

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on December 8, 2020, at 6:00 p.m. This meeting was held by electronic communication means using Zoom and a telephonic connection due to the COVID-19 state of emergency. This meeting was adjourned from December 2, 2020.

SUPERVISORS 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.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Julian Bivins, Karen Firehock, Tim Keller, Jennie More, Rick Randolph, Corey Clayborne, and Daniel Bailey.

ABSENT: None.

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

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m., by the Chair, Mr. Gallaway.

Mr. Julian Bivins, Chair of Albemarle County Planning Commission, called the December 8, 2020 meeting of the Planning Commission to order.

Mr. Gallaway said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." Mr. Gallaway announced Supervisors, Planning Commission members, and County staff present in the meeting.

Mr. Gallaway said the opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting are posted on the Albemarle County website, on the Board of Supervisors homepage and on the Albemarle County calendar.

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session on Housing Albemarle.

- a. Review of Key Recommendations from Draft Housing Policy.
- b. Review of Feedback Received from Prior Work Sessions.
- c. Discussion of Key Issues.
- d. Next steps.

Ms. Stacey Pethia, Principal Planner for Housing, said she was joined that evening by Ms. Jodie Filardo, Director of Community Development, and Planning Director Mr. Charles Rapp. She said the work session would be about the draft housing policy, for which staff was excited to hold this conversation to hear the Board's and Commission's comments throughout the evening.

Ms. Pethia said this would be the third work session on this topic. She said the first work session was held in August 2020 with the Planning Commission. She said there was a second work session in October with the Board of Supervisors, and at both meetings, both bodies requested the opportunity to get together to discuss the policy before it moves forward.

Ms. Pethia said the overall purpose that evening was to provide some direction to staff on the four discussion points that were included in the agenda materials. She said this was not the only information staff was seeking, however. She said the four questions they would be talking about were really to help staff move onto the next steps to make sure that the housing policy is reflective of the Board's and Commission's housing goals.

Ms. Pethia said that evening, they would start with an overview of the policy itself, then move onto four discussion topics, three of which came directly from conversations in the previous two work sessions. She said the final question was one from staff to make sure they were moving in the right direction. She said they would wrap up with a recap of the discussion held that evening as well as next steps to move the policy forward.

Ms. Pethia said she would start with the overview, and that the timeline shown on the screen should, at that point, be familiar to all members. She said the timeline showed that that County housing policy's work began in 2004, with the adoption of the current affordable housing policy to the Comprehensive Plan. She said the Planning Commission then renewed their focus on affordable housing issues with an affordable housing work session in 2016.

Ms. Pethia said following that, the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) released a regional housing needs assessment in April of 2019, and in July of 2019, staff approached the Planning Commission with a resolution of intent to amend the current Comprehensive Plan with an updated housing policy. She said this resolution was passed.

Ms. Pethia said since that time, staff has conducted a series of community engagement activities to better understand the needs of the County and worked with the stakeholder committee to draft a set of housing policy recommendations. She said these draft recommendations were then presented to both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors during the work sessions held previously that year.

Ms. Pethia said the draft housing policy includes a set of 12 policy objectives and 39 corresponding strategies, organized across seven broad policy themes, which were shown on the screen. She said these include increasing the County's overall housing stock and affordable housing options, preserving existing housing in the County, ensuring fair access to housing, and supporting the creation of sustainable communities. She said all of these policies, objectives, and strategies were designed to support the County's goal of providing housing that is safe, decent, and sanitary; available to all incomes and age levels; located primarily in the County's Development Areas; and available equally to all current and future County residents.

Ms. Pethia said they would move into the discussion period. She said staff received a number of comments during the previous two work sessions, several of which were shared by members of both bodies. She said these shared comments would be presented that evening to help set the stage for the first three discussion topics. She said staff will introduce each topic and provide some background information on them, then open up the topic for discussion.

Ms. Pethia said staff has worked to pare down the list of discussion questions provided earlier to the bodies to provide more time for discussion. She said the final topic is presented by staff to ensure the draft policy reflects the County priorities, as mentioned earlier. She said there would be about 10-15 minutes at the end to wrap up the discussion and talk about next steps.

Ms. Pethia said Discussion Topic #1 relates to proposed objectives and strategies outlined in the draft housing policy. She said comments were received during the August and October work sessions that these proposed actions are not bold enough to meet the County's affordable housing needs. She said the stakeholder committee voted to propose broad policy and programmatic initiatives to provide staff with the flexibility to respond to changing housing needs over time, and the room to develop and propose innovative housing solutions to those changing needs.

Ms. Pethia said the committee members did identify several specific tools that had the potential for significant impact on affordable housing. She said all of these tools have been discussed during the previous work sessions, but staff would provide a brief recap of the strategies as a refresher. She said these strategies include changing the way the County defines affordable housing and qualifying incomes, as well as introducing a new category of workforce housing. She said both of these housing categories proposed home sale price limits that are significantly lower than the County's sale price limit of \$243,750 that it currently has, which potentially opens the door to homeowners with households with incomes as low as 50% of Area Median Income (AMI).

Ms. Pethia said the policy also identifies three new tools to support the preservation of existing housing and communities, including working with owners of naturally occurring affordable rental units, or those units that are affordable due to market forces, potentially due to age of the housing stock and the implementation of rental inspection districts.

Ms. Pethia said one of the key proposed objectives is the development and implementation of an affordable dwelling unit program, which would take the place of the County's current proffer system for affordable housing.

Ms. Pethia said to help further the County's goals for increasing community equity and ensuring fair access to housing, the policy proposes developing and implementing an equity evaluation tool and affordable housing impact statements.

Ms. Pethia said the question shown on the screen, "Does staff need to modify any of the objectives or strategies in the draft housing policy?" was for keeping in mind the information that staff needs to help move this policy forward. She said they would open up the conversation to the two bodies, noting that there was an hour budgeted for the conversation. She said she knew the members had a lot of interest in the topic and some good ideas, so she was interested in hearing what those were.

Mr. Gallaway said to establish a game plan or rules, typically in a Supervisors meeting, he will call out each Supervisor and go through the speaking order. He said this was done in a joint meeting with the School Board, going in the same order. He said if he calls on Ms. McKeel, for instance, Mr. Bivins will be able to speak after that. He said they could do this if it was fine.

Mr. Gallaway said if one were to have a follow-up after their turn to get in another question or comment, they can use the chat. He said he would then be able to see those and if there are multiples, he could call on them in the order received.

Ms. Mallek asked if it would be useful for Ms. Pethia to quickly go over the inserted new strategies that were developed so that they are not kicked around again.

Mr. Gallaway asked Ms. Pethia if this would be easy to do.

Ms. Pethia replied that the new strategies were those that she had just highlighted. She said she could pull them up again. She said there are 39 strategies, and she did not want to go through all of them. She presented on the screen some of the key strategies that staff and the stakeholder committee believe will have the greatest impact.

Ms. Pethia said starting with how affordable housing is defined, the keys are to tie the maximum

rent limits to the AMI itself, bringing it closer to what households can afford, which would be based on 25% of 65% of the AMI. She said staff has created a series of factors that developers would be able to use, applied to the AMI that is current at the time. She said they would also drop down the affordable home sale price to 60% of the Federal Home Program's one-unit purchase price limit for existing housing, which currently would bring that for-sale price down below \$200,000.

Ms. Pethia said the policy also recommends creating a new category for workforce housing, which would serve households with incomes between 60-120% AMI for rental housing, and 80-120% of AMI for for-sale housing. She said this category would help households that currently make too much money to qualify for affordable housing programs and assistance but cannot really afford market rate housing today in Albemarle County.

Ms. Pethia said in terms of preserving existing housing, working with owners of naturally occurring affordable rental housing is proposed. She said one of the proposals in the policy is to do an annual or biennial rental housing survey of rental properties in the County to help identify those that are affordable without any additional assistance. She said they would then be able to reach out to the owners of those properties and work with them when they go to renovate those properties or sell them to help preserve some of those units as affordable housing.

Ms. Pethia said rental inspection districts are targeted to specific neighborhoods based on age of housing stock, the quality of the housing stock, the number of property complaints that the County has received, and any code violations that are there. She said it is more of a proactive approach to addressing health and safety issues in rental housing. She said these are annual inspections and do not happen every time a person moves out of a unit.

Ms. Pethia said they can be designed to allow certain properties to be exempt from inspections for a particular number of years from new construction. She said that because the County needs to inspect those before any certificates of occupancy are issued, they know that they are in good quality for at least 3-5 years. She said for any rental units that are rented by a housing choice voucher holder, they could exempt those from the program since they are inspected on an annual basis.

Ms. Pethia said the neighborhood change indicators can be used by the County to identify areas for focused interventions and investments. She said those could be areas that are at risk of leading to disinvestment, and the County could begin to provide incentives for owners of those properties located in those areas to bring their properties up to code, or target investment for new housing in those areas.

Ms. Pethia said in terms of increasing the affordable housing stock, the Virginia Code provides that the County have the ability to create what are called affordable dwelling unit programs. She said these would work to replace the current proffer system. She said that under the proffer system, housing proffers are voluntary. She said under the affordable dwelling unit program, developers would be required to either provide a percentage of the residential units in the development as affordable units or pay a particular amount into the housing fund. She said this is more of a mandatory program as opposed to voluntary.

Ms. Pethia said the program could be designed to provide the County with the option to purchase up to two-thirds of the units immediately, once they have been built. She said the County can keep those in a long-term supply of affordable housing and will be able to set affordability periods and resale prices for those units. She said they could be deed-restricted to control the resale price for a certain number of years.

Ms. Pethia said in terms of fair housing and community equity, equity evaluation tools help the County evaluate the impacts of any policies, programs, initiatives, or funding programs on racial equity throughout the community and help protect against any unintentional discriminatory impacts on protected classes. She said the Office of Equity and Inclusion is in the process of creating something like this, and she believed they will pilot that tool through Community Development in the coming months.

Ms. Pethia said affordable housing impact statements are a way for the County to measure the impact of any proposed developments, ordinances, or policies on the affordable housing stock of the County. She said they cannot be used to base any decisions as to whether or not to approve or deny a project, but it is really a way for the County to begin tracking potential impacts and where they may need to invest their money into certain neighborhoods and programs.

Ms. Pethia said this is a fairly new tool, but it has already been implemented in the cities of Atlanta, New Orleans, and San Diego. She said the City of Pittsburgh is considering implementing affordable housing impact statements in their city.

Ms. Pethia said those were the highlights from the policy. She asked if there was anything else the bodies were interested in hearing about.

Ms. Mallek said this was very helpful.

Mr. Gallaway said he put in the chat the order in which they would go through the questions. He noted there is an odd number of people in the Planning Commission, so they would start with the at-large member of the Planning Commission, Mr. Keller, and then go through the order by district.

Mr. Keller said that overall, he thinks the document is an excellent beginning point, as many have

said as they had seen the last draft and this one. He said there are specific points that he would hope to address and tweak possibly a bit more before it is ultimately approved. He said if not, he thinks they will learn as they get into this, and there will be a need for tweaking along the way. He said he thinks it is most important to have the document in place and to move forward, and so overall, he felt very positive about it.

Mr. Clayborne said he would echo Mr. Keller's sentiment that the draft is a great start. He said two points that he would bring up, which he believed he had shared at the previous work session, included whether or not they can make a correlation with size and affordable units. He said he knows that is probably terribly difficult, but one thing he has seen over and over again is that a proposal for affordable units comes to the Commission, and the square footage is so small, they are not sure if the family who has scraped enough money to finally put down on a unit or home can even live there. He said if there is any kind of correlation to a square footage range that goes along with the AMI projections, it could be helpful.

Mr. Clayborne said on a larger scale, something that was probably more for the schools is that ultimately, what he would try to avoid is people with a lot of financial resources all going to the same school district because it has "great schools," which drives the price of housing up. He asked what kind of impact this has on affordable housing and how this is studied.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley said she wondered if, being new on the Board, there was any way to have a side-by-side comparison between what the County has had and what they are looking for. She said she knew they were looking at 80% AMI for affordable housing currently, and now, they are looking at 60% AMI. She asked if this was correct.

Ms. Pethia replied that the 60% AMI would be for rental housing. She said for-sale affordable housing would be available up to 80% AMI. She said the current policy is 80% AMI across the board.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley asked if the main improvement would then be in the rental affordable housing.

Ms. Pethia replied that it would be in both. She said the proposal is to tie the rental limits to the AMI itself. She said currently, they use HUD's fair market rents, which can fluctuate from year to year. She said the one-bedroom fair market rent for 2020, for instance, is lower than it was in 2019, while the fair market rent for every other size unit has gone up. She said if they tie the rent limits to the fair market rent itself, this stabilizes them and keeps them from fluctuating up and down so much.

Ms. Pethia said the County currently ties the maximum home sale price to Virginia Housing's maximum sale price for the first-time homebuyer program. She said this is set at 65% of that price limit, which currently equals \$243,750. She said by changing to a different base price, they are able to bring this affordable sale price down below \$200,000, which opens the door for lower-income households to become homeowners for the first time.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley asked who makes up the difference in that price.

Ms. Pethia replied that this would be through the proffer program or through the affordable dwelling unit program.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley said she knows that they have had some success with 80% AMI. She said they are currently asking for 15% affordable housing, but her understanding is that they want to ask for 20% from developers for affordable housing. She asked if they are not taking full advantage of the 15%, how going to 20% would help.

Ms. Pethia replied that there are some other suggestions within the housing policy itself. She said with the affordable dwelling unit program, they would be able to design it in such a way that that the County or a designee, such as a local nonprofit, could purchase up to two-thirds of those units and keep them as affordable housing forever. She said because the nonprofits already work with lower- and moderate-income households, they would have a pipeline of buyers to move directly into those units. She said they would at least be able to get a larger percentage of those units occupied.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley asked Ms. Pethia if she believes they have enough nonprofits that would be willing to purchase the two-thirds of affordable homes that are being put up in the proffers.

Ms. Pethia replied yes.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley said this, then, was being done in lieu of getting money. She asked about areas where affordable housing perhaps is not feasible because there is no transportation. She asked if there would be a monetary proffer or not.

Ms. Pethia replied yes. She said there would be the option to pay a cash-in-lieu fee as opposed to providing those units. She said this money currently goes into the housing fund to be used for future affordable housing projects, and the policy recommends keeping this.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley asked if the Board is in control of the affordable housing fund.

Ms. Pethia replied yes.

Ms. Firehock said she appreciated the progress they were making on the affordable housing policy, as this is a passion of hers. She said she wanted to talk about how people become aware of affordable housing. She said she knows this was brought up in the past, and one of the comments had been that the TJPDC would have a housing locator website to help people find these units once they are proffered as affordable and are on the market.

Ms. Firehock said she had asked Ms. Pethia at the Commission's last work session to provide her a statistic on how many of the affordable units that were proffered actually got into the hands of the intended market. She said Ms. Pethia researched this for her and found that it was about 49%. She said this is a 50% success rate, and she and Mr. Randolph have brought up in the past that the County used to have someone whose job it was to help be the matchmaker. She said from what she understood from the research she conducted with staff, this was actually very successful, but the position disappeared due to funding during the last recession.

Ms. Firehock said she also understood Ms. Pethia just said that she was thinking about having the nonprofit housing-providing community purchase two-thirds of the available properties that they could then work to get into the hands of their clients. She said she agrees the nonprofits are the most qualified because they have already been working with individuals and know their needs, have counseled them on credit, and the like. She said she is a little concerned, however, about the notion that they could afford to do that. She said perhaps she was misunderstanding what was proposed.

Ms. Firehock said the County gets excited about affordable units, then they approve developments because of that, and only half of them get taken up. She asked Ms. Pethia if she wanted to comment on her concern about how they are being effective in actually getting those units into the intended hands.

Ms. Pethia replied that she has spoken with a couple of nonprofits that are looking at ways to fund what would essentially be a strike fund that would provide the money they need to be able to purchase those units. She said there is also the option for one of the nonprofits to work with their bank to take out mortgage loans for those units so they would then be able to sell those to people on their waiting list.

Ms. Pethia said, in addition to the TJPDC's housing locator service, staff has been looking at any way where the County could create at least an internal waiting list for units with interested staff who income qualified. She said there would need to be more details put into that research in terms of how to qualify and how they would maintain that waiting list, but this would be another way they would be able to connect income-qualified buyers to any units that would become available and help County staff to be able to live within the County.

Ms. Firehock said she had three more comments, and she would try to be quick. She said her other comment had to do with transportation. She said the County does have affordable housing in some of the more far-flung parts of the County, but with the cost of a working family maintaining two cars to get back and forth, she is pleased with the opportunities that JAUNT may be providing with on-demand transportation that the Commission learned about a couple of meetings ago. She said she wanted to encourage the County to make the strong link between transportation because if one could get to work, they could live in nice housing that is at the tip of Albemarle County, where there are affordable houses for sale.

Ms. Firehock said she thinks distance is the issue, which brought her to her next point. She apologized in advance for making a blanket statement. She said she is also concerned about the County's willingness to approve higher-density, affordable developments within the Urban Ring. She said there have been several that have been turned down, and if they are indeed committed to this, she thinks they need to rise above some of the concerns of some of the neighbors, who have come and testified to the Planning Commission that they have their \$450,000 house, and they do not think it is right that someone may live across the street in a \$250,000 house. She said she does not think this is right. She said she is concerned about the County's commitment to provide the density and diversity so that people can get their starter home.

Ms. Firehock said her last point was her concern about the fact that they are stuck in a vicious cycle where they provide the affordable housing and then, it leaves the market because someone sells their house. She said they are constantly trying to play catch-up.

Ms. Firehock said she understands they have nonprofit housing providers, like Habitat for Humanity, which often have a clause within their sales that say they have right of first refusal so they can regain that unit and make it affordable to someone else. She said this is one model, and there are other models where the nonprofit or the County owns the land and then, the house is sold, but one cannot completely take the unit out of the affordable market because they do not own the land under it. She said it is a strange model, but it does work.

Ms. Firehock said she would rather the County invest a lot of their resources in finding ways to acquire land or units that will not disappear because otherwise, they will never win this game.

She said Albemarle's Urban Ring and the County, in general, are beautiful, attractive, and a wonderful place to live. She said they will keep becoming a hotter prospect, and she believes affordability will continue to decline. She said she is concerned that they will do these strategies, but they will lose the units they have invested in.

Ms. Palmer said she agreed with what everyone else said. She said she had a question that she believed was a legal one. She said Ms. Pethia was talking about the required percentage of affordable houses for rezoning and that the more voluntary 15% would be changed to 20% and not be a proffer, but a requirement of that rezoning. She said she did not know that the County could do that, and so she wanted to understand their ability to require 20% for rezoning. She said it sounded like more than she thought they could, and perhaps Mr. Andy Herrick or Ms. Pethia could answer her question.

Mr. Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office, said he would defer to Mr. Greg Kamptner, County Attorney.

Mr. Kamptner asked Ms. Pethia if she was looking at the 20% in the context of a bonus density.

Ms. Pethia replied yes.

Mr. Kamptner said it is a voluntary program that becomes mandatory if the developer receives the benefit of the bonus density. He said how this works as they are moving away from conventional zoning districts or to a form-based code is something that will need to be further examined, but they are enabled to provide incentive zoning. He said if the developer is willing to take advantage of the bonus density or whatever incentive, that percentage of affordable housing units becomes mandatory.

Ms. Palmer said this explained it for her and sounded like a good idea. She said along the same lines as Mr. Clayborne, she was concerned about how big a house would be that cost \$191,000 in Albemarle County. She said there was no answer to that, but just a concern. She said she has not seen too many of those homes that are big enough for a family to live in.

Ms. Palmer said she did appreciate the comment about the "great schools" that she keeps hearing from people in Mill Creek; that the housing is getting more and more expensive because of the wonderful Spanish immersion that is taking place at Mountain View. She said she supposes it is a good thing that the County is putting affordable housing money into Southwood to help that along. She said this is another thing she has no idea what to do about.

Ms. Palmer said she did think it was a good start on this document. She said she did find a couple of the tables to be a little confusing, and she thought some of those could be more simplified for the rest of the world skimming through this so they can understand it more easily.

Mr. Bivins thanked Ms. Pethia and the community for pulling together the document. He said as far as moving the conversation and lifting their sights to a higher level, they have done something that is commendable.

Mr. Bivins said many colleagues, both on the Commission and the Board, had said things that he did not particularly need to add to, so he would go in perhaps a different direction. He said when reading the document, it felt as if they were talking about two separate things, and he would ask or suggest that Supervisors take a strong stance in the middle. He said on one hand, they are talking about using traditional market forces to bring additional housing units or spaces into the community. He said this may or may not work because as Ms. Firehock mentioned regarding the statistic Ms. Pethia provided, they have a 50% success rate. He said he would call this a 50% non-success rate, and the question is how to deal with that.

Mr. Bivins said part of this is that there are certainly numerous externalities that deal with market-based solutions. He stressed that while he is a free market person, he did not necessarily know if communities, when thinking about the welfare of their people, can rely solely on market to achieve it. He said there are some places where he thinks the community needs to intervene.

Mr. Bivins said the conversation that Ms. Firehock was speaking about that alluded to the fact that having a different type of housing structure or community adjacent to another is not the fourth horse of the apocalypse. He said he reminds people that many of them came from diverse neighborhoods when they were growing up, and it is a change for him, at least, to see this level of angst about other types of people sitting next to them.

Mr. Bivins said what he would ask, moving forward with this, is that the Supervisors think very collectively as to how to change the narrative around the word "affordable" and the language and conversation about how diverse the housing stock needs to be, given the diversity of the economy and the fact that Albemarle is still a place hopefully, after this period of unfortunateness, that is primarily a service-based economy. He said service-based economies have limitations on the kinds of salaries they can pay people, yet the County wants and needs those individuals to be close by in good, safe housing while also enlivening the community and neighborhoods.

Mr. Bivins asked the Supervisors to stand in that position where they help shape the narrative to bring down some of the anxiety in the community about what density might do the community.

Mr. Bivins said he mentioned the market forces, and he does think there will be a point in time that the Supervisors would wrestle with in terms of what the pay-in is from the Supervisors as far as land or budget is concerned. He said they can perhaps begin to build an inventory of land or a budget that would allow the County, much like they are doing with the Economic Development group, to ask if they are going to bring businesses into the community, how they are also going to bring housing stock there or

lift up housing stock so that the full range of employees can live within a reasonable distance to the people the County are attracting there.

Mr. Bivins said this would be a conversation about the economic nexus to housing and to the future of the community. He said he would suggest that if they are to invest in bringing businesses to the County, as they invest in keeping school systems on the cutting edge, they also need to invest in providing income-accessible housing to the people who come there to work. He said he would like to see how they can draw that nexus so that it is not a purely market-driven solution they are lifting up.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated and agreed with Mr. Bivins' comments, as well as most everything that had been said. She thanked Ms. Pethia for the report, which is moving them off the dime and was needed.

Ms. McKeel said she would make a couple of comments, and she was not sure if they could be addressed immediately or in another presentation. She said her first comment would be about how this report marries with the UVA's identified plan to provide 1,000 to 1,500 affordable housing units in the community. She said UVA had made that announcement in March of 2020, and not much was known about it.

Ms. McKeel said she would love to hear how the affordable housing plan connects to the County's Comprehensive Plan. She said she knows there is a nexus, but she would like to have it clarified.

Ms. McKeel said another point was that when she looks at the affordable housing plan for the County, one of her first questions is how it supports the expansion of home ownership. She said they know that the way to build generational wealth, which has been denied to many, is home ownership. She asked how this plan will support this for the County's lower-income families.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated hearing from Ms. Pethia about equity, but she would like for it to go further. She said this was leading into where she wanted to go. She said they know that workforce housing is desperately needed in the community, and from an economic development perspective, when people are able to live and work in the community, they spend money in the community. She said when they are forcing them to go to Greene or Fluvanna, they are being paid with dollars from Albemarle, but are going outside of the community to spend the money, which is not what the County wants. She said this was a general economic development thought that she has come to realize.

Ms. McKeel said her next point was that she would go with something that is different from what was being discussed, but it connects to many of the points that had been made. She said she would describe this as thinking about a big, audacious goal or act. She said a few years back, the Board decided to do something that was big and audacious with their work on Southwood, on which they have been very successful.

Ms. McKeel said she would like to think of a different way because they have some available property, and they just have to figure out how to use it. She said the County has 50 acres of proffered land for County Government and Schools along Berkmar Drive, from the Development Area through the commercial area. She said they need to use this available property, which is in an area where they have population and transportation access. She said the County has created this with much of the work they have done.

Ms. McKeel said they also have the Lambs Lane campus, Albemarle High School, Jack Jouett, Greer, and Ivy Creek School, which is 120 acres, 20 of which are absorbed with a gas station, car wash, building maintenance, car repair, and storage for about 150 school buses. She said this is valuable land in the Development Area's Urban Ring.

Ms. McKeel suggested thinking about utilizing these properties and figuring out how to make them best work for the County. She said this is property the County owns, and they could move all of those things that do not belong on an educational campus. She said they would have 20 acres, and they could then perhaps think about partnering with a developer on affordable housing for teachers, fire and rescue safety officers, and policemen. She asked what they could do with this big, audacious idea.

Ms. McKeel said they could move the other facilities, which are really more appropriate off of an educational campus. She encouraged the Board to think big and audaciously. She said they could have a recycling center on Berkmar, or a police substation. She said they could put the bus depot there with a car wash and gas station, build a new facility for the School Division that actually has a modern garage and mechanics, enabling them to do much more mechanical work on all their vehicles.

Ms. McKeel begged the Board to think big and audacious, as this property is valuable and is in a great location for them to do something with. She said this could provide some workforce housing. She said she understands it will not take care of the entire problem, but it would put a stake in the ground to say to developers and the community that the County is serious about this. She said she is very concerned, as Ms. Firehock noted, that the County has been denying proposals that add density in areas where they have been saying that they need density. She encouraged the Board to put a stake in the ground, say they are serious about affordable housing, and say what they are going to do. She said other communities do this, and Albemarle can, too.

Ms. More said she agreed with much of what others had said. She said her comments were more

about the basics than Ms. McKeel's. She said she wanted to circle back to what Ms. Firehock said. She said when she thinks about key strategies, where she thinks things really fall apart is in the percentage of units they know are being proffered and built, but the connection not being made with the buyer. She said she knows some strategies were discussed for this, including having a website that might connect those potential buyers with those properties. She said for her, however, a key strategy would be that while they are working on the new policy, they have units that are being built under the current policy where if they are not connected to that buyer, they flip back into the market.

Ms. More said she does like the idea of the ability for nonprofits or even the County to buy up units so they could then keep them in the affordable pot rather than losing them to market rate, but she feels that, as Ms. Firehock said, the matchmaker part is not working right. She said it is her opinion that she thinks the County needs to play a stronger role in this, even though they know they are working with partners whose expertise are identifying families and making sure they qualify for things they can afford. She said the County has a list, however, and they know what is being built in the pipeline.

Ms. More said on the DSS Advisory Board, there was a smaller presentation that was about this, and was also focused on the voucher program where there are project-based vouchers for rental and then, the vouchers that people can take out into the community as a more portable type of voucher. She said when they talked about that, they were also talking about housing available for purchase, and Ms. Pethia had mentioned tracking the units they know are coming online in different developments, with larger developments that are coming in in phases.

Ms. More said she would like to see a more robust role on the part of the County to track units they know are coming. She said they will sometimes come in a couple at a time and knowing those will be online is important because there is a very small window of time for buyers to make those purchases. She said the question is how to connect those buyers to the agencies working with them. She said for her, while she feels that all the other goals are definitely worthy, this feels like a piece that they can get in place.

Ms. More said perhaps she was misunderstanding how many staff resources it would take to get that in place, but it would be a priority for her to get something in place where they are hooking people up and plugging them in as quickly as possible to a knowledge base of qualified buyers and units they know will be built, under some sort of timeline, even if it is a couple months ahead of when they will be issued a CO (Certificate of Occupancy) and become available for purchase. She said she would like to see some work around that, and she believed Ms. Pethia had some ideas about that. She said perhaps there were some things that had happened in the past that helped do some matchmaking, like Ms. Firehock had pointed out.

Ms. More said for her, she thinks one of the biggest issues is looking at the number of units and seeing how many never even made it into the buyers' hands. She said she feels this is where a lot of good work could be done. She said to the point that they could be doing 20%, if they are still not connecting those people to those units, they will have numbers that do not look good, in the end.

Ms. More asked Ms. Pethia if she wanted to comment on the mention that she had made to the DSS Advisory Board about tracking units prior to them being available for purchase.

Ms. Pethia said Community Development staff tracks those proffered units, and so they have a fairly good idea of when those for-sale units will come online. She said that when they are available for purchase, the developers need to send her a notice so that she knows exactly when those proffered units are available, what size they are, how many bedrooms they are, and where they are located. She said she sends this information out to the nonprofits.

Ms. Pethia said many of the developers have started working directly with Piedmont Housing Alliance to locate buyers, but part of the problem they are running into is that many lower- and moderate-income homebuyers just cannot afford to pay \$243,000 for a house. She said this is one of the things they are working around. She said another thing is that it is very difficult for developers to market those units beyond the nonprofits, and the County does not have the ability to do that in-house. She said there is a working group with the TJPDC to look at the best way to utilize their new housing locator service to connect those proffered for-sale units with community members.

Ms. Mallek thanked the group for the wonderful segues. She said she loved the big, audacious idea, which she thought was spectacular.

Ms. Mallek said her brain, however, was totally wrapped around the things they could do right now, which were things that they used to do in 2010 that would get them back on track so much more quickly. She said they did have homeowner training that went on for a year while things were being built. She said they did have voucher lists that were kept up to date. She said her great concern is that over the last several months, she has learned that they do not do any of those things anymore. She said those things have to be done almost before anything else becomes a reasonable investment, if they are not doing the program that they have already shown to be successful. She encouraged figuring out how to do those things again and how to do them better.

Ms. Mallek said that in her mind, it was not fair to leave the burden totally on people who are struggling with housing and jobs. She said she used to get into big arguments with Ms. Pethia's predecessors about this because they said it was not their jobs to chase people. She said it is their job to be accessible and make it easier for people to find their phone number so that they can be notified.

Ms. Mallek said she hopes there is a way that when units are under construction, there is much more lead time that could be provided or required to be provided by someone who is building units so that the homeowner investment classes have much more lead time than a 60-day scramble, and so Ms. Pethia is not getting notified the day one could turn a key in the lock, but two or three months before that. She said she thinks it is unreasonable and that they have set themselves up to fail with these very limited timelines, and so she hoped someone smarter than herself would think about that.

Ms. Mallek said she does understand that the pie-in-the-sky plan that was talked about for years was cramming 200,000 people into the growth areas that would come before 2050. She expressed that this gives discomfort to the people who are currently living in Albemarle, even if they just arrived yesterday, because they did not come there to live in Fairfax, Arlington, or the like.

Ms. Mallek said it is a learning and evolution process that the County has to work on. She said her growth area in the White Hall District is an old town with 800-square-foot, 100-year-old houses next to bigger, newer ones, and there is no problem with that. She said people are more concerned about protecting their older working man's neighborhoods built around the lumberyard and railroad track than they are about anything having to do with fancy housing.

Ms. Mallek said that to her, the biggest obstacle that the citizenry of all types has is the lack of infrastructure because if there are already 8,000 more new people than there were in 2005, 4,000 dwelling units were approved, and 300 of those were supposed to be affordable units, yet there are 21 that are being lived in by people who are of the income range it was designed for. She said to have those be the facts, and then expect a neighborhood to welcome another 200-unit apartment building on their doorstep when they do not have sidewalks, streets, and all the things they thought they were promised in 1988, it creates a complete and total frustration.

Ms. Mallek said that as they make progress with their infrastructure, it will help people to be more comfortable that they actually have the ability to cope with more people. She said that as they build the bridges to get people to have options other than just one street, north and south, to go anywhere in a community of 8,000 people, where rush hour is a nightmare, this will help all of the other future decisions that come along.

Ms. Mallek said that having access to the opportunities for the housing is incredibly important. She said they had had several different great ideas, plans, and approvals for workforce housing in an area on Blue Ridge Avenue that the community worked for more than a year on planning. She said it was going to be 35 workforce houses on small lots that would especially be aimed towards teachers and EMS workers. She said the nonprofit that was engaged with it decided not to do it and flipped it into 126 apartments on 4 acres. She said people feel as if they have been cheated, as they did not get the follow-through on what was promised to them. She said the County has to continue to do a good job to get that information going.

Ms. Mallek said that for future information, she read a couple of times about the rental inspections, but she did not quite know how one would manage to do all of that in the space of 10 days at turnover time. She said this was due to a lack of information on her part as far as what this was all about.

Ms. Mallek said she was especially interested in what Ms. Pethia said about focusing on neighborhoods that are at risk of change and a way for the County effort to focus on those, which she supposed meant they were falling into disrepair and could be purchased. She said the other side of it is equally important, however.

Ms. Mallek said if there is a neighborhood that is threatened to be demolished and gentrified, this throws out 200 families who live next to the lumberyard in Downtown Crozet. She said they, their parents, and grandparents work at the lumberyard and walk to work. She said those are the kinds of things that the community has been very focused on in master plan discussions in terms of figuring out mass, scale, and other ways to keep the opportunity for people to stay in those houses that probably cost \$5,000 to build, and now are sold for less than \$100,000 but are still terrific.

Ms. Mallek said there are certainly a lot of wonderful ideas that she is sure are successful in other places but will be a change of operation for Albemarle when it comes to who will be managing two-thirds of the units that the County may purchase. She asked if they would be setting up a housing management authority and the like.

Ms. Mallek said she was not saying no to any of these ideas, but that these were things she was sure would evolve and they would learn more about them as they go along.

Ms. Mallek said with regard to Mr. Clayborne's idea about the schools, she has been so pleased in watching how the School Division has worked over the last 10 years to equalize the opportunity among the different schools. She said she thinks this is helping to make people less anxious because they know if their child goes to Crozet Elementary, for example, they will have the same opportunity as the kids at Brownsville. She said she thinks this is creating a much better, cohesive community because the school leaders are working hard to make sure that everyone has the same opportunities.

Ms. Mallek said she would focus on the pipeline of buyers and making sure that they are doing all the training and education far ahead of time so that people have a chance to get with it.

Ms. Mallek said that her father and many of his friends started a savings and loan in the 1960s, and they would personally meet with all these buyers and explain to them how they should not get into a house if it was going to be more than 25% of their income to pay the mortgage, where, back then, it was 4% for a 30-year loan. She said she knows that bankers do not do that anymore, but this is where the County's partners have to step up to help people whose families never had a chance to do this before to not get so overextended.

Ms. Mallek said she felt terrible during the housing crisis because there were many people stuck with a mortgage who were completely unable to survive with it, and they would have been much better off if they had been comfortable renting something. She said they tried very hard, and she thinks people were made to feel inadequate if they did not follow this common path. She said while she knows it is a wonderful equity-building adventure, the County needs to be helpful as much as they can to the different people with different experiences.

Mr. Randolph expressed that Ms. Pethia was rounding this into form and praised her for her continued good work on this. He said his first point was that he thinks bolder is good in terms of the approach to policy. He said that as Ms. McKeel pointed out, however, innovation is also called for, and he wanted to talk more about that.

Mr. Randolph said he thinks the number one need within this plan is identifying dedicated funds for economic resiliency and equity. He said these are really the prime necessities and, as such, those are challenges that are fiscal and political in nature. He said he wanted to be very clear about that because they summon forth a necessity that there be a political will to meet the goal of economic resiliency in a major way.

Mr. Randolph said he would give an example. He said \$3 million is proposed here as an annual funding goal for new affordable housing, but this automatically implies that the new comes ahead of the old. He said they do know that rehabilitation of housing delivers more results per tax dollar than building new housing, and yet it seems that the bias here is very strongly on the new rather than the old.

Mr. Randolph said the County's old neighborhoods are already neighborhoods that oftentimes feature minority ownership and presence. He said if they suddenly shift the playing field to emphasizing the new and deemphasizing rehabilitation, gentrification will exert itself in those older neighborhoods. He said they would be spiting their nose, thereby undermining their goals and objectives.

Mr. Randolph said Ms. Firehock talked about vulnerabilities, and he wanted to point out that for the nonprofit organizations, they have to think through the implications of being seen, as a result of the implementation of this approach, as quasigovernmental organizations. He said such a view is going to have an impact on their independence as private donors view them, and perhaps even also as foundations view them. He said they run, therefore, the risk of becoming captured by the government and used for the goals and objectives of government which may not, long-term, be in the best interest of those nonprofit organizations, boards, and executive directors. He said this was something to think about.

Mr. Randolph said thirdly, he would emphasize that bolder policy objectives and strategies without identifying achievable funding strategies, as Ms. Mallek has pointed out, is a recipe for continued failure and Albemarle's capability to ensure there is safe, livable, affordable housing available for the County's lower-income residents and working-income residents at the lower end of the middle scale.

Mr. Randolph said in terms of increased dollars for Albemarle County to purchase units, the plan does not spell out whether they are proposing a public-private bank. He said if so, they need to be clear about how this will operate. He asked if they would rely on the private sector. He said there are implications that there is both good and bad with that, and he echoes the comments of Mr. Bivins. He said he is biased towards private enterprise as well, but they know from experience that in the African American community, redlining in the private sector did not ensure equity but rather, continued discrimination and second-class citizenship in the ability to amass capital to ensure a livable lifestyle.

Mr. Randolph said his fifth point is that they currently utilize proffers, which is a form of mandatory and inclusionary zoning. He said even if they go ahead and switch over from proffers, though, this is going to be one arrow in the County's quiver on affordable housing. He said he would argue, as he did as a Board member for three years, that impact fees have much greater potential to include rural development and increase County funds, which can address school enrollment growth, traffic, and affordable housing. He said they have to include that as part of the conversation, going forward. He said again, this is a political and fiscal issue.

Mr. Randolph said the Board was very successful with the General Assembly in increasing its quiver of revenue mechanisms that year, and he thinks that even though it is a short session, it is the year to make the argument again for impact fees and hopefully get this implemented next year.

Mr. Randolph said in terms of incentive zoning, they know there is reason for concern. He said he has a case study of Avon Park II, where changes in setbacks and lot sizes became a long-standing issue over five years with residents about the introduction of Avon Park II into the backyards of residents of Avon Park I. He said they have to be careful here because when they push incentives and they increase their goal of expanding affordable housing, the question is if they will do so at the expense of their existing residents, who had an expectation that there would be reasonable setbacks behind their property and that there would be minimal lot sizes similar to theirs. He said this was something to think about, moving forward.

Mr. Randolph said his primary concern was the economic one regarding where the funds are, or "Show me the money."

Ms. Price said she concurred with many of the remarks that other had said. She said she would repeat some of them not simply for the purpose of repeating them, but to ensure that it is clear that there are other voices that actually agree and support these particular objectives.

Ms. Price said she would concur with, "Go big, go bold, or go home." She said if they do not have a big plan, they will not accomplish anything.

Ms. Price said she wanted to thank Ms. Pethia and everyone who worked on the plan. She said they have given the Board something great to start with. She said she also wanted to express her appreciation to the Planning Commissioners, who have the freedom of objectivity without some of the political considerations that the Board of Supervisors has to pull into play in their analysis. She thanked Mr. Randolph for his thoughtful, wise comments.

Ms. Price said she agreed with Ms. McKeel, specifically with regard to the Lambs Lane property. She said this is an excellent opportunity for the County to be able to provide affordable housing, through which they will bring back into the County teachers, first responders, and others that they want to be there, not just so they can spend their money in the community, but so they can live in the community that they represent.

Ms. Price said she concurs with the desired increase of affordable housing from 15% to 20%, with the understanding that whenever they increase the number or percentage of affordable houses, what they are also doing is increasing the cost of market-based housing because developers do have to make a profit or a return on their investments.

Ms. Price said she concurs with trying to achieve a balance between creating and maintaining the housing stock of affordable housing while also providing segments of society who have historically been denied the opportunity to accumulate wealth through ownership of property which, if they do not provide that opportunity, they are simply continuing generational poverty among a segment of the population that has historically been denied.

Ms. Price said in terms of who would have the right to purchase the two-thirds of the affordable housing, she was not in favor of the County becoming a real estate business, but perhaps a housing authority that monitors nonprofits that would be able to purchase it, as it is the nonprofits' business. She said what they have seen at Southwood with Habitat, for example, and with other organizations is a very good working model that they can go from.

Ms. Price said in terms of reduction as far as things the County can do to provide additional affordable housing, her only concern with reduction in parking requirements is that if they do too much of that, they have undone the good of increasing affordable housing by diminishing the quality of life of the residents that move in there because now, they have a place to live, but do not have a place to park.

Ms. Price said she appreciated many comments from others. She said she agreed with Ms. Firehock in ensuring that there are mixed housing types required in new developments. She said as others have talked about with redlining and other mechanisms that were used to deny segments of the population to live where they wanted to, it has actually resulted in a self-isolating aspect of society.

Ms. Price said she believes that rehabilitation of existing housing stock is a substantially overlooked component of affordable housing. She said in her district, she has many residents who need assistance in remaining in their affordable housing and building them up. She said she thinks most of the County's focus tends to be toward new developments because this is probably an easier system to work with, but they cannot ignore the rehabilitation of existing housing while they try to avoid the gentrification that displaces individuals.

Ms. Price said she is in favor of establishing a housing trust fund. She said she believes that as other locales have done, something like an expense attached to property transfer fees is both a good way to fund an affordable housing trust fund and provides a method by which a calculation of what could go in, estimated on an annual basis, that is not subject to the vagaries of an annual Board of Supervisors' funding towards it.

Ms. Price said she believes one of the problems is that they do not have a mechanism to determine when receiving cash in lieu of affordable housing is more productive than requiring units to be built. She said this is a problem that needs to be fixed. She said looking at a rent rebate program is another thing they could look at.

Ms. Price said one of the questions that was posed to the Board was the housing policy indicates inadequate water and sewer infrastructure as a barrier to affordable housing, but she is concerned there are residents in the Urban Ring who should be connected to the County sewer system but are not and are instead of septic systems. She said she thinks they need to find a way to help those residents who should be on the sewer system to connect to it.

Ms. Price said similarly, there are areas that need sidewalks and other improvements in existing developments in order to improve their quality of life. She said equity, again, is something they need to

use for all of these things.

Ms. Price said she believed they were well on their way to an excellent policy.

Mr. Bailey thanked Ms. Pethia and staff for pulling the policy together and continuing to iterate upon it. He said he believed it was coming along quite well. He said he would try not to repeat what was already said, although he may repeat some comments.

Mr. Bailey said thinking about housing as accessible, as was mentioned, is important. He said he specifically thinks about sections that deal with people with disabilities, aging populations, and those who need modifications to the form of the house to be able to navigate daily life. He said he was not sure how they would track, in addition to affordability, some of the accessible features of that to make sure they are providing accessibility.

Mr. Bailey expressed that he knew firsthand, with aging parents, the health challenges and moving from their home to something they can afford while having the accessibility for wheelchairs. He said with smaller units and rentals, many times, modifications cannot be made.

He said there needs to be an understanding not only of bedrooms and square footage, but of what accessible features there are for people who need them to stay an active part of the community. He said he appreciated the sections of the policy that addresses this.

Mr. Bailey said he agrees with others about having a big vision, how they are going to finance it, and how they are going to track it and know they are on track, or not. He said he was still trying to piece together the numbers, and the question was how to get this to something where they can see the progress and track the dashboard.

Mr. Bailey said he was looking at the residential dwelling units report for the third quarter, and it looks as if they may be achieving what they are trying to do where, over the nine-year trend, there is definitely more development being started in the Development Area versus the Rural Area, which is trending down, and so there is some impact there from the Comprehensive Plan. He said the question is how this relates to the affordable and accessible housing, and if they can see how those things interplay and if they are on track.

Mr. Bailey said while it was good to have these meetings, it was hard to know if they are on track at these intermittent reporting structures.

Mr. Gallaway said he wondered if they would have time to get through everything in a way that was meaningful. He told Ms. Pethia that the thing that was missing for him was something he was not sure was fair to ask for. He said he believed the questions he put forward were asked in an unclear or sloppy way. He said his question was what methods and/or tools allow them to see a return on investment to succeed in providing affordable housing.

Mr. Gallaway said what he was looking for there were not examples of things that work but, knowing that they are going to go through budget cycles where resources are not going to be plentiful and they are going to have limited resources to them, how Albemarle will decide if they program certain dollars, that Option A gives them a better return than Option B in achieving their vision.

Mr. Gallaway said when he looks at this as a policy, he has to ask Ms. Pethia what is missing from it. He said he cannot tell her what is missing from it. He said staff has pulled together all the great tools they are going to use, but he does not have the expertise to say that something is missing.

Mr. Gallaway said he does know he is hoping that as they proceed into budget time and conversations are held, citing Mr. Bivins' question of what the pay-in is, and Mr. Randolph's "show me the money" quote, he is ready to have those conversations at that time. He asked what they can use, as Supervisors, to determine how they will program a limited number of resources in a way that will see the best return as they attack this issue. He said he did not know if this was a fair question or not, but to him, it seems to be what is missing. He said they do this in so many other areas when they work through budget, and it is what is leading him to expect that it will be there for this item as well.

Mr. Gallaway said he thinks this is what ultimately helps them get to the proactive nature of enacting this policy versus just reacting to an application that comes forward that asks for more density and determining whether or not it is a good idea to do affordable units there in order to help approve the application. He said they are just waiting for things to come to them, from this standpoint. He said another Southwood or other opportunity may pop up, and they should have the resources set aside to be able to jump when an opportunity come up, but they have to get more specifically proactive and say they will create those opportunities for themselves. He said he wants to know which tools should be in place to get that bang for their buck, which was driving his question.

Mr. Gallaway said Ms. Palmer would have a final comment to make on this round. He said he believed they answered many of the questions, other than the one that was in front of them. He said Ms. Pethia did need answers to her questions, and so he would ask that as they move forward, the Supervisors and Commissioners be quick and stay focused on the question. He said if they had already answered it, they should simply state so in order for everyone to get a chance to get their answers in, and so Ms. Pethia will also get the information she needed.

Ms. Palmer said she ended up with more comments since she wrote the first one, but she would quickly say a couple of things. She said she hoped that when they put the amount of money into the budget, that they include the amount of money they have already programmed for affordable housing in that. She said she assumed this was coming out of that lump sum of money.

Ms. Palmer said she had a quick comment about sewer connections. She said there are definitely some people in the Development Area that are getting their septic tanks pumped out on a regular basis and need to connect to sewer. She said she would hope that this would come out of County funds and not ACSA funds because there are fairness issues there, which she would not go into at present time.

Mr. Gallaway told Ms. Pethia that the two bodies spent a lot of time on Question 1.

Ms. Pethia agreed. She said they actually answered most of her other questions and gave her enough information to skip those. She said she would go directly to Topic #4.

Mr. Gallaway said he did believe that a lot of people had a chance to answer and throw everything out. He told Mr. Keller that going first was not easy to do and asked him if he had additional points to put out that he did not get to answer the other questions in Question 1.

Mr. Keller replied yes. He said he was playing by the rules and was going to respond topic by topic. He said he believed this had been a great discussion and that most of the points he wanted to make were covered. He said it seemed to him, in listening to the big picture, that there are two issues, with one needing to be called out, which he believed many had done. He said what they are really trying to achieve is permanent affordability, and he thinks they need to be particularly careful when they talk about the various percentages of AMI and the life of those AMIs to put them in the context of what true, permanent affordability is for the County.

Mr. Keller said in terms of measuring success, which Mr. Bailey had alluded to, he believes that they need to think more about the data that is collected, as it can help them in the measures of their success so that in down years, as was just discussed, they would be able to point to successes of previous and future years that they are looking towards.

Mr. Keller said perhaps his next point would go to Mr. Richardson, as he knows Mr. Richardson has been working on it since he has been with the County, which was about the data from the various parts of County Government. He said it seems to him that there could be a very interesting query, for instance, annually, just based on the assessed house rates that would give them an automatic breakdown of how many homes are at 120% AMI, 100% AMI, 80%, and 60%. He said this would be an interesting measure to see whether they are trending positive or negative in the private sector, much less the public sector adding to it. He said he used this as an example and that it would be interesting to put the numbers people together with the planning people from the County and think about that.

Mr. Keller said Ms. Mallek and others were talking about the Rural Areas. He said that in his greater neighborhood, he has seen 100 houses in the last 10 years that he knows are in the affordable category either be scraped or rehabilitated out of the affordable area. He said he thinks the County needs to track those. He said they can say they need x number of new affordable units, but if they are losing several hundred a year, then they are not looking at as big of a net gain as they have been thinking about.

Mr. Keller said he does believe that in terms of measuring success, there needs to be thought at a future date, then shared with the Commission and Supervisors how they are going to track what they are doing.

Mr. Keller said in the big picture, he certainly thinks Ms. McKeel is on target with her audacious idea. He said Mr. Randolph has been talking about the need for a quasi-governmental entity, and he thinks they are all thinking that it would certainly have the ability to accept gifts and possibly have bonding authorities to support this.

Mr. Keller said he knew it would be crazy for him to say this, but if one takes the figure of half a billion dollars and divide it by \$200,000 or \$250,000 to build a house, they are not getting too many units. He said he thinks they could take the idea of property that the County owns and look for a creative, interesting way to match that to be the basis for a land bank that has big, long-term bucks, and they try to buy the value of affordable houses out as land banks do, either using the regional land bank or something that would be a subset of this quasi-governmental entity. He said this was allowing him to hit the big policy that he did not before and try to address #2 quickly.

Mr. Gallaway expressed that he may be indicating to everyone to move things along.

Ms. Pethia said she wanted to be sensitive to everyone's time, and they had about half an hour left until 8:00 p.m. She said her final concern, which was a staff-driven question, was that the policy identifies six housing objectives and strategies that the stakeholder committee felt should be placed for priority action. She said those were listed on the slide shown, and they cover many of the priorities that the bodies identified, such as funding. She said they include creating a housing trust fund for the County, but they also look to identify a set of incentives to encourage developers to provide affordable units.

Ms. Pethia said the Stakeholder Committee felt that the affordable dwelling unit program was a strong tool and recommended this be created as a priority action. She said in terms of creating a standing

housing advisory committee, she knows that the County has had one in the past, which was more ad-hoc and called upon when needed. She said this would be a permanent body. She said the current stakeholder committee has agreed that if this is something the County wishes to pursue, they will work with staff to draft a structure for what that can look like and bring it to the Board for approval.

Ms. Pethia said the stakeholder committee has also recommended beginning review of the County's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinances to make sure that barriers to affordable housing are removed from both of those and that they coordinate together.

Ms. Pethia said the final priority was to work in partnership with public, private, and nonprofit partners to create several additional permanent supportive housing opportunities for chronically homeless households.

Ms. Pethia said staff's question was, "Are these priority strategies that have been identified by the Stakeholder Committee the right priorities for the County?"

Mr. Gallaway said the idea was to state if anything was missing or if anything should be replaced by one. He said he would go through the same speaking order as before.

Mr. Keller said overall, he could stand with it, just so they could keep this moving.

Mr. Clayborne said it looked good to him, and he had one question for Ms. Pethia. He asked where advocacy would be on the legislative side, working with VACo or whatever the appropriate entity would be, to get policy change at the state government level to help locally. He asked where this would fit into the mix.

Ms. Pethia replied that she could not remember what all the objectives were, off the top of her head, but she could review those and identify an appropriate spot to add that as one of the strategies.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley said she would go along with all of this, but she would also like to see something with going "big and bold." She said she liked the Lambs Lane idea as far as developing housing there for first responders and teachers. She asked if this could be somehow incorporated.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley said that for the existing housing and for people who cannot afford to stay in their house or are not hooked up to sewer, she wanted to know if there was the possibility of establishing a fund that would then be able to pay for that, and this would perhaps be a lien on the house that would be repaid when the house is sold. She said this was about thinking outside of the box to be able to help people, where the County could recapture those monies at a later date.

Ms. Firehock said she did not have much to add, and she believed it had been a good discussion. She said first, she hoped that they would invest more in the County side of the equation in terms of staffing to find and market these properties. She said they cannot simply rely on the affordable housing providers to find that market of people because everyone who needs an affordable house is not a member client of one of these organizations, and this is just a fact.

Ms. Firehock said the second thing was that she wanted to see the County have metrics to measure its net effectiveness, as was well articulated by several others. She said otherwise, they can keep doing things and have more programs and incentives, yet at the end of the day, they have lost affordable housing percentages. She said they would not be winning, but they would be winning the small battles and losing the worst.

Ms. Firehock expressed that she did not want to come across as negative about this because she was excited about this. She said the Planning Commission held its own work sessions a few years ago to try to advance this ball, and she was excited to see the County seeming to be interested in investing in it. She said she knows they made a big investment in Southwood, but this was just one project. She thanked Ms. Pethia for all her good work.

Ms. Palmer said she agreed with what everyone had said. She said using County land could easily be a part of Strategy 2B. She said she appreciated the initial attention to rental housing, as she thinks this is important.

Ms. Palmer also expressed that she did not want to be negative, but in terms of the strategy to review the County's Comprehensive Plan and ordinances, her only concern was about where this would come into the work plan and who would be doing that, as they already have a lot of things in the work plan. She said perhaps it would be Ms. Pethia, who perhaps has plenty of time to do that.

Mr. Bivins said he could not say how pleased he was about Strategy 2B, as this was something where if they had done another round, he would say that while he appreciates that the American Dream is to own a home for many people, maintaining a home is something that is painful and ends up putting a lot of burden on families. He said he does not think there is anything wrong with people saying that their lives will be around have quality rental housing. He said they can then allocate their resources other places. He said as far as the priorities were concerned, he was absolutely in agreement with those. He added that perhaps Ms. McKeel's idea could be included as a part of Strategy 6A.

Ms. McKeel said she agreed with everyone so far that these proposed objectives are good. She said she liked the strategies. She said she would go back and suggest that what she is putting on the

table as the big, audacious idea would be permanent affordable housing. She said as communities are doing all over the country, they could structure it so that those affordable units roll over every three or five years but are permanent, affordable housing units.

Ms. McKeel said she also wanted to comment that Ms. LaPisto Kirtley was great to put the sewer issue on the table, and she does think that Ms. Siri Russell is planning on mapping out the sewer connections to determine where the gaps are. She said they cannot really fix the problem until they know where the gaps are and how many there are. She said she hopes this data will be part of the atlas and data points that Ms. Russell is preparing for the Board.

Ms. McKeel said the only other thing she wanted to say was that for all of this work and talk, when they talk about affordable housing, they have to be willing to support it. She said that when a proposal comes to the bodies, they have to be willing to support it. She said this is the political will and a heavy lift, and she is hopeful that somehow, with this discussion and with Ms. Pethia's work, they will get to the point where they will be able to do that.

Ms. More said she wanted to make sure that her comments from before were clear that she definitely supports the big and the bold, but her comments were directed more towards the idea that if they are talking about a bang for their buck, it is a matter of going back to some basic things that the County had been doing or could be doing better that would give them a better result. She said she does also know that they need to come up with bigger strategies, and she liked all the strategies.

Ms. More said she would echo what Ms. Firehock said about a way to track these strategies and be able to have a mechanism for having the County learn. She said they have come so far under a policy that has failed them in a dramatic way, and perhaps some have realized this along the way and had concerns, then were shocked to see the numbers. She said from that, they should have learned that if they are going to go bigger and bolder, they need to have a way to track that and keep closer tabs on it so that they know where they are being successful and where things did not create the intended results. She said if anything, they should learn that.

Ms. Mallek said she thinks that in these established objectives, the things she and others mentioned about priorities already fit. She stressed the importance of active County involvement rather than just a handoff to someone else so that this is something that the County takes leadership on. She said the priority, for her, is to get the people for whom these units are designed into them, no matter whether they are old units, current ones, or ones that will be built.

Ms. Mallek said she had not thought about universal design before Mr. Bailey had mentioned it, but she thinks it is incredibly important. She said perhaps there is a way in Strategy 5A, if they are establishing the program and getting new units built, to have them be universally designed units. She said it does not cost any more to have wider doors and lower counters so that anyone of any age who needs a place with that capability would have it. She said they should have those things coming in and out of the marketplace. She said the attention that others have given to rental housing and rehab was definitely important.

Mr. Randolph said he was very focused on Strategy 6A, and he wanted to include with Topic #2 and measurable goals the need to assess those goals annually, and certainly within the five-year plans of the CIP, to take a look at what has been achieved and what has not been accomplished.

Mr. Randolph said for sustainability, Pittsburgh set aside real estate transfer fees for which the rate was increased, and thereby dedicated to their housing opportunity fund. He said for the life of him, in Boulder, he could not figure out how their funding for their community housing assistance program worked because it was circular. He said every time he tried to find out what the funding source was, it sent him back to the housing strategy or program and did not reveal where the money comes from.

Mr. Randolph said his bottom line here was that the Board of Supervisors annually setting aside money in the budget for affordable housing is politically risky. He said it assumes the Board will be committed to affordable housing, but Boards can come and go in terms of their philosophy, ideology, and prioritization of affordable housing. He said he thinks it is important that for sustainable, affordable housing, they have a dedicated revenue source specially reserved for the affordable housing trust fund.

Ms. Price said she concurred with the comments and with the priority objectives.

Mr. Bailey said he also concurred with the objectives and comments.

Mr. Gallaway said it was not that he disagreed that Strategy 8A should be there, but he wondered if it was the most appropriate from the standpoint of whether others could be there from a housing policy plan when they should be doing a Comprehensive Plan review as a Board of Supervisors and eliminating barriers to affordable housing is work that should be done as part of that review.

Mr. Gallaway said he would imagine that this topic of conversation would be part and party to that, and so his point was that it was not inappropriate to be there, but knowing that a Comprehensive Plan review is coming, the question is if they could get more from another strategy being on the list as one of the six versus this one when this should be a priority of a part of the Comprehensive Plan review in general. He expressed that it was a matter of getting another strategy on the list, and it was food for thought.

Mr. Gallaway expressed that it was not that he had another strategy to put in, but it might be something that is worth considering, knowing that this work needs to be part of the Board's Comprehensive Plan review, in his opinion, and if they were not on board with identifying and removing the barriers, he would question what the purpose of being the review would be.

Ms. Pethia said that based on everything she had just heard about priorities and everything that was discussed that evening, Strategy 8A could be replaced with the priority strategy of identifying County-owned properties for affordable housing. She said she could not remember what number that strategy was in the policy, but she could replace it with that, and this would fit within the recommendation from Ms. McKeel with the Lambs Lane project and others. She said this was one step that could be taken.

Mr. Gallaway said this was exactly the idea. He said Ms. McKeel has mentioned the Lambs Lane project on a few occasions now, and he thinks it is a particularly good one. He said it sounded like there was a lot of endorsement there that evening around the idea. He said they may get more out of having a strategy like that one on the list when they know that the Comprehensive Plan review is coming.

Mr. Gallaway asked Ms. Pethia if there would be other topics that she needed the bodies to react to.

Ms. Pethia replied no and said this had been the last one. She said the other ones that were online to discuss were related to transportation and broadband access, and the recommendation there from staff is to add two strategies within the policy document itself to direct staff to work with the Broadband Authority and public transit providers to identify ways to make this happen throughout the entire County.

Ms. Pethia said there was also the question about whether or not they have the right data points to track within the policy. She said from what she heard that evening, they should add a few more. She said many of the data points that had been identified that evening would come out of individual programs as they are created so that they would be able to tie those directly into the success and evaluation of those particular programs. She said a data point to track affordable units that have been lost on an annual basis and compare this to how many that were created is something that staff can add right now.

Ms. Pethia said most of the questions were answered during the first part of the evening. She said the next steps in the process would be for staff to incorporate the information that the two bodies shared that evening, which would finalize the draft housing policy. She said staff could then send the policy out and post it for public review and comments. She said this was not a necessary step in the process, but since staff did go out into the community to collect information from them at the front end, many local residents had expressed interest in seeing the draft as it came out. She said staff felt it was appropriate to post it and provide the community the opportunity to respond and provide comments on the draft. She said this would happen in January.

Ms. Pethia said staff would then incorporate any feedback received from the public comments in February, and then bring the draft to the Board again in March of 2021.

Ms. Pethia concluded the work session and offered to answer any questions. She said if there were any follow-up questions for which the Supervisors and Commissioners wanted more detailed information on, they could forward those onto staff.

Mr. Gallaway said he would go through the speaking order to allow for brief final comments.

Mr. Keller said it had been a great evening and thanked everyone for having the joint session.

Mr. Clayborne said it was a job well done.

Ms. LaPisto Kirtley said she wanted to comment on what Ms. McKeel had brought up. She said as they look into this, they do need to remember that with additional affordable housing and going from 15% to 20%, this will increase the density. She said Ms. McKeel is correct that they will get pushback, but they need to remember that affordable housing does not come without increased density in the Development Areas. She said everyone did a good job.

Ms. Firehock thanked staff for all the good work.

Ms. Palmer echoed Ms. Firehock's comment.

Ms. McKeel thanked everyone for the good work. She said she appreciated all the support on her big, audacious idea. She said if they never talk about anything and keep doing the same thing over and over again, they get the same results. She said a big move forward was made that evening in many ways, and she appreciated it.

Ms. More thanked staff for their hard work.

Ms. Mallek asked if she assumed correctly that this would be a public hearing before adoption, as they do when there are other things they do planning-wise, such as the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Kamptner replied yes.

Mr. Randolph asked if Ms. Pethia would also send the policy to the Planning Commission when it is sent to the Board, so they have a chance not to formally discuss it, but to at least discuss it with their Supervisors.

Ms. Price said it was a great evening.

Mr. Bailey said it was wonderful to have the meeting. He thanked staff for their hard work.

Mr. Bivins said on behalf of the Planning Commission, he wanted to thank Mr. Gallaway and the Supervisors for inviting them into the space. He said he thinks this was when the Commissioners, as the Supervisors' appointees, are at their best. He said they wrestle with many thorny issues, and he was sure that many of the Supervisors have heard about when they do that. He said this was a time when the Commission gets to share with the Board the work that they had asked them to do.

Mr. Bivins thanked the Board, on the Commission's behalf, on how they allow the Commission to aid them in crafting the future of the community. He said this is a big thing, not a small one, and they all take this very seriously. He said when and if the Board wants to do this again, they will have the Commission there for the two hours.

Mr. Bivins thanked Mr. Gallaway for managing to do something that he himself has a hard time doing, which is keeping his colleagues to the two-hour limit. He joked that perhaps he should invite Mr. Gallaway to their meetings.

Mr. Gallaway said he knew the Board was very appreciative of staff, as they had heard about throughout the night. He said to the Planning Commission, the Board has always appreciated the level of discourse they all put into all the decisions. He said if they listen to the Board meetings, they will hear not only how many times the Commission minutes are talked about, but the discussion that is contained in those minutes. He said this is something he knows the Board very much appreciates and they all knew would be necessary as they went through the policy.

Mr. Gallaway said if staff feels that this type of session is helpful to get into the weeds, which was the point of this meeting, two hours was not enough and if they think it is necessary and needed, they should not hesitate to try to put something together again on this topic. He said it is important enough to merit the agenda time of both bodies.

Mr. Gallaway thanked everyone for participating in the meeting. He said he looked forward to the work that would continue.

Agenda Item No. 3. Adjourn.

At 7:59 p.m., the Planning Commission adjourned their meeting until December 15, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

At 8:02 p.m., the Board adjourned their meeting to December 16, 2020, 1:00 p.m., an electronic meeting pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(16) "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." Mr. Gallaway said information on how to participate in the meeting would be posted on the Albemarle County website Board of Supervisors homepage.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 07/20/2022
Initials CKB