said that is one factor in the budget, and that CAT also has personnel increases for salaries, benefits, and operating costs as well.

Mr. Gallaway asked if they could marry the \$1.4 million that Mr. Bowman was saying was requested versus the \$1.7 million in the Board's budget book's FY 21 request.

Mr. Bowman clarified that the \$1.4 million applies to existing services. He said the \$1.7 million refers to the additional positions that were requested by CAT for transit mechanics, to convert some drivers and temporary staff to regular positions, and a few more items that Mr. Williams would talk about. He said the difference between the \$1.4 million and \$1.7 million are those new additional positions that were requested in the recommended budget.

Ms. Palmer asked about the contingency.

Mr. Bowman replied that the contingency represents the amount from the current funding to get to that \$1.4 million.

Ms. McKeel said the packet, there were two budgets -- one was a base budget from CAT, and another was an expended budget that included the positions.

Ms. Mallek asked if the contingency was different than the contingency they were using for the pilot.

Ms. McKeel replied yes.

Ms. Mallek said she didn't want to not know that and think that this is where the contingency pilot money was going.

Ms. McKeel said they have a visioning pilot money that is separate from the contingency funding being discussed that Mr. Richardson was recommending.

Mr. Bowman replied yes. He said the budget includes a \$388,000 contingency and that separate from that, the \$100,000 (now updated to \$69,000) was over transit.

Ms. McKeel said these were very different pots of money.

Mr. Bowman said JAUNT is recommended to be a \$278,000 (or 12.4%) increase. He said JAUNT is also looking at a projected decline in State revenue, which increases the County and all the other local partner shares. He said they also had increased personnel and operating costs that Mr. Sheffield would speak to.

Mr. Bowman said one difference between CAT and JAUNT is that through JAUNT, there is the inclusion of \$84,000 for a local match to Capital, which includes six electric transit vehicles. He said currently, the local match to capital is not provided to CAT. He said this is one portion of JAUNT that is different from CAT.

Mr. Bowman said there is the contingency (\$388,000) that represents the difference of current funding in the FY 20 budget for CAT to the amounts that, as of January, were contemplated for continuing the existing services.

Ms. Palmer asked what the State is doing that is reducing funding for CAT and JAUNT.

Mr. Bowman said the State is going to move to a performance-based model, and systems that are smaller and don't have the steady ridership or trends in ridership would be in a tougher position to compete for State programs. He said this was one factor.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said with this new State funding formula regarding performance, she knew the area was losing ridership.

Mr. Boyles replied this was correct.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said it would be incumbent to be able to bring up the ridership in order to compete for State dollars.

Mr. Boyles said this was correct.

Ms. Price said the State was going more towards operating transit, increasing the dollars, but making it more difficult for the smaller communities to be able to get some of those dollars.

Mr. Williams said they are asking all communities to take a hard look at their transit systems to make improvements. He said they are not willing to continue to fund at the current level if a community has underperforming transit. He said as they continue to turn the system around, there will be more money available.

Mr. Bowman said the short-term challenge is that the level of service initially provided takes some time to take off and get credit for that ridership. He said there may be more of a lag than in the past in terms of needing something that's putting closer towards the dollars versus the return in terms of State funding.

Item No. 2.c. Jaunt, Inc.

Mr. Brad Sheffield, Chief Executive Officer for JAUNT, presented an overview slide to give a sense of the size of the system they operate. He said currently, they have 88 vehicles and that, at maximum, they operate about 70-80 vehicles at a time. He said this includes the commuter routes (CONNECT routes) as well as demand response services and paratransit needs.

Mr. Sheffield said JAUNT is merging with the Greene County transit system, and that the numbers on the slide did not reflect that. He said the budget numbers the Board would see, however, do reflect this merger. He said when they see numbers on miles, trips, and costs, to remember that Greene County's information was not on the very first slide.

Mr. Sheffield said they have a diversity of where people need services as far as the types and location (rural vs. urban). He said they feel fairly fortunate because if they see a decline in one area, it is not hitting them overall.

Mr. Sheffield said their request was driven by a number of things that are not necessarily about JAUNT trying to correct or improve on any internal aspects as much as continuing to sustain the services

that are already out there. He said they requested from the County about \$166,000, and at the time, he made a mistake and said five positions when it was really only four. He said there is one already that is a dispatcher, based on the fact that the call center supervisor was expected to help improve efficiency, there was a reduced need for dispatch.

Mr. Sheffield said they have a need for what are called extra-board drivers, meaning the drivers who aren't quite assigned to a run will come in in the morning because in transit, there are people who are out sick, and for JAUNT, if they have two people call out, they have to take the schedules to try to merge them and figure out how to get work done with two less people. He said extra-board drivers help prevent that from happening and helps them adhere to the promise they made to the passengers about being on time and putting them to their destination in those timeframes that they committed to.

Mr. Sheffield said increases are driven by things such as looking at giving a 4% wage increase to their staff. He said they are wrestling still with their healthcare, although they have a positive outlook that House Bill 1106 by Delegate Hudson has been passed by the House and Senate, and will be signed by the Governor, which means JAUNT has access to local choices and State healthcare plan, which will reduce costs and help get that under control. He said this has been consistent for about 15 years, seeing a 15% increase.

Mr. Sheffield said another increase was in general supplies and services, including contracts.

Mr. Sheffield said with regards to the local match, they asked for a local match for capital last year, and they had some leftover funds to be able to match it. He said this time, they made the request for it. He said before then, they used what is called their excess agency revenues to help cover the local match. He said there was a fairly ambitious capital program that year, and they formed \$84,000 with that. He said there was still currently some local match above capital themselves, but things like going after six electric vehicles increases the amount, which is where they came up with the request.

Mr. Sheffield said there was something that changed more recently since they submitted the budget, which is the federal dollars that they had budgeted for, for the urban area, was about \$536,000. He said based on the apportionment that were released, that should be going up about \$100,000 for JAUNT, which means they would be able to fund the critical position called Safety Supervisor. He said it was a federal requirement by July 20 that all transit systems have a safety plan in place that meets the new federal code. He said they will be meeting that, but they know that they will need staffing to do that, which is why it was in the budget request.

Mr. Sheffield said things like the virus outbreak that they were dealing with currently really emphasizes the importance of having someone who is very dedicated to coordinating various safety aspects of the transit system, especially when there are 80 or more vehicles out on the road.

Mr. Sheffield said the additional funds are usually split between Charlottesville and Albemarle, and so about half of that \$100,000 would have been assigned to Albemarle, had he known that number earlier on. He said he was asking, at some point, to be allowed to retain that to fund the Safety Supervisor position. He said this was not necessarily something the Board needed to make a decision about that day, but JAUNT believes they could get the position covered with those additional funds.

Mr. Sheffield said the urban money seems to have gone up about \$370,000 above what they anticipated, overall. He said they get about 25% of that, meaning about \$100,000 for JAUNT.

Mr. Sheffield presented a slide to give a sense of the context about Albemarle's revenues and expenditures in relation to the overall regional services that JAUNT provides. He said currently, they have an estimated \$18 million budget. He said adding Greene County pushes them up even higher than they have been before. He said it is a mix of capital and operating money, with about \$5.6 million in capital that they are going after, with the remainder being on the operating side.

Mr. Sheffield explained that the pie chart in the middle of the slide was focused solely on Albemarle. He said of all the services they provide in expenditures of that, with roughly \$12-13 million of operating, about \$8.3 million of that is to expand services in Albemarle County. He said \$2.4 million of the operating that the Board has allocated is towards that, and then the \$84,000 is helping the local match with the capital. He said looking at the pie chart, the left side of the green area is the capital, and on the side of the blue is the operating.

Mr. Sheffield noted that the keys or secret to JAUNT's success is coordination with human service transportation (e.g. Medicaid and other entities), which allows them to offset costs to the localities. He said for Albemarle, it is about \$662,000. He said that of that amount, carrying these additional types of services at the same time that they are carrying passengers at Albemarle County offsets the costs. He said to think about two people riding down the road on JAUNT, with one of them being paid for by some sort of human service agency, and the other being covered by JAUNT. He said the cost of that trip has now been split between the two, which is what helps JAUNT keep some of the costs down from where they currently are.

Mr. Sheffield said otherwise, this was the breakdown of the revenues that the Board sees coming in. He said this does exclude the \$100,000 that he mentioned about the federal amount. He said he did not put that in, as he was putting the slide together to adhere towards what the budget request was looking like.

Mr. Sheffield said the expenses breakdown shows that they are looking at what they fund on the capital, and then the operating side, which correlate to the revenues that come in. He said it is important to note that labor is the vast majority of operations. He said looking at the pie chart in the middle of the slide, if they take out the capital and visually look at the green and blue portions coming together, the blue takes up a huge amount. He said whenever they have challenges with recruitment and compensation, it has a direct impact on the cost of services.

Mr. Sheffield said in looking at how JAUNT is trying to allocate their expenses, they know the majority of it is labor, and his philosophy is about how to empower and encourage their staff to be able to make the best decisions possible. He introduced the numerous people sitting behind him, who were JAUNT staff.

Mr. Sheffield said the key of what they try to do to maintain expenses or best utilize them in the most efficient way is empowering the employees (including drivers and reservationists) and help them understand how the decisions they make trickle up and down the organization and ultimately results in what they are spending their funds on. He said labor is a big cost, but it is also the focus of their efforts, from a development standpoint.

Mr. Sheffield said JAUNT is fortunate to have strong ridership. He said the urban ridership has been leveling off, as it has been with paratransit services. He said the demand response is all in the rural area (e.g. Earlysville, Esmont). He said commuter services have been taking off, and that they wouldn't see the line on the graph for Crozet CONNECT going much higher until they have more capacity in their vehicles. He said this has been a popular service. He said the more they are focusing on the messaging and promises for the Connect service, the more response they get from the community of what it means to get from home to Grounds or Downtown or without dealing with the hassle of traffic or parking.

Mr. Sheffield said what is the most interesting thing about the CONNECT service and the riders was one would think that one incentive for people to ride transit is to get there just as quick, or faster, than driving. He said this was not the case. He said they have found that many of the riders of the commuter services are willing to trade slightly more time with riding to have the convenience to not have to worry about parking or traffic congestion. He said this was encouraging because it meant that they do not have to focus as much on being quick as they should other factors, such as safety or convenience.

Mr. Sheffield said they are building on those things, and that they have put in a technical study as well to look at a route that would come from the Town of Louisa and Zion Crossroads into Charlottesville as one of their next year investments.

Ms. Mallek asked if the green line on the graph for the rural section on the slide was Albemarle County only.

Mr. Sheffield replied yes.

Mr. Sheffield noted transit is seasonal in that the ridership, no matter what transit system it is, dips in the winter and during holidays, and goes back up in the spring. He said it goes back down in the summer (due to vacations and schools being out) and goes back up again in August. He said the up and down was not a volatility matter in ridership but was due to seasonality.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification on Albemarle's CONNECT Routes on the slide.

Mr. Sheffield replied that this referred to all other CONNECT routes outside Crozet, including 29 North.

Mr. Sheffield noted that regarding State funding, one of the reasons they have seen a decline in State funding was that in order to get the Crozet service up and running, they asked for State money to help fund it. He said it is a one-time funding that has gone away, which adds to that slight decline.

Mr. Sheffield said he sits on the State committee called the Transit Service Delivery Advisory Committee that works on that funding formula, and that everybody will see some sort of increase. He said there are some that did not fare as well, but for the most part, it is a reasonable formula. He said FY 21 will be the final year of the transition of the formula. He said this current year, that's about 50% that they are focusing on with ridership. He said next year, it will be 60%.

Mr. Sheffield said one of the entities that fared the most was Greater Richmond Transit Company. He said it was important to note that they went through a completely different way of restructuring that resulted in ridership increases and so forth. He said they focused on what they could do better to encourage the ridership. He said they didn't necessarily do that in anticipation of the State funding formula, but that they benefited the most because they had that significant change in their performance around the same time. He said focusing on how performance relates to the funding is always critical, whether or not someone is dangling a carrot.

Mr. Sheffield said JAUNT's projections would go slightly down with the final formula because their ridership isn't as robust as some other systems that are more urban. He said this is why he was predicting a slight decrease, and then the decrease because they won't have State money for the Crozet service. He said they will lean more on the County to help with that.

Ms. Palmer said on the graph, Mr. Sheffield had the urban/paratransit numbers listed, but on the

rural demand response, paratransit was not listed. She asked for explanation of how much of the ridership require a doctor's letter or agreement. She said she was told there was a problem with people getting the doctor's agreement and then not finding that person after that period of time was over with.

Mr. Sheffield said the eligibility was something that perhaps Mr. Williams could address. He said CAT defines the process by which someone becomes eligible to ride as a paratransit rider. He said in the urban area, a person applies with CAT to be ADA/paratransit eligible and once they are, they can ride under that paratransit tag. He said it doesn't exist outside of the urban area, which is why it is not included in the rural demand response.

Ms. Palmer asked how the urban area is defined. She asked if it was just the City of Charlottesville.

Mr. Sheffield replied that the urbanized area does not line up with Albemarle's urban or development area. He said it is sometimes a terminology barrier of what the feds call an urban area versus what a locality defines as urban. He said the State used to have urban development areas. He said the feds look at some of this information and with a community this size, they are looking at population and population density. He said if it is over a certain threshold, they are tagging those census blocks or tracts as urbanized. He said if they exist too far away from a typical urban area, then they are an area of significance, and do not get included in it.

Mr. Sheffield said it is a strange looking map, with a Pantops leg that goes up. He said it is all based on Census data, and no one is looking at a map when they are deciding which of those tracts should be urbanized. He said it is done every 10 years, so they should see that map change once the 2020 Census is done, which will reassess the population and population density. He said this will define the opportunity to use something like paratransit versus demand response.

Mr. Sheffield said going back to Mr. Boyles' slide about the wording being confusing, this is the number one thing that determines what services someone might be eligible for. He said it sometimes depends on where someone lives, if they are disabled, and a handful of other factors. He said although they try their best to limit the confusing aspect, it was not easy.

Ms. Palmer asked if she didn't feel like driving into town, she could call JAUNT, and they would come out and pay, without having to be disabled.

Mr. Sheffield replied yes. He said she could call, and they would figure out what time is best, then take her in.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if with on-demand, a person could have the same type of service if they are disabled and in the rural areas.

Mr. Sheffield replied that they eliminated the requirement to have someone say that they are elderly or disabled in their recent restructuring of their fares. He said he didn't feel that it was fair to have two different fares (one for a regular person, and one for an elderly or disabled person) in the rural areas. He said they worked on consolidating the fare structure, and it happened to be the fare that is most used by the elderly and disabled. He said rather than requiring someone to jump through hoops to get that fare that is most used anyway, they eliminated all those requirements to say that it is one fare for that particular service.

Mr. Sheffield said JAUNT does not ask if the person is elderly or disabled in the rural area anymore because they don't want to put that additional requirement on someone who is already limited in their mobility and transportation options, now having to do one or two more things to get an option on the table for them to get to a medical appointment, job, or education.

Ms. Palmer said they probably didn't know in the rural area if riders are elderly or disabled versus the people who simply don't feel like driving in or may have an issue driving in.

Mr. Sheffield replied that they have customer surveys they do but even then, he wouldn't rely too much on that data because people are not willing to identify themselves as an at-risk or disabled person.

Ms. Palmer asked if JAUNT's budget delineates those different groups (urban vs. rural) so they can see how much Albemarle County is paying.

Mr. Sheffield replied that they break it down more internally, as there are different pots of money. He said the urban area is at 5307, which is the ADA urban money. He said this is the \$100,000 they were able to get. He said this is capped, is set each year, and doesn't go up or down based on any additional spending. He said with the rural demand response and CONNECT commuter routes there is a 50/50 match with local funds, so that with every dollar they spend on service, they are drawing down a dollar from the federal government.

Mr. Sheffield said if they spend \$2 million in services, they are drawing down \$2 million in federal. He said it has a positive double impact, and a potential negative double impact on the funding. He said with the urban area, right now, every single additional trip requires 100% local money to make it happen because they have already used up all the federal and state funds in the first six months, because they are so limited. He said after that, they rely more on the local funds.

Mr. Sheffield said if he was to do pie charts on the rural funding, they would see the local and federal even in size. He said if they look at the pie chart for the urban, the federal would be very small and the local would be much bigger. He said it is one of the challenges that they welcome encouraging their ridership as rural in the commuter routes, but not so much on the urban side because it is relying more on the localities to fund it, which makes it unsustainable.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was still wheelchair service to the rural areas.

Mr. Sheffield replied yes.

Ms. Mallek said she didn't want anyone to think that this was not excluding this service.

Ms. McKeel asked if the urban/paratransit eligibility depends on the eligibility that CAT establishes.

Mr. Sheffield replied that they have eliminated the eligibility requirements for the urban riders in Albemarle County.

Mr. Garland Williams said as far as the urban areas, as far as the CAT is concerned, it is a matter of where there is fixed route service. He said wherever there is a fixed route bus (3/4 of a mile around), those are the individuals in the urban area who can apply to CAT to get into the ADA pool. He said they would be eligible to take paratransit rides associated under CAT as opposed to using JAUNT's rural service.

Ms. McKeel reminded the Board that as they were establishing a new fixed route, it would cost JAUNT money because of the ADA circle they have to draw around that route, which increased the County budget.

Ms. Palmer said it also brings to mind that if they have a very dense urban area and if they do not have a CAT route there, then those people cannot apply.

Mr. Sheffield clarified that there are other services they can access.

Mr. Williams said this was not coming out of the pot of money associated with 5307, but was coming out of JAUNT funds.

Ms. McKeel said looking at a couple of the charts, as they are going through the next couple years and transit is becoming more important for the community, in thinking about what they might add to the budget book for information, a couple of the pie charts to be clearly described as far as what JAUNT is doing with the revenues might be a good addition. She said she thought they would start paying more attention in the community to the costs, and that something to consider for next year would be including these pie charts in the budget.

Mr. Gallaway said if someone were to ask him about the school budget, he would be good at delineating federal and state money. He said this breakdown was showing him that he would not be good at explaining this in terms of transit. He said looking at the slide that had the \$8.3 million in Albemarle, if someone were to ask him about the budget for transit and he went to this slide, he would not be telling the right story. He said he would like to be able to trace this more appropriately or accurately in the budget book. He said this should perhaps be discussed for further conversation about future improvements.

Ms. McKeel agreed, noting that explanation with pie charts aren't very easy to understand.

Mr. Gallaway said he heard the Census being mentioned and had just happened to be participating in something they would be putting out to the community, encouraging Census. He asked for the website.

Ms. Emily Kilroy replied it was 2020census.gov.

Mr. Gallaway encouraged everyone to make sure they participate in the upcoming Census, as this was important for the very things they were talking about.

Mr. Gallaway asked Mr. Sheffield to talk more about electric vehicles and why he thinks this is a route to take.

Mr. Sheffield replied that he tries to pay attention to business aspects of electric vehicles and that right now, there are huge amounts of investments being made by Ford, Amazon, and others into electric vehicle technologies. He said his belief is that it is no longer going to be about a dream technology, but that it's now something that makes financial sense to a lot of big, international companies that see the return on that type of investment, long-term.

Mr. Sheffield said this made him realize that this would come quicker than he had realized before. He said looking at Europe, Paris recently ordered 800 electric buses. He said they are not looking to manufacture diesel buses in Europe anymore. He said this is coming, and for a system like JAUNT, there aren't any transit electric vehicles like the vehicles they operate. He said he knows that they need to figure out how to make that work within the structure of how they operate now.

Mr. Sheffield said right now, to operate a gasoline vehicle, they fill up when they are getting low, which could be after a couple days. He said electric vehicles use a different type of fueling in that they could do it overnight, or along their runs. He said fixed-route Transit buses charge up along the routes, but that JAUNT does not have any set routes, as they go wherever people need them to go. He said it got even more compounded in their thoughts about wanting to tackle this, in that opening up the conversation about if JAUNT cannot figure out how to charge on the go when they are doing their on-demand response, how any kind of commercial company like heating and air or a package delivery company figure out how to charge as they go along. He said they will not make the jump to electric vehicle technology if they feel like they can't have that solved. He said JAUNT is in a good place to be able to explore and figure it out, and so they decided to make that move towards electric.

Mr. Sheffield said it can't be about saving money, initially, but has to be about where the technology for vehicles is going. He said they could jokingly relate it to horse and carriage buses, to gasoline. He said they are seeing a quantum jump in technology as being applied to vehicles these days, and that this would be there before they know it. He said it makes financial sense to a lot of big companies. He said they will either be stuck operating a gasoline vehicle in a day and age of electric ones, or they can get ahead of it now and be prepared.

Ms. McKeel said she would love to have Mr. Williams discuss this, as he has said at at least 2-3 RTP meetings that he would like to see them move towards compressed natural gas (CNG) as opposed to electric. She said she found this interesting and concerning, to some degree. She asked why Mr. Williams was not as excited about electric.

Mr. Williams said the timeline is different for urban transit than the model transit vehicle that Mr. Sheffield is using. He said Mr. Sheffield's vehicles are a 5-year investment, and when he buys a bus, it is a 12-year bus. He said alternately, he can get a small bus that is 10 years. He said CAT has already had hybrid electric vehicles in its fleet for almost 10 years now.

Mr. Williams said unfortunately, they haven't been very reliable, so they are at a point where they should be talking about being able to replace them, meaning that they have gone 10 years, or 300,000 miles, and they should be able to replace them. He said they haven't gotten the amount of miles required, and they have already had to replace batteries once. He said some of them are already degraded to the point where they will have to do it again.

Mr. Williams said the technology is improving in the big bus side, and that he would like to get in contact with a number of other transit agencies. He said Duluth, Minnesota is one of the first transit agencies to actually use one of the Proterra electric vehicles. He said they were a test bed for the FTA. He said one of the main points in the presentation, that he could send out to the Board after the meeting, is that they've had some issues in keeping the vehicles up and running, or getting them to actually run at all. He said it was not a one-for-one switch but is almost a two-for-one switch on the big bus side.

Mr. Williams said he comes from a system where they have used alternative vehicles that used CNG. He said the busses they used are 97% CNG. He said their next purchase will be 100% CNG. He said they have had zero issues with reliability, and their fuel costs have been able to be redeployed to actually improve the service. He said the equivalent for a gallon of gas is about \$2.70, and a gallon of CNG is \$0.60. He said this was a tremendous savings that they would be able to redeploy to the department.

Mr. Williams said he didn't think this was the model for CAT to do right now, as there is a significant infrastructure component that they would also have to do. He said the State and federal government are not allowing them to do expansion but are asking them to do it as part of replacement, which was very concerning for him. He said if he can't depend on it, then he can't provide the service they want.

Ms. McKeel said she sees the hybrids as very different than the total electric as far as results. She said they would be talking about having to build out an infrastructure with CNG. She said with the market, it seemed to her that the model right now is for electric vehicles. She said she understood what Mr. Williams was saying about the size.

Mr. Williams said his goal to make sure the region has reliable transportation. He said right now, if he can't depend on the vehicle being able to be out there every single day (noting there are only 36 vehicles in his fleet, with 10 of them being hybrids), he doesn't have the capacity, which is his concern.

Mr. Williams said most transit agencies that are moving towards electric are using their 10% vehicle contingency as they are exploring this. He said if they have 200 vehicles, they are using 20 of those vehicles to test. He said CAT did not have the luxury of being able to test right now.

Mr. Sheffield said this should be something that is discussed regionally. He said in a couple more days, a federal grant called a "low-flow, no-flow" (low emissions, no emissions) will be closing, and there are windows of opportunity every couple of years to tap into federal funds to help purchase low-emission and no-emission types of vehicles.

Mr. Sheffield said if the region doesn't come to a consensus on how to tackle this, then the federal government won't give them any money, it doesn't matter who is applying. He said they are looking for a unified, clear vision of where the transit system in the region is going. He encouraged

having healthy discussion about where to go to work out any of the limitations (e.g. replacement versus expansion, infrastructure) so that this gets worked out before the grant comes out next time. He said putting a great proposal together and drawing down money was very feasible.

Mr. Boyles reminded that the RTP has one of its subcommittees specifically working on that topic.

Mr. Williams said the low-no grant comes out every couple of years. He said that doesn't mean that CAT doesn't want to explore electric vehicles at all. He said the timing right now was not right. He said there needs to be time for the products to develop, and once they get to a point where CAT can depend on them, then they would jump into that pool.

Ms. McKeel asked if CAT did not have the infrastructure right now for the CNG.

Mr. Williams replied that they do. He said there is a CNG station that could be retrofitted, or they could apply for a grant have the State pay for them to have CNG. He said it was on the State's website to allow them to do the CNG, which was not there for electric vehicles.

Ms. Palmer said Mr. Williams has evaluated the system and knows what it needs. She asked if UVA had all electric buses.

Mr. Williams replied no.

Ms. Palmer said she thought UVA was experimenting or buying electric buses.

Mr. Sheffield said there were intentions to. He said until they dive into this and get some of the questions answered, it is hard to move forward with a clear understanding of what they are trying to achieve out of any initiative.

Ms. Palmer said she had heard they were planning on this.

Mr. Sheffield said that UVA runs 12-year buses just like CAT does, so the window of opportunity is much narrower, in that sense. He said for him, every 5 years is a fairly reasonable opportunity to replace or even expand JAUNT's fleet to be electric without taking the risk of there being some unforeseen problem. He said he would imagine that UVA would want to be part of this conversation as well. He emphasized that when applying to the federal government for these kind of grants, they want to see that unanimity of where things are headed in these types of projects.

Ms. McKeel said it makes sense to have the community buy into the same product.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if diesel buses usually run about 25 years.

Mr. Williams replied that their buses stay for 12 years before replacing. He said if the bus is a 29-footer, he has to exceed 300,000 miles before replacement. He said once it gets to 30 feet and above, he has to go 500,000 miles.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said diesel has its own pollutants, but that she understood that CNG also does.

Mr. Williams said that the level of pollution for CNG is half of diesel. He said he was interested in potentially transitioning from buying diesel to doing half a route with the CNG, and when the timing is right, the other half becomes electric. He said he was not big on putting all his eggs in one basket. He said if the electric grid were to go down, the fleet couldn't run, so if he had half the fleet as CNG, they could run service. He said the other half would eventually be electric.

Recess. The Board recessed at 4:42 p.m. and reconvened at 4:55 p.m.

Item No. 2.d. Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT).

Before the presentation, Mr. Gallaway asked Mr. Williams if he could think of one major opportunity for Albemarle County that could improve services.

Mr. Garland Williams, Director of Transit for Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT), said he wanted to ask one question of Mr. Gallaway before he answered. He asked if Albemarle County looking to increase density, noting that he would change the answer he would give. He said if this was not the case, and they were just trying to provide coverage for transportation, then this was a different model.

Mr. Gallaway said this was fair, noting he was looking at the current situation.

Mr. Williams said the current, status quo situation is that CAT needs to become more reliable. He said this would take management doing better as well as resources. He said the current model is that they have 50 drivers who are full-time and an addition 37 who are temporary. He said the temporaries sometimes show up, or don't, and impacts their service.

Mr. Williams said if Mr. Gallaway was asking what he really wanted to focus on, he would like to explore getting their frequencies on many of their routes (which are 60 minutes) up to at least a reasonable 30-minute service. He said if they were trying to build ridership, this was a baseline. He said there are very few people who are going to ride the entire route. He said their routes run every 70 minutes, which adds insult to injury in the sense that they have to wait 60 minutes, then an additional 10 minutes to get one bus to come and pick someone up or take them home.

Mr. Williams said there has been conversation about the RT service on Route 29. He said he comes from a system in Richmond where there were a ton of services on Broad Street, in the main corridors. He said the federal government will look at doing a model like that once the region has made a substantial investment in that corridor first.

Mr. Williams said if the region in Albemarle wants to do bigger, more robust projects, there needs to be a first step with the region wanting to do higher frequencies in those corridors first before the federal government will step in and help. He said he sees potential expansion of service to the airport, to higher points of activities. He said Route 29 was the most likely place.

Mr. Williams said the current model is a hub and spoke. He said he was not sure they would continue this model, as it could be more of a grid pattern that even establishes a connection point in the County where everything doesn't have to come Downtown. He said this was potentially a way to move people faster and get them to where they want to go, but it all depends on what the region envisions for their transit system.

Mr. Williams said the County is his client, and he is trying to give them what they want. He said he would be happy to provide his recommendations, but it was dependent on what they are willing to fund and what they want CAT to do for them.

Mr. Gallaway said some in the County are frustrated, and while he didn't mean to throw shade at Mr. Williams' predecessor, what he was hearing was that the management of the system has not been optimal. He said this could be one of the biggest changes that could impact the current system delivery to Albemarle County.

Mr. Sheffield asked if Mr. Williams was familiar with the urban development area of Albemarle County. He said half of the population is on 5% of the land. He said it would be interesting, at some point, to do a transit workshop around overlay with the urban development initiatives. He said to the question about density, this related to the development areas.

Mr. Gallaway said Mr. Boyles had mentioned the importance of fixed routes, which is what he was focusing on, and the frustration on the current fixed route service through there. He said Mr. Williams is new and looking at the system and determining whether or not the current delivery is effective. He said it sounds like there can be improvements made just from the management of the current resources to better deliver services to Albemarle. He said this could be the biggest focus right now.

Mr. Williams said this was his number one focus not just for Albemarle, but for the region, whether it is the City or the County. He said one of the first things he did when he first entered into his position was created a document called Missed or Pulled Trips because he wanted to see where they were missing service. He said he asked his team to go back and start from July 1 of the fiscal year to have a way to look at starting to improve. He explained that he wanted to see how efficient they were, and being able to see whether they were able to deliver every single trip that they promised each of the jurisdictions they were going to do. He said this was an important piece, because if they were not measuring it, they cannot improve.

Mr. Williams said what they were showing was that they were missing 75-80 hours of service in a month, 125 hours. He said routes weren't running. He said over the last two months, they were down about 6-7 hours. He said this was still too much, but it was a marked improvement from where they were just a couple months ago. He said one of the things they are assessing is the way the routes and drivers work, and that they had to come back and recut their work, so it made it less cumbersome on individuals to be able to do their work and provide the County with the level of service that it wants. He said by doing that, they were able to cut down on people missing out on trips and feeling like the schedules were against them.

Mr. Williams said one of the things he told his team when he first started was that they were going to do what is in the best interest of CAT so they can deliver the service to the City and County that they are paying them to do. He said they are working through the model so everyone feels they are a part of the answer. He said the team is more important to the model than he is. He said he can only give them the vision, and that they have to execute it.

Mr. Williams said if they execute it well, the region and system will rise. He said this will take more money, but it would also take a lot of planning about where they need to be because there is significant infrastructure and vehicles that need to be purchased if they are trying to get bigger. He said if this is the goal of the system, then there will need to be an infusion of cash, at some point.

Mr. Gallaway said he appreciated Mr. Williams' response, as it was out of protocol for him to ask Mr. Williams a question like that prior to his presentation.

Ms. McKeel said it would behoove the Board to make sure that Mr. Williams understands the County's model of land use with the development area, with the rural area, and how this impacts their density. She said this was a discussion for another time.

Mr. Sheffield said this conversation has likely never happened.

Mr. Gallaway asked Mr. Williams to start his presentation.

Mr. Williams said, in addition to serving as the Director of Transit for CAT, he also covers pupil transportation for the City and the urban side of Charlottesville Area Transit. He said he would provide an overview of what CAT is. He said CAT is a small urban transit agency, meaning that they are able to directly receive federal funding that allows them to offset the expense to run the system.

Mr. Williams said in FY 19, they served nearly 1.9 million riders. He said as a reference point, in the Board's packet, there is a trend that shows that in 2015, ridership was 2.5 million, and that now, it is about 1.8 million, and that they were still unfortunately trending down. He said they want to turn this around.

Mr. Williams said that in their model, they have 375 bus stops in the complete system, and one park-and-ride lot in the transit center. He said they operate 364 days of the year, approximately 19 hours a day Monday through Saturday, and 11 hours on Sunday. He said they have 36 fixed route buses, and 13 fixed routes that operate. He said they have provided service in Albemarle County since 1978, with 9 routes that operate in the County (Routes 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11; with Route 12 only operating on Sunday and is a combination of Routes 5 and 7).

Ms. Allshouse said the details about those routes are provided in the Board's packet.

Ms. McKeel expressed that it would be ideal if, at some point, they could perhaps talk about not only using the route numbers, but also using descriptions of where they run. She said one of her visions would be to have the routes be more descriptive.

Mr. Williams said he would give a perspective of the last six years of ridership in transit. He indicated on the slide to a blue line, explaining that it was one of the highest peaks, which was FY 15, when their numbers were up almost 2.4 million. He said the green line was the current FY 20 line, which was trending down. He said the inconsistencies of not having vehicles or drivers available has affected the system, and they also have technology that they are trying to address.

Mr. Williams said he has reached out to the State for a technical systems grant that would allow for a deep-dive into the system that looks 1-2 years out and help them right-size the route, as they have not been looked at in years.

Mr. Williams said the running times, one end to the other, should be adjusted annually and if they haven't been, then where it used to take 20 minutes to get from COB to Fashion Square Mall, it now takes 27 minutes but they are still trying to do it in 20. He said this makes people upset with CAT, because they think the bus is coming in 20 minutes, and it looks like they are always late when they haven't adjusted the running times to fit the needs.

Mr. Williams said he also wanted to provide information about revenue expenditure drivers for FY 21. He said revenue for CAT comes from a federal bucket, a State bucket, money that comes from the City, money that comes from purchased service from Albemarle County, and money from the farebox from when people pay them. He said shares from the federal government are 19%, and 21% comes from the State. He said once the State and federal credits are applied, it is 41% that the City pays to run the entire system. He said Albemarle County pays 16% to run their part of the system.

Mr. Williams said performance will equal more money from the State, so if they can turn the numbers around long-term, over the next 3 years, then they will get more money to redeploy to the system to make it better.

Mr. Williams said CAT's expenditures drivers are service levels from each jurisdiction, which is the total miles in operator hours. He said these play a key role in how they allocate the funds. He said converting temporary staff to full-time staff levels would help with reliability issues. He said fuel costs (whether diesel or gasoline) is a major issue for CAT. He said they are seeing system-wide that is the fuel costs come down, they will recoup somewhat of a savings, but it was not anything grand, at that point in time.

Mr. Williams said repairs and maintenance (e.g. parts, materials, supplies) play a major role. He said as the fleet continues to age, the numbers continue to go up. He also explained that there would be a percentage of pay increases.

Mr. Williams presented a slide on revenues, noting that this was the revenue projection that was done prior to the City Manager's budget coming out and knowing what the final numbers were. He said when CAT worked on their proposal to Albemarle County, they said that the federal government would still give them the \$1.615 million. He said actually, this number is \$2.1 million, with \$600,000 coming out of the pool that comes from the federal government and goes to JAUNT to help offset the ADA portion of urban paratransit in the City.

Mr. Williams said there is State money of \$1.78 million, and local money that comes from the City, which is about \$3.1 million. He said at that point in time, he was requesting \$1.4 million, and adjustments have been made there. He said there is directly generated money (e.g. farebox, ticket sales, advertising) as well, which brought them up to \$8.6 million in total revenue.

Mr. Williams said going to the expense side, the slide breaks down that there are 5 categories by which they allocate the money. He said there is an operational budget, which would go up that year because in this fiscal year, they have converted four temporary employees to full-time, which brought his number to 50 full-time drivers.

Mr. Williams said they also right-sized and tried to improve the overtime numbers, somewhat. He said historically, this was budgeted at \$170,000, and they actually put \$300,000 for overtime into the numbers, which is more realistic to what they were anticipating being able to spend in FY 21. He said for context, last year, in the operations side alone, over \$500,000 was spent in overtime. He said this was a product of not having drivers.

Mr. Williams said the administrative portion of the budget includes six administrative employees, plus some consulting money. He said all of this is roughly about \$965,000.

Mr. Williams said there is a maintenance fund. He said they also have a small marketing budget, at \$130,000, which is one employee and some marketing money. He said safety and security was a new category that was created (pulled out of administration and operations) to clearly delineate what they are spending on safety and security. He said this was a requirement by the FTA to see a Safety and Security officer on board, and they will be able to show the expenses for this.

Mr. Williams said the total expenses added up to \$8.6 million.

Ms. Palmer asked what percentage of the riders are Albemarle County residents versus City residents.

Mr. Williams replied that he did not know this answer because he could say where people get on the bus, but he would have to assume if they were from the County if they get on in the County. He said they are working through the model in being able to clearly show how many people get on and off at every single one of their bus stops. He said this was a planning function, but he does not have a planning staff, so they are working through this. He said he was getting some resources, and that the City's GIS team is helping to go through millions of records that allow him to answer that question, but that he didn't have the actual percentage, currently.

Ms. Palmer asked if CAT does surveys of ridership to ask. She said this is done in other areas of City-County mutual agreements.

Mr. Williams replied that they do, but that they are so small in scale and should have been much bigger. He said that on-board riding surveys would actually be better.

Mr. Williams said that with part of the technical assistance grant that he is asking for help from the State, he was going to put automatic passenger counters on the buses temporarily so that he can provide better numbers as to how many people got on in all the locations in the County. He said he hoped to be able to do this process and be able to provide better information in the next couple months.

Ms. Palmer said one of the things she was getting at was, if going back to the slide that has the City's proportion and County's, with the County's being almost half what the City's is, she was curious as to how this works. She said she always thinks of the ridership as being mostly City people, though she could be wrong. She said the local City contribution is \$3.1 million, with the County at \$1.4 million. She said looking at this, she was excluding State, federal and the revenue generated.

Mr. Williams replied that the numbers they were seeing was a high level of saying that the total budget to run the system is \$8.6 million. He said when he looks at the revenue hours associated with each one of the routes, it dictates the actual cost for each one of the routes in the system. He said on some of the routes, they indicate 50%, 25%, 92%, or 100% of the route, depending on who funds what route and how far it goes into the County. He said because it slides, it is not proportionally to say that they get "x" number of dollars. He said in the context of the overall budget, Albemarle's total expenses equal about 28% of the total system.

Ms. Palmer said she thought it was 16%.

Mr. Williams replied that it was 16% once they are offset, and once they get credits from the State, farebox, and advertising.

Ms. Palmer asked if it was not ridership but was based on the cost of running the system.

Mr. Williams replied that it was based on the cost of running the system.

Mr. Boyles said they calculated that in the formula because it is so difficult that if a person gets on at Fashion Square Mall, they are getting on in the County, but that could be a City resident. He said without surveys to better detail that, there is no way to know. He said the current formula, and the formula that had been used in the past, was based on those hours of service in the County because they

couldn't differentiate who was who.

Ms. Palmer said this makes perfect sense to do it that way as far as the cost to provide the service. She said her other experience was with fixed services in one spot, which was why she had been thinking differently.

Ms. McKeel said looking at the map, it really looks like (based on where the stops are) that it is a stretch for the County's share to be 28%. She said she was not saying it wasn't, but that to her, it looked like less than 28% of the time being in Albemarle County. She asked if there has ever been the opportunity to verify that. She said if looking at Route 11 and where it runs, just based on the schedule, there is a difference between what it looks like the County is paying for that route and how it actually runs (the percentage of time).

Ms. McKeel said they know that they are paying for the routes when they cross the County line, and that this makes sense. She asked if they have ever used the schedule of the routes when it leaves from one place and goes to another, then comes back, for each route and verified that they know what that percentage is.

Mr. Williams said he would let Mr. Boyles talk about this.

Ms. McKeel said it didn't look like, when looking at the map, that the County is getting almost 30% of the routes.

Mr. Boyles said when they were working on this with the committee, they were using the route map. He said they were looking at information that said they come into the County at 9:25 a.m. and leave at 11:30. He said to the best of his knowledge, this has never been verified, but the trip delay information would show if they weren't getting to that first spot until later.

Mr. Boyles said he had the same question because it doesn't show up well on the map. He said that the route might have 3 buses on it, and though there is one line that shows Route 11, there may be three buses on one line.

Ms. McKeel asked where Route 11 goes to.

Mr. Boyles replied it goes to Rio Rd. He said although the Rio bus may have three buses on it, on the map, the line will look exactly the same as a route that has one bus. He said there is therefore three times the amount of time, which is why the map doesn't give a good view of what 28% may be.

Ms. McKeel said at some point, it would be good to go in and actually verify some of those percentages.

Mr. Williams said he was going to do this soon. He said this was part of the technical assistance that he talked about. He said CAT would bring a consultant in, and that they would help him verify that the hours or miles are correct. He said he had no way of knowing because he does not have a scheduling software package that would actually tell him whether it was correct or not. He said they are working through that.

Mr. Gallaway asked how the consultant would do this.

Mr. Williams replied that the consultants would use their GIS software to put the CAT maps in. He said they will be able to trace and drop in the Census tracts as well as the lines from where it goes from City to County, and will be able to track the mileage associated from the City to the County.

Ms. McKeel asked if it would be easier or more cost effective to buy the software package, then have Mr. Williams' staff do that work.

Mr. Williams replied that the software package is almost \$1 million, and they were likely looking at 2-3 individuals who would do nothing but this work. He said this was not a cheap endeavor. He said those individuals with that level of expertise make about \$85,000-90,000 per year.

Mr. Williams said the system constantly needs to be evaluated and tweaked to make sure that people continue to get to work on time. He said if they go too long without evaluating and adjusting the schedules, riders will be mad because they have been getting to work late for 6 months or a year, 10 minutes late. He said he should be able to know that and make the adjustments so that the bus leaves 10 minutes earlier to get people there on time.

Ms. McKeel said this was a different issue.

Mr. Sheffield said JAUNT has a fixed route scheduling software for their commuter routes. He said it is based on the Route Match platform.

Ms. McKeel suggested there could be synergy between the two organizations.

Mr. Williams noted it was a different model. He said in Richmond, the Route Match model is used on the paratransit system. He said the consultants have a software system that is almost a \$1 million model and is designed so as the transit system gets bigger, it optimizes trips (whether it is told to give

more or less service) in an efficient way.

Ms. McKeel said perhaps Albemarle doesn't need the same system Richmond needs. She suggested perhaps working with Mr. Sheffield.

Ms. Palmer said she was ready to go back to the request for the money.

Mr. Gallaway said they likely all had different topics to jump to.

Ms. Mallek asked if with miles, Mr. Williams was talking about revenue or service miles. She asked what measures CAT is using, as Route 11 is a long way, and if they are coming back empty, she wanted to know if the County was getting charged for this, too.

Mr. Williams replied yes. He said it should be total miles and not just service miles.

Mr. Gallaway asked if instead of buying the whole software system, Mr. Williams would bring a consultant in, which would offer some temporary understanding.

Mr. Williams replied yes, noting that they could do this every year until they were big enough that they could buy their own system. He said they could have an on-call contract with the consultant for \$75,000 a year.

Ms. Palmer said she wanted to get back to what is being asked for the County's budget now, noting Mr. Bowman would give an update that the \$1.4 million was now \$1.2 million. She asked about the contingency and what decisions the Board was being asked to make. She said Mr. Williams was also asking for additional money to convert the temporary employees to permanent FTEs, and that she would like to understand what the Board was making decisions on.

Mr. Gallaway said they were trying to understand, in their budget recommendation from the County Executive, that the request was \$1.7 million. He said he understood there would be adjustments, and staff was trying to explain that.

Mr. Gallaway said he wanted to understand as an entity paying a service to a vendor, the request was \$1.7 million, and the other entity that contracts CAT's services (in the current year) was \$1 million. He said this meant it was \$700,000 more than the current year. He said the year over year budget, which includes the City, only went up 23%. He said the County's goes up almost double (64%). He said the City Manager weighs in, as he should, just like the County Executive weighs in, after all the requests come in from the departments.

Mr. Gallaway said Mr. Williams is new and looking at the system, and is asking for a huge increase, year over year, from the County. He said he would like to know between that, and the ask of the City Council and their percentage increase (noting they don't necessarily need to complicate this with what the City Manager does), why there is a big ask, and why there is a disparity in asks from the City versus the County.

Mr. Williams replied that he didn't know it was a disparity between the City and County. He said he actually asked the City for 20 positions to become converted from temporary to full-time. He said he asked for additional positions for three supervisors, three mechanics, software, and a transit analyst. He said this was what was needed, which is why there are two budgets that were sent to Mr. Bowman. He said he sent Mr. Bowman the status quo budget (\$1.4 million), and if they wanted to make significant improvements, it would be \$1.7 million.

Ms. McKeel said this was why they had two budgets, with Mr. Williams referencing one as a base, and one as a budget with additional personnel increases.

Mr. Williams replied yes.

Ms. McKeel asked if those positions were not submitted to the City.

Mr. Williams replied that they were.

Ms. McKeel said it looked to her that Albemarle County would be picking up the cost for those.

Mr. Williams replied that it is the combination of everything in the pot, and then the County's portion of it was being taken into the \$1.7 million. He said the City's number would have jumped much higher.

Ms. McKeel asked if the City Manager's budget does not reflect those positions.

Mr. Williams replied this was correct.

Ms. Palmer said she wanted to get back to Mr. Bowman's correction he gave the Board and how this affects Mr. Williams' ask. She said the \$1.4 million was now down to \$1.2 million, which changes the landscape. She said the City Manager did not approve the 20 additional positions, so she assumed that the County would not approve what the City Manager didn't approve.

Mr. Bowman said without any additional positions that were requested by CAT, and not funding any of the County Executive's recommended budget or the City Manager's proposed budget, the cost (using CAT's budget as of the City Manager's proposed budget for existing services) would require from the County an additional \$203,000. He said this could be provided from the \$388,000 contingency, for the Board's consideration.

Ms. Palmer said Mr. Williams was not asking the County for positions that the City Manager didn't propose. She asked if the City Council has made their decision, or where they were in the process.

Ms. Leticia Shelton, Deputy City Manager for the City of Charlottesville, replied that the City Council was still looking over the proposal from the City Manager, and were scheduled to meet the next evening at 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Palmer asked if this might be a topic of conversation.

Ms. Shelton replied yes.

Ms. McKeel said it was not in Dr. Richardson's budget proposal, but that City Council would be discussing it.

Ms. Shelton replied yes.

Ms. Palmer asked what decisions the Board was being asked to make that day. She said she personally would not want to weigh in until she heard what the City Council was doing.

Mr. Bowman replied that nothing needed to be decided that day.

Mr. Gallaway said he appreciated Mr. Williams being willing to do this, but that he was trying to understand and track information. He said this was finally allowing them to get into the weeds so that when he is asked what from his constituents what they are paying for and getting, this helps him understand it. He said they have the extra layer of a new director with new eyes now coming in, and Mr. Williams' request. He said much like when they see the County Executive and budget book, and a department comes forward, and they have unfunded requests, the Board sometimes asks what the reason was for that request, the rationale behind it, and why departments ask for extra positions.

Mr. Williams said with regards to the request from him for the additional positions, he took a look at CAT's system. He said in his humble opinion, they have too many routes that are 60 minutes long. He said he wants to improve that service and at least get them up to a 30-minute standard.

Mr. Williams said there is a document that CAT is required to do called the Transit Development Plan. He said his predecessor and team must have worked through it, and in it, there are recommendations to convert some of the routes to what are called bi-directional routes, meaning they are running the same direction on the same streets, and they start the route at the same time on each end of the line, so there is continuity. He said this is not what they have in the system today, which frustrates individuals because someone may want to go south, but they have a one-way loop where they have to go north to go south.

Mr. Williams said trying to correct some of that is a part of asking for the additional position conversions. He said they wouldn't be able to do all of that, and they would have to do one or two to do. He said this also allows CAT to become more dependable because they are not subject to temporary drivers not coming in and not providing the level of service that is desired.

Mr. Williams said he wants CAT to be able to run on time and he wants to be able to give the County the level of service they are paying for. He said if he cannot depend on the individuals to come in, however, he cannot give them the service. He said there is no other way to make this model work without people and vehicles. He said if he doesn't have enough vehicles or people, he cannot make the model run.

Ms. McKeel said she was trying to understand the people because aside from the new positions, with the people CAT already has that the County would be cost-sharing, it looked like there was a 15% increase to the full-time salaries.

Mr. Williams replied no.

Ms. McKeel asked what the drivers would go to, as an hourly rate.

Mr. Williams replied that it depended on where they are on the scale, but that his highest driver (which were one or two drivers) were at about \$20/hour.

Ms. Mallek asked what the minimum rate was.

Mr. Williams replied it was \$16/hour.

Ms. McKeel said she was looking at the original budget.

Mr. Williams said there are full-time salaries in the budget, and in the operating budget, there are

temps, and the overtime number.

Ms. McKeel said that for example, the actual full-time salaries in FY 19 was \$1.898 million. She said the proposed was \$2.333 million, which was a 15% increase. She noted there is overtime at \$300,000. She said she was trying to figure out what increase the drivers would be receiving that year.

Mr. Williams replied that in the model, there is a 2% increase next year on top of a 4% increase that happened last year (which affects this year). He said this is the bulk of the number Ms. McKeel was seeing.

Mr. Bowman said in the current fiscal year, CAT has converted some temporary drivers to be regular positions, and that this transition would appear in full-time salaries. He said this happened in FY 20 and would continue into FY 21.

Mr. Williams introduced Ms. Janice Woodson, his staff accountant. He said last fiscal year, CAT finished in the red (about \$505,000). He said the adjustment that was made for this year reflects that there wasn't enough money in the system to run the system last year. He said they are actually making some improvements in the system, doing things better with the resources that they have. He said they are trying to right-size it to say that if the County gives them this amount of money, it is allowing CAT to give them the level of service they are asking for.

Mr. Bowman added that under the MOU, they currently have a true-up process that will happen for the first year in FY 20. He said over the last three years, with the MOU in place, in FY 17 and 18, the County would have overpaid. He said in FY 19, the County would have underpaid, if there was a true-up to happen in each of those years.

Ms. Janice Woodson (Senior Accountant, CAT) said that there is an operations manager, his supervisors, dispatchers and the people who run the station. She said it was not only drivers, and that the salary was not exactly set at the \$16 range for all of them.

Mr. Williams said they actually converted one of their lead drivers to a supervisor in the model, which also added to the salary increases.

Ms. Mallek she was not alone in having citizens who like to hear the details of these things, and so she tries to understand so that she can answer them when they ask. She said Mr. Williams had mentioned the farebox revenue, and it looked from the way that budget is done that only certain categories of the revenues are actually shared with the County, before that split is made. She said the UVA, miscellaneous revenue, and transit past revenue sales look like they are zero, which would make a big difference as far as where the 20% share is.

Mr. Williams replied that this was adjusted. He said this was a matter of him being new and not knowing.

Mr. Bowman clarified that all transit past sales and transit farebox revenues are shared between the County and City. He said the County gets credit based on their 28% of service hours.

Ms. Mallek asked if this was in the \$1.2 million true-up number.

Mr. Bowman replied yes. He said the \$1.2 million reflects that. He said there is one revenue that is not split, which is the UVA trolley revenue.

Ms. Mallek said she had another question about the administrative costs for the school bus transportation, which is apparently also part of what the County is paying for.

Mr. Williams replied no.

Ms. Mallek said there doesn't seem to be any delineation about separating out the money that they are spending of CAT's administrative time on the school bus matters as opposed to the transit matters. She said without information, her assumption is that this is coming into the big pot.

Mr. Williams replied that school transportation is sitting in the General Fund. He said CAT is a special fund outside of the General Fund as far as where the money from CAT sits. He said the General Fund money actually comes in from the school budget, which comes from the City budget, and round robins back to CAT. He said he didn't know whether his salary is divided between the two or not.

Mr. Bowman said it is not.

Ms. Mallek said there is time that Mr. Williams allocates, and federal funding doesn't allow for that. She said it is something they need to know more about, going forward, so that things are clear for the average person like her to understand.

Ms. McKeel recalled that when they saw the advertisement through the transit partnership, they were advertising for Mr. Williams' job, and he applied for that. She recalled it was specifically in his job description that he has responsibilities for the pupil transportation system for CAT.

Mr. Williams replied this was correct.

Ms. McKeel said she was getting at Ms. Mallek's point. She said they were anticipating that, because it was in Mr. Williams' job description, he was spending part of his time on pupil transportation.

Ms. Palmer said she was trying to understand what they were asking now. She asked if they were asking for CAT to look at how much they spend on the school system busing, then track some percentage out of that to figure out the math. She said this is done with other areas, such as Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority and the Solid Waste Authority, to proportion the administrative costs to other things, and so it was very reasonable to expect that.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the total cost of the CAT budget includes the pupil transportation.

Mr. Williams replied it does not. He said it is in a separate budget.

Ms. Mallek asked if the administrative portion was part of CAT's budget.

Mr. Williams replied that their set budget is not reflected in the CAT budget. He said those individuals are not in this budget. He said there is a separate budget by itself for this.

Ms. McKeel said her understanding was that the City schools have a contract with CAT to run their system. She said the Board was asking about this because they were not seeing this broken out in Mr. Williams' budget anywhere, as far as administrative time and staff time.

Mr. Williams said these are included in the pupil budget. He said all the drivers and administrative staff on the pupil side reside in the pupil budget, which is in the General Fund, which is not in any of these numbers that he presented. He said there is not a pupil driver, supervisor, or any other personnel that is affecting the CAT number, other than himself.

Ms. McKeel observed that there are 29 FTEs for pupil transport.

Mr. Williams said those are approved FTEs. He said he did not have that number of drivers for pupils and that at present, he had 16 drivers total for pupil.

Ms. McKeel said this was so different than the County's model because their model has the school system bus service completely separated and not co-located together.

Mr. Williams replied that CAT was technically not co-located. He said the two budgets are separate and that they have drivers who work in pupil and work in CAT. He said when they get from pupil, they are coded as "pupil," meaning they are being paid from the school's fund, and then when they work for CAT, they get coded as "CAT" to make sure to keep it clean. He said there is no sharing of resources between the two.

Ms. Mallek said Mr. Williams mentioned there were 327 bus stops and wanted to know how many of those were in the County.

Mr. Williams replied that he would get her a number.

Ms. Mallek said she was somewhat concerned about the ADA changes being made, after so many years of not requiring anyone to jump through the doctor's hoops. She said it was concerning about the way they were treating the riders.

Mr. Williams said part of the earlier conversation that he had with Mr. Sheffield was that his numbers continue to grow for the urban ADA side. He said they need to try to control that because the ADA paratransit side of the house for the urban system is designed to get those individuals who desperately need that transportation to get to doctor's appointments. He said they can't ask them where they are going, as it is not allowed. He said they ask for the address but can't ask the purpose when the riders are booking a trip.

Mr. Williams said what they are doing is what most transit systems across the country are doing, which is actually putting that doctor's approval portion in to pare down the numbers, so that the folks who actually really need the system (as opposed to wanting it) can get it, and in a timely manner. He said it was not that they are trying to apply the letter of the law (which is what FTA technically wants them to do), but to get the system available to the people who really need the complimentary ADA paratransit service.

Ms. Mallek asked what would happen if there was a reason why someone would need JAUNT services instead of a bus (e.g. there isn't a bus service near them). She said she didn't understand why CAT was trying to cut the numbers down for ADA services in the County's territory.

Mr. Williams replied that it was a matter of capacity. He said Mr. Sheffield could speak to this, but it was a matter of whether they will make a significant investment in adding the vehicles and drivers for JAUNT to take that additional load in Albemarle County, or if they look to try to pare down and make the system better so they can actually use the fixed route system to get to their doctor's appointments or work.

Ms. Mallek said this was 2-3 years out, and they were talking about present time, or in July, as far as people getting where they need to go. She said this was a problem for her.

Mr. Williams said that CAT and JAUNT are supposed to mirror each other. He said on the weekends, the same level of service applies, as with weekdays. He said when someone is qualified to ride ADA, they make CAT free to that person, but that most individuals are preferring to pay double to use JAUNT. He said this actually puts more pressure on JAUNT and increasing that model. He said if they could improve the CAT system, they could probably take some of the pressure off of JAUNT and make it easier for people to get to their appointments without having to take 1-2 hours to get there.

Ms. Mallek said once the improved system appears, people will migrate back and not have to spend that extra money, but there must be a reason why they are feeling they would rather spend their dollars in the short term. She said they couldn't force people to change when they need to be drawn back into a better service.

Mr. Sheffield said when they look at the ADA ridership between the City and the County, the County's has leveled off, for the most part. He said a lot of the growth is in the City, and at some point, they will need to dive in and figure out why. He said in the urban area, they are seeing more ADA ridership, and the trend in growth is in the denser urban area of the City than it is on the County. He said it is curious to see that the County's ADA ridership isn't going up, but the City's is, which is a concern to him.

Ms. Mallek said this correlates with the ridership for CAT, perhaps.

Mr. Williams said it would change if they were to improve their performance.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said those people needing ADA services would rather ride on the JAUNT bus because it is smaller and more mobile. She said there is more personal connection with the driver because the driver usually assists with a wheelchair, for instance. She said the larger CAT bus is much more impersonal, and if CAT were to have smaller buses, she thinks they would find there would be an equalization of use. She said a person with a disability would not get on a large bus if they could use smaller buses, and that this was why they were paying for it.

Mr. Williams agreed. He pointed out that since he has been with CAT, there has been a temporary approval for a year for ADA. He said there was one that was recently taken away due to an expired date. He said the person had been riding for two years with that expired ADA ID. He said she wasn't using JAUNT, but was using CAT for free. He said there are number of people in the system who shouldn't have a card, and they need to do an annual or biannual purge of that information. He said having the doctor certify that they have a mobility issue actually helps to preserve the model so if they do have a mobility issue, they can get JAUNT and use it to get to their doctor as opposed to someone using it to go to the mall.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the current requirements were not being policed (for lack of a better term).

Mr. Sheffield replied that it was more relaxed at CAT than the typical transit system. He said it was not a matter of policing it, but it was a matter of the process of eligibility.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the plan was to tighten that up.

Mr. Williams replied yes.

Mr. Gallaway asked if they were going to make additional changes.

Mr. Williams replied additional changes would be to institute the medical provision and allow individuals a certain amount of time to figure out what that is to transition a new card that would say that they are eligible to continue to use the service.

Mr. Gallaway asked if this was over and beyond what is required now.

Mr. Williams replied that it is over and beyond what is required now, based on their loose approvals.

Mr. Gallaway said it sounded as if they were going to tighten up, and then perhaps do an extra step.

Mr. Williams said the extra step is the medical approval.

Mr. Sheffield said something to think about that was parallel was the mention about the development area. He said he has the same goal of reducing the ridership, and looks at it from more of the limited ability to get to the bus stop, looking at the development area to see who they are serving currently who is ADA and why they may be calling JAUNT instead of walking to a ditch to go to a bus stop. He said this was likely more what was driving it. He said undoubtedly, the friendliness of the drivers and culture JAUNT has is the first reason they are calling but being able to get to that CAT stop in the County's urban development area is a challenge. He said in the County's urban development area, this is likely a big limitation of why they are calling JAUNT.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley added that at the bus stops, if there is no canopy or a place to sit or wait in inclement weather, they are going to call JAUNT.

Mr. Sheffield said when he was a consultant, he did a project in Florida that had the same problem of increasing the ADA ridership. He said they surveyed the ridership and that it was a matter of infrastructure, noting that the stops in Florida did not have shade for the elderly to sit under. He said as they started making those changes and improvements, the ridership shifted away from the ADA back to the fixed route. He said he was convinced that it was an infrastructure access issue that was driving people to go to something easier to access.

Mr. Williams agreed, noting that the infrastructure piece would come in once they make a decision about the fixed routes.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she wanted to clarify that she had said the personalization for JAUNT comes from the fact that there may be 6-7 people on the bus, whereas with CAT, they may have 20-30 people on the bus. She said she was sure that the CAT drivers are just as friendly and helpful as JAUNT.

Mr. Sheffield said there as an exercise by Smart Cville, and many people who spoke highly of both sets of drivers. He said if there was anything on the top of his wish list, it was to celebrate and figure out how to boost the drivers in the area and show that appreciation for them more. He said with the virus outbreak, the drivers (getting paid \$14-16/hr.) are on the frontlines of that virus being transmitted. He said it is a hard ask to pay someone that kind of wage but tell them they are susceptible to a virus that could kill them.

Mr. Gallaway said he appreciated Mr. Williams' candor, as the Board was receiving more answers than they have had in years. He said he understood that they were tightening up the ADA piece, and asked what the evidence is that this was a big issue.

Mr. Williams said in most systems where there is the ability to ride for free, that number spikes. He said the ridership spikes because they are qualified to use ADA, but the system is designed well enough that they can actually get to their doctors or the bus and not have to pay anything. He said in Richmond, this is no problem. He said when they made it a policy that once someone gets ADA and can ride the system for free, their numbers increased.

Mr. Williams said it is just the opposite with CAT, where they saw an increase at first, but then the numbers started going down. He said it has gone down every year, while JAUNT's numbers have gone up every year. He said there is a direct correlation, and while he couldn't say that those are the exact same people, there is a correlation between something not working well in CAT's system and the people relying more on JAUNT than CAT.

Mr. Williams said this was the reason for the conversation about if they can make CAT more reliable, he believes they can reverse that trend and get those individuals on the bus. He said they are already able to use it for free, so it will help them in more ways than others.

Ms. Palmer said they are used to Mr. Sheffield's articulate and thorough explanation of things at JAUNT. She thanked Mr. Williams, noting that it was wonderful to have articulate and thorough conversation and explanation about CAT. She said this was refreshing.

Mr. Williams welcomed the opportunity to have conversations with each of the Supervisors. He said he wanted to have one-on-one conversations about where they want to see the system go. He said they need to start this planning, and that he and Mr. Boyles have discussed infrastructure. He said if he needs to buy buses, he has to start that model now, because it would be 18 months before he would get that bus. He said if the County told him tomorrow that they wanted to add services, he wouldn't have the people to do it. He said they need to discuss and figure out how to get to the place the County wants to be.

Ms. McKeel said it became apparent before Mr. Williams and Dr. Richardson came into their positions, when going through the RTP process and the memorandum, that CAT was underestimating the amount of federal dollars they were getting. She said Mr. Williams referenced it in a different way. She said in December, she knew that the federal amount funding numbers come out. She said right now, they were showing a discrepancy. She said for CAT, that document showed that CAT is receiving \$1,891,217, and Mr. Williams has in the budget \$1,615,000. She asked what this difference of a little over \$250,000 was about.

Mr. Sheffield said this was the same number that he mentioned that with the 2020 apportionments, the amount for Charlottesville has gone up \$375,000. He said it is causing JAUNT's 25% to be \$100,000, and what he thinks Ms. McKeel is looking at is the correlating increase on the CAT side of that rate.

Ms. McKeel said she brought it up because this is what they have found historically before Mr. Williams and Dr. Richardson were there. She said it was concerning that the amount of money CAT is receiving from the federal government is underestimated, and that the County is paying to make up the difference.

Mr. Williams said to imagine that the number is \$1.8 million. He said he cannot spend that \$200,000 until he would have to go back to City Council and appropriate it. He said at that point of time, they would get to 25% anyway. He said they would get the additional 25% of the money in the agreement that goes to JAUNT, and the County would be at 28%. He said he couldn't spend it,

regardless of whether he had it or not.

Mr. Sheffield said this was where the true-up that Mr. Bowman had mentioned would come in.

Mr. Williams said appropriations mean that his spending limit is at \$8.6 million. He said if he has \$200,000 more, he can't spend \$8.8 million because he has to go back to City Council and show on paper that he got \$200,000, where it came from, and where and how it is going to be spent. He said they would see that in this model, and that he wasn't sure how it was done in the past.

Mr. Sheffield said this may be referring to how it is applied to the County's request.

Ms. Janice Woodson (Senior Accountant, CAT), said for 2.5 years, they were penalized, and a certain amount of that money was held back by WMATA (Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority), because they weren't in compliance. She said it came in FY 20, which would show the discrepancy. She said for the FY 21 number, all she had to go on was what she had when she was putting it in.

Mr. Williams said if that number has changed recently, he was not aware of it.

Ms. McKeel said she thinks it has changed and perhaps he should look at it again. She said Ms. Woodson was right about the money WMATA held being repaid back.

Ms. Woodson said this was correct, that it showed up in FY 20.

Ms. McKeel said she was concerned about the current number.

Ms. Woodson said she didn't know why she hadn't seen any changes.

Mr. Boyles said one of the discrepancies they found out during the MOU process was on the local side, where historically the budget that went to the City Manager had been used to calculate the County's request.

Ms. McKeel said this created a whole new problem.

Mr. Boyles said after that, what was finally approved by the City Council would happen after Albemarle County had already approved their budget, which is where the differences came in.

Ms. McKeel said it was as if they had the two there, and the County was paying for it.

Mr. Boyles said now, they have this accounted for.

Mr. Sheffield said the transit agencies won't find out about their State funding true numbers until May, which is after budgets are adopted.

Ms. Mallek said this didn't mean they had to spend it all. She asked if this amount was paid all at once at the first of July, or if it were paid quarterly in which case, it would allow the true-ups to happen on a regular basis.

Mr. Bowman replied that under the MOU, the County accrues to CAT on a quarterly basis.

Ms. Mallek asked if there are changes reflected quarterly, or if they wait until the next year.

Mr. Bowman said this was the first time they have done this. He said in the current year (FY 20), they have not made any adjustments mid-year. He said the idea was at the end of the year, there would be a true-up.

Ms. Mallek asked if this would happen in 2019.

Mr. Bowman replied that it would be in the fall. He said as the City completes its year-end reports, they would be able to do this.

Ms. Mallek asked if this was calendar year or fiscal year.

Mr. Bowman replied it is the fiscal year.

Item No. 2.e. Board Discussion.

Item No. 2.f. Meeting Wrap up.

Agenda Item No. 3. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. Price apologized for saying something at the budget meeting the week before that she personally found offensive. She said they had a very intense conversation last time about spending for

the Boys and Girls Club, and they decided to defer that until the upcoming budget meeting. She said that right after that, she had said that her number one priority was a convenience center in the southern part of Albemarle County, and that it has upset her that she said that. She said she was not apologizing if she offended someone, but that what she said was offensive. She said nothing was more important than people, and that she wanted to apologize for the insensitivity last meeting.

Agenda Item No. 4. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There was none.

Agenda Item No. 5. Adjourn.

At 6:16 p.m., the Board adjourned their meeting to March 17, 2020 at 3:00 p.m. in Room 241.

Chairman

| |
|-------------------|
| Approved by Board |
| Date 11/04/2020 |
| Initials TOM |