

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on October 13, 2021 at 4:00 p.m. This meeting was held by electronic communication means using Zoom and a telephonic connection due to the COVID-19 state of emergency.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Ned Gallaway, Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J.S. LaPisto-Kirtley (left at 6:18 p.m.), Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer (left at 6:15 p.m.), 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 4:00 p.m. by the Chair, Mr. Ned Gallaway.

Mr. Gallaway said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(8), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster."

Mr. Gallaway (Rio District) announced the following Supervisors in attendance: Ms. Ann Mallek (White Hall District), Ms. Bea LaPisto-Kirtley (Rivanna District), Ms. Diantha McKeel (Jack Jouett District), Ms. Liz Palmer (Samuel Miller District), and Ms. Price (Scottsville District)

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. He said participation will include the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public will be received.

Mr. Gallaway announced the following in attendance: Jeff Richardson, County Executive; Greg Kamptner, County Attorney; Board Clerk Claudette Borgersen; and Assistant to the Clerk Grace Tamblyn. He said other staff would introduce themselves and their title at the appropriate times throughout the meeting.

Agenda Item No. 2. Presentations: Strategic Planning Process.

Mr. Jeff Richardson stated that this was an update of the strategic plan and the work staff was continuing to do, noting the big goals that the Board has challenged them with. He said they have worked hard to identify the larger opportunities in the community to make the biggest difference on the community and the citizens they serve every day. He said that he has a good team of people on the call today, all of whom are intricately involved in the strategic plan execution and are highly dedicated to public service and moving the community forward.

Mr. Richardson said that the budget staff is interested in looking at where there is financial capacity to be able to fit it in with the larger strategic plan goals so they can make the biggest difference in the community with the amount of funding available. He stated that the Board hears fairly regularly from him that when they do strategic planning, they are trying to identify the biggest opportunities and challenges on a daily basis—but they cannot do everything because they simply run out of resources. He emphasized that the Board's leadership and guidance are critically important to the organization for its long-term success.

[Pause in meeting due to audio issue.]

Mr. Gallaway introduced Ms. Shifflett.

Ms. Kristy Shifflett introduced herself to the Board as the Director of the Project Management Office. She explained that she would be walking the Board through the multifaceted and multidisciplinary functions that the County's government provides, as well as summarizing the progress made to date. She said the last update to the strategic plan was in November 2020, and they reviewed the strategies and the progress made to them. She stated that they also addressed how the pandemic had made an impact on the ability to perform government operations and examined the pivots the County made to address continuation of providing services, in addition to driving plans further. She said that the newest version of the full report would be posted on the County's website, where the cumulative progress over the past two years could be viewed. She said that for today's meeting, she would only be detailing progress from the past year.

She said that as they continued to implement the first phase of the Climate Action Plan, they focused on organizational structure, development of internal operational policies, and progress on projects. She said the greenhouse gas inventory for calendar year 2018 is complete. She continued that the County had launched implementation projects such as electric vehicle chargers at COB-McIntire, a mobile home weatherization pilot, low-income housing weatherization programming, and financial support for LEAP. She said that climate-related strategies are now being incorporated into the design of future facilities, and a tracking mechanism has been created to show those efforts. She stated that staff would be working towards the resiliency planning process over the next year to include developing strategies and identifying specific projects in the community. She said the organizational structure to systematically

operationalize climate action is an effort to program it into their work, rather than something that needs to be added on or competing with current work. She said with time, they can be more systematic. She continued that Lori Allshouse would be speaking to the Board at the end of this presentation about a related topic, the plastic bag tax. She said the climate action priorities set aside funding that will be programmed, which she added would be visible in the next budget process.

Ms. Shifflett stated that the next priority to review is to expand and promote outdoor parks and amenities. She said that the rezoning of Biscuit Run is complete, noting that Phase 1A is underway and includes park entrance, parking, restrooms, and trails. She said it is scheduled for completion in the fall of 2022. She stated that they had added virtual and outdoor fitness and special interest classes. She continued that installation of six dedicated pickleball courts at Darden Towe Park through a partnership with the Central Virginia Pickleball Club was complete. She continued that Powell Creek, Rivanna trail, Moore's Creek bridge and trail, and Lickinghole Creek Greenway had dedications.

Ms. Shifflett reported that the Rivanna Greenway feasibility study was completed and provides recommendations for the Board to see. She said the Economic Development office pivoted dramatically to support local businesses during the pandemic, and they also launched a Buy Local campaign in partnership with the City of Charlottesville. She continued that the Broadway Blueprint Study is in its final phase. She said that while the Economic Development office has noteworthy accomplishments, they are excited about completing an industrial zoned land inventory, the Broadway Blueprint study, and convening stakeholders from the brewery, winery, cidery, and distillery industries to identify opportunities for them to successfully become primary businesses.

Ms. Shifflett stated that the organization and Board were able to keep several school projects moving forward with the school division, even under the uncertainty of the pandemic. She said that four elementary school projects received funding for design, additions, or improvements. She stated that the High School Center II design was continuing as well. She said the school division would be reviewing their CIP needs with the Board of Supervisors and the School Board next week, so the Board would hear more on the matter.

Ms. Shifflett stated that infrastructure planning to determine desired levels of service for water resource protection programs had staff continue to map and collect data on traditional built conveyance infrastructure, both existing and newly constructed. She said this includes culverts, pipes, and manholes. She said staff would begin collecting data on the condition of conveyance channels throughout the urban areas to complete the infrastructure picture. She said program planning and further condition assessments have been paused due to the pandemic, and consideration of programming will be part of the FY23 budget process. She stated that during the pandemic, additional analysis on funding mechanisms was paused, but staff is now investigating other urban programs for alternative funding strategies. She said the Revitalize Aging Urban Neighborhoods initiative has had a lot of progress, and there are many bike/ped improvements and new crosswalks. She noted that the Greenbrier Drive pedestrian crossing of Rio Road has been completed. She stated that several Smart Scale grants have been acquired to assist in the US-29/Hydraulic improvements and also to convert the 5th Street/Old Lynchburg Road intersection into a roundabout. She stated that the project to construct pedestrian improvements to Old Lynchburg Road was now being developed for designing and engineering. She stated that Phase 1/Village 1 of Southwood redevelopment is under construction, with construction management meetings happening weekly.

Ms. Shifflett stated that the contract was executed for design on the Court systems, and on June 29, 2020, many work efforts were paused due to the pandemic, but the interview process was able to be slowed down to allow for the significant investment of time and energy required to choose a contract. She said that construction services were procured differently than in the past. She continued that the firm that was selected will collaborate with the County and the design firm to use best practices and find issues and mistakes before they become costly, and to look for opportunities for cost savings. She said the construction phase has begun and the schematic design was being reviewed.

Ms. Shifflett said the initiative to redevelop the Rio/US-29 intersection area was a major topic for the Board meeting that afternoon, so she would not discuss it at length. She said that the form-based code ordinance had been accomplished, which had been approved by the Board earlier in autumn of 2021. She said they had also draft updated the zoning ordinance of the intersection area. She stated that one development application of the projects from the private sector had been put in.

Ms. Shifflett stated that the broadband area of work was accelerated by the pandemic due to the urgency and funding levels through federal, state, and local sources from the Board of Supervisors. She said that they had been able to make a significant impact in this area for the community with many varied projects—some through state awards and grants and others through MOUs. She said the Firefly project is a very large effort that is going to take several years to accomplish, but it will have a massive impact on the community. She said they had been able to hire a project manager for the Broadband Accessibility and Affordability Office. She stated that the Board has appropriated \$3 million as well as an additional \$1.5 million in ARPA funds, for a grand total of \$4.5 million, to continue this focus of work.

Ms. Shifflett stated that she was showing the Board the current process of how the strategic plan for FY20 to FY22 would play out. She said that at the current date, they had completed year two of the plan and were moving into the final stage. She stated that they normally would be looking at a new plan, and she would explain how that plan would benefit from other continuous work happening in the County. She said that is the Comprehensive Plan update that the Community Development Office had discussed before the Board. She said there were many things related to strategy and vision for the County,

including growth management and framework, policy review and design, and beginning action steps and strategy development. She explained that these items were organized in the way that the work would be occurring over the next couple of years, and she would also lay out the Strategic Plan process. She added that she believed the work of the community and engagement of residents could be complemented by and with the business community to inform the next strategic plan process.

Ms. Shifflett stated that the next item was the foundation of the nine priorities of the plan, to focus on quality government operations and provide services at a basic level. She said operations must be effective and efficient to deliver on the priorities of the community, and the definition of “quality government operations” had been previously discussed. She stated that the focus is on customer service enhancements, financial management, business process reengineering, and workforce stabilization. She said this critical work must continue to be supported, and quality government service is necessary to further the vision of the County. She said the challenges had been researched extensively in the organization as they’ve tried to modernize. She said through assessments and process reengineering, roles and responsibility specification, and technology systems, the strategic plan report had an addition of a quality government operations section so that the Board could see the accomplishments they’ve tried to make internally to support the community. She said that may look like the new website, the GIS web migration, or the personal public engagement hub. She said they have done a lot of internet redesign and time and attendance work that is only internally visible but furthers the staff and the office’s focus on doing the right work.

Regarding workforce stabilization, Ms. Shifflett said the Board approved the \$15 minimum wage, the 2% market increase, and the public safety pay plan. She said they also were able to launch a telework policy implementation. She noted that one key area of focus was the human resources function, and the County’s human resources model was shared with the school division—an arrangement that had been going on for a long time. She said both organizations wanted to provide outside consultants to investigate how the work was being done, and it was found that there were differences in policies, structures, and cultures between the departments. She said that the assessments showed it was necessary to rebuild trust and responsiveness, which included technology systems. She said the organizational compensation methodology needed to be updated as well. She stated that those assessments helped point out priority areas through interviewing staff and the leadership team, including improving onboarding, performance management, professional development programs, career ladders, and succession planning. She stated that these priorities were part of the foundational work.

Ms. Shifflett said separate human resource functions would be launched in the next fiscal year, so the County would have its own Human Resources. She said this includes systems re-modernization with a focus on minimizing manual processes and establishing the new human resource positions and structures. She said the Human Resources Department would be able to focus on the County’s public service and some of the complicated nuances of the state code that must be followed, as well as public safety. She said the County government compensation study and strategy would be coming forward so the County can do an assessment and look at the market, competitiveness of pay, and how they are using this for recruitment and retention.

Ms. Shifflett stated that the last item under quality government was a project being developed to integrate enterprise resource planning and development tracking for internal and external use, and they have already begun projects in many of the manual processes. She said the Community Development Office had begun using a new system called Camino, which focuses on intake services, and they hoped to launch that system later this year or early next calendar year. She explained that this was work being done to be responsive and true to the public service covenant, pursuing modernization, and staff believes this will result in long-term benefits to the entire organization and its customers. She said the purpose of this work was twofold: improving the usability of the customer-facing processes, and preparing the department for the reengineering processes towards eventual replacement of the County View development tracking system. She noted that the replacement was anticipated as part of the core systems modernization.

Ms. Shifflett said that at the same time, a payroll clarity project was created to provide more education and change management for staff around shifting County pay philosophies from a payback exception to a positive pay and to increase the pay frequency. She said this culminates the payroll service moving from an internal process to an ADP process. She said this was all work that connects to the core systems modernization. She stated that they hoped to replace the current financial system with an enterprise resource planning (ERP) system, which will impact the Finance and Budget Department as well as the Human Resources Department. She said that the work is focused on metrics to ensure there are automated processes that will improve capacity, as well as on metrics for the community and internal operations for continued improvement.

Ms. Shifflett concluded that she was proposing to the Board to extend the County’s Strategic Plan for one more fiscal year, through FY23. She said she wanted to recommend this not only because the pandemic has stretched across 18 months and the impact has caused different restrictions and challenges, but also because the ambitious nature of these priorities would benefit from the opportunity funding and programming to continue throughout FY23. She said if the Strategic Plan is extended, the Board’s work with the comprehensive plan could be utilized and adjustments could be made for the new Strategic Plan to be developed.

Ms. Shifflett asked the Board if there was consensus from them for the extension of the strategic plan through FY23.

Mr. Gallaway said the Board should address any questions they have and give Ms. Shifflett an answer about if there is a consensus.

Ms. Mallek stated that she is definitely in favor of extending the Strategic Plan because then the Board would start where they finished—and she hoped it would be started before they tried too many more things. She said she had been known for beginning multiple projects at once and now knew it was not a good idea, so she hoped to learn from her mistakes. She said she appreciated that climate action was discussed at the beginning of the presentation, as well as internalizing that concept throughout County operations. She commented that purchasing and processes should be added to the list and kept in mind. She said that cost and risk should be avoided because the world is changing so much.

Ms. Price thanked Ms. Shifflett for her presentation. She said she concurred with the extension of the strategic plan through FY23. She stated that she highly supported the updates to the technology systems and believed everyone had experienced entities that have failed to keep up with technological needs, so it is imperative to do that up front.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked Ms. Shifflett for her presentation. She said she was also in favor of extending the plan and said it was a smart move. She said they should get the things they've had in planning done and addressed. She said she concurred with Ms. Price that society was becoming more and more technologically based. She said they needed to be sure they kept up, because it would save time and money.

Ms. Palmer stated that she was happy with the plan and presentation. She said there was a lot of detail, so she may have missed it, but she assumed that a facilities evaluation of the property for the possible school buses and convenience center off of Berkmar was buried in the Strategic Plan. She asked if that was a correct assumption.

Mr. Richardson responded that this was a very good question. He said that they were working on the Lambs Lane campus and the north convenience center located at the proffered property in the Rio area. He said it was not specifically noted in the current plan, but they were planning to have a joint meeting with schools about their capital needs and priorities on October 20, which was the following week. He said in that presentation, they would be talking about the discussions held with the Board in March of 2021 about ARPA funding and other focus areas, in addition to the strategic planning priorities that Ms. Shifflett had outlined earlier. He said that Ms. Palmer would be able to see that in the presentation next week, but they could talk about it today as well. He noted that what they would be seeing next week were additional items that are connected to the Strategic Plan but that staff has not formally folded into the plan. He asked Ms. Shifflett if that was a fair statement.

Ms. Shifflett confirmed that this was accurate.

Ms. Palmer said she was fine with waiting until the next week and thanked Mr. Richardson for explaining.

Mr. Richardson said he did not want to prolong the subject because there were other speakers who needed to talk, but he suggested that Mr. Henry address Ms. Palmer's question in case there was additional information that could be shared.

Mr. Trevor Henry said Mr. Richardson had not missed anything, and Facilities and Environmental Services was in coordination and communication with schools and was scoping the work at both of those sites, then moving into the design process. He said they had provided a written update to the Board the previous month, and there was nothing more to add for today's meeting.

Mr. Richardson thanked Ms. Palmer and asked Mr. Gallaway to proceed.

Ms. McKeel stated that she appreciated Ms. Palmer's question because she had been wondering about the same thing, and she was looking forward to hearing more about the update at the meeting. She said it was true that they should be talking to the schools about this, because it is a combined school and County government proposal and project. She said in answer to Ms. Shifflett's question, she was supportive of extending the strategic work through FY23. She commented that she very much appreciated the presentation and said it was helpful to have the review of the Strategic Plan so she could refocus on what work had been completed and the current state of the plan. She thanked Ms. Shifflett and affirmed her support of the extension.

Mr. Gallaway stated that he was supportive of extending the plan but had a few comments, and in the extension, there would be a new Strategic Plan that focused on new priorities. He said that some items have met many goals of the plan, and a lot of the groundwork has been done for those projects, such as the redevelopment of the Rio/US-29 intersection. He said they have completed the small area plan, the form-based code was approved, economic development would continue, and public and private partnerships would continue to be forged. He said when he looked at the items listed under quality government operations, a lot of them had been completed from a strategic planning standpoint. He said that the business process engineering piece should be included in this Strategic Plan, and it would be done in conjunction with other items already listed. He said that at some point, it would make sense for the community for that piece to be an organizational strategic priority that rises to the level of a Climate Action Plan—or the organization may not be able to get the other strategic priorities accomplished.

Mr. Gallaway said his concern is that while it is smart to extend the plan for another year, it also

takes another year before new priorities are established. He said he is not looking for any kind of decision, but the Board should think about while there is good reason for the extension at the current time, there are other things that have come up to be a priority of the level of other items, and it was necessary for those to be included as a priority of the same level as those other items, and the Board needed to have the flexibility to do that. He said he did not know if anyone could comment on his opinion, but he felt that the Board needed to be able to do some maneuvering and not wait until the next Strategic Plan update.

Mr. Richardson asked if what Mr. Gallaway suggested was to raise the awareness level and attention level of the foundational item of quality government operations to make it clear that it is a priority and that to some degree, it drives the success they are able to achieve in other areas. He asked Mr. Gallaway if he had explained that in a way that made sense.

Mr. Gallaway responded that while he used a specific example of a redevelopment project, he felt the same way about the economic development program and how that evolved. He said a lot of items had been accomplished, and to look at the list of items and extend them another year, while the Board knows what has been accomplished, that is not necessarily communicated outward, and there should be no wait if other items could take precedence. He said he is not in disagreement with that approach but wanted to make sure that the Board could be flexible and maneuver priorities if new ones arise. He said that those new items could potentially be accomplished, and then the Board would have a new outlook on their next strategic plan.

Mr. Richardson said that made sense to him.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the Board had any further questions. He said he felt they had reached the consensus they needed. Hearing no further questions from the Board, he asked Ms. Shifflett if the Board had addressed her question.

Ms. Shifflett said they did, and she thanked the Board. She said to Mr. Gallaway's point on the Economic Development Office and Project Enable, the Board would be hearing soon about the work accomplished thus far. She said that she recognized that some of the listed priorities have had a lot of progress and success and that Mr. Gallaway had pointed out the challenge between strategy and operations. She said when things started moving into the operational component, it would then give the opportunity to look at what other items need attention. She said she appreciated his point that to address the items that have not been able to make as much progress, they would be continuing through the budget process and would use the Board of Supervisors meetings and decision-making to drive the progress on other things not listed under quality government operations.

Ms. Palmer said that they had discussed this in their past two-on-two meetings, but in regard to the quality government operations, she agreed with Mr. Gallaway that the public needs to know the plan is happening, and they need to make sure they were not keeping the information internal. She said it is not interesting to a lot of people, which was one of the comments that staff had made before. She stated that despite this, it is vital for the community to understand its importance. She reiterated that she agreed with Mr. Gallaway's earlier point.

Ms. Mallek stated that she had made an assumption that the quality government operation business optimization project was going to be included and would be discussed with the upcoming budget, because without it, they cannot do the climate action or economic development programs properly. She said all of items relate to the others, but that specific item influences every single other priority, and she agreed that it should not be discounted in any way.

Mr. Richardson said that they would elevate the level of communication with quality government operations in the upcoming budget process, as that had been brought up by multiple Board members, so there would be increased emphasis on that. He said it would not be to the detriment of anything else being worked on, but it would be more visibly connected to the community with service delivery and operations. He said he appreciated the opportunity and the Board's continued support. He said the Board had heard from him regularly that they were doing things that in five or 10 years would be seen as good investments. He said that the nine items were like a house, and quality government operations were the foundation they were investing in for the organization's future. He said he believed they had the right staff with skillsets that were very complementary to being able to do the work the right way. He said sometimes the work was harder and took more time to find an investment, and staff was sometimes tired and frustrated because it is hard work, but he appreciated the Board's support and their challenge to elevate this plan more during the budget process. He commented that this was very good feedback and thanked the Chair.

Mr. Gallaway said that Ms. Mallek was correct in that they should be having a lot of conversations about this plan as it relates to the budget. He noted that he and Ms. McKeel had done a program at the end of the previous week, and one of the points they both made was about business process optimization and business process reengineering. He said they both asked what precisely those terms meant. He said he personally believed that it stood in the way of the Board making progress with what they wanted to do because of the time it took to get certain things done, and both of those elements were going to help free up time. He said the host of their program said they were "turning red tape into green tape." He said it reflected tremendous organizational change, and the fact that it should be included as part of the other strategic plan items and was agreed upon with the other Board members meant it should be a top point of budget conversations. He said before COVID, business process optimization was said more as a catchphrase and was not given the same attention as other items such as public safety or fire operations.

He said the community needs to understand why that is so important, because it will allow the goals of climate action, affordable housing, and more efficient operations for the citizens. He said he knew everyone was already aware of these things, but he felt it was important to bring attention to it so that when they discussed the budget, they would be aware that it would be a high point for conversation. He thanked Ms. Shifflett for allowing him to discuss this issue.

Ms. Shifflett said she could discuss it all day, as it was her work. She said Ms. Allshouse would be reviewing something related to the Climate Action Plan.

Ms. Lori Allshouse introduced herself to the Board as the Assistant CFO for Policy and Partnerships, stating that she would be sharing information about an option that staff has planned to bring forward for consideration. She said before she started, she wanted to remind the Board that in December 2020, there was new taxing authority that the General Assembly had provided to counties. She said for many years, counties had been asking for different types of taxing authority to take the pressure off of real estate tax. She said several options were provided to the County, one being a cigarette tax. She said that tax plan was brought before the Board in December and was the first they would work on. She said it has taken some time to implement because they were planning to set up an original board, and the Board of Supervisors would be considering that tax levy next week. She said the focus of the staff who works on these types of policies has been on that particular taxing authority and considering things such as equity implications and stakeholders.

Ms. Allshouse stated that many people had probably already heard about the disposable bag tax, and many jurisdictions were already considering it. She said the General Assembly allowed Virginia localities to adopt a five-cent tax on disposable plastic bags, which applies to disposable plastic bags provided to a consumer in grocery stores, convenience stores, or drugstores. She continued that the Virginia Department of Taxation would be solely responsible for administering the tax, which helps alleviate some of the work of the County's internal offices. She said that a two-cent portion of the tax may be retained by dealers for the cost of collecting and remitting. She stated that many jurisdictions have stepped forward and have already adopted ordinances. She said the Board may be aware that one of the jurisdictions had to go before the Department of Taxation to prepare the final document and guidelines.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the final implementation guidelines were released on September 1, 2021, and there was now clearer information that could be shared with stakeholders and others as to exactly what is involved in this tax. She said they had a Batten student work on providing background information of the project in the summer of 2020. She stated that the timing for implementation is recommended to be part of the FY23 budget process, and they were talking about the strategic plan because that budget planning process was happening the following week. She said that as soon as the cigarette tax item was considered, the focus would turn to this plastic bag tax. She said there are complications that arise if the item is added into the budget quickly. She said that they want to share this item with stakeholders and had to be mindful of the impacts it might have on businesses, and they would make sure there is time to communicate the information to the community. She said the revenues would have to be estimated and are very specific in the plastic bag tax—and why it ties so well to the strategic plan discussion is because the monies must be used for environmental cleanup, educational programs, mitigating litter and pollution, and reusable bags for SNAP and WIC recipients. She said she believed this tied into what the County was interested in if the tax was implemented. She asked if the Board had any questions at this time, or if they thought they should proceed ahead of the budget process.

Ms. Mallek said she had no questions and commented that it certainly tied in with climate action.

Ms. Price thanked Ms. Allshouse for her presentation. She said she fully supported the item, and it was important for community members to appreciate that tax policy is not only for revenue generation but also established what is important in a society. She said there is a child tax credit because they value families and want to help them raise their children. She said that when looking at the five-cent tax on disposable plastic bags, it is not just revenue creation, but it also establishes and demonstrates the interests that the County has about protecting the environment. She said she was especially pleased with the restrictions on what the revenue can be used for, because she had been troubled by governments implementing policies or taxes for a purpose and then not using the revenues for that purpose. She said she was very happy to see the first three items: environmental cleanup, educational programs, and mitigating litter and pollution. She said she was not opposed to the fourth item, but there should be some sort of accountability for the bags so they did not generate some sort of off-market of reusable bags. She said that this was a litter issue, so to use the funds to promote the climate action plan was extremely relevant.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked Ms. Allshouse and said it was wonderful to see the plan coming to fruition. She asked if the environmental cleanup would include cleanup along the roadways. She stated in a lot of the rural areas, litter can be seen spread all around. She said that in some communities, such as the Proffitt Road and Polo Grounds Road area, citizens go out twice a year and clean the roads. She asked if the monies could also be used for that type of project.

Ms. Allshouse responded that she believed so. She said that the only guidelines were the written words, so she thought it was up to the community and the Board to determine as part of the budget process and the initiatives they wanted to implement what they decided to do with it.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was very much in favor of the tax and felt that the sooner it was implemented the better.

Ms. Palmer said she was in favor of the tax, and it was good to work it into the FY23 budget. She said that Ms. Allshouse had indicated that the state would manage this. She asked if the storeowner or the company sends the money directly to the state, and then the state would reimburse the County.

Ms. Allshouse confirmed that this was her understanding.

Ms. Palmer said she had no other questions and that she was fine with it, adding that it was a great step forward.

Ms. McKeel said she agreed with the other members of the Board. She said she was thrilled that they were talking about it and that they would see it move forward. She said there is not anything on the list that they had not heard before. She corrected herself and said that the community certainly talked about litter, pollution, and environmental cleanup a lot—and she can't imagine that the community would not be supportive of this effort. She said she is interested in the educational programs as well, because the Board had discussed in the past the idea of including schools and education. She continued that she had grown up in the 1950's with educational programs that were about not littering, they had all grown up in a culture of not littering, and she felt that they had gotten away from that mentality. She said she would love to see environmental cleanup and mitigating litter and pollution, but also conduct some education so that the County would not have to clean up the litter.

Mr. Gallaway asked if it were known what kind of revenue the tax would generate for those programs.

Ms. Allshouse said that it would be an item that would have to be worked out and they would have to see what would happen, adding that they have to be very thoughtful. She said this policy might lead to people using less plastic and using items like reusable bags, paper, or other alternatives, so no tax would be collected. She said that as Ms. Price had mentioned earlier about tax policy, the effect of the tax would result in a change in behavior as much as anything else. She said that it was a piece that the County would have to monitor and be thoughtful about the behavioral changes that will probably come out of it.

Mr. Gallaway said he was wondering how a number would even be calculated for this.

Ms. Allshouse said that the few jurisdictions beginning this policy ahead of the County would help them see the changes that they have had. She said there have been other states that have implemented this tax, so that could be researched as well to help forecast the revenue.

Ms. Mallek said it occurred to her when Ms. Allshouse mentioned moving away from plastic that they have to be very diligent about what materials they choose. She said there are many plastic-containing reusable bags that would not be helpful at all. She said there were many fabrics that could be used, and she hoped they would take the time to ensure that what fabric is used is moving completely away from plastics. She said there was an article she wanted to share with everyone, and the state of Maine had put in a requirement that producers would be responsible for the cost of trash generated, cleanup, and recycling for items. She said that meant that if toothpaste comes in a box, there is a fee or another mechanism, but she is unsure of the exact details. She said they had to stop this transfer of cost to citizens, which is called "greenwashing." She said for example, the rubber tire industry says that their products can be used on playgrounds so that they do not have to take care of the waste.

Ms. McKeel commented that she agreed with Ms. Mallek, and the recycling issue had been extremely greenwashed. She said that while everyone is in favor of recycling and everyone should do it, they have to understand that it is not the solution for this country. She said that they needed to stress that this is not a revenue-generating project. She said that if they could change behavior and have no litter or plastic polluting the environment—and that was the outcome she wanted. She reiterated that it was not about revenue, it was about changing behavior and helping the environment.

Mr. Gallaway asked Ms. Allshouse if she had any further items.

Ms. Allshouse replied that she had no further items.

Ms. Shifflett thanked the Board and said that concluded their portion of the meeting.

Agenda Item No. 3. Presentations: Rio Road Corridor Plan.

Mr. Gallaway stated that this would be the Board's first chance to see the work done.

Mr. David Benish greeted the Board and introduced himself as the development process manager of the Community Development Office and the project manager for the Rio Road Corridor planning process. He said the purpose of the day's work session was to present to the Board the work done to date on the corridor plan and answer any questions and receive any comments or direction the Board had for the consultant and project team before they moved forward with further development. He said he hoped the presentation would be concise and provide ample time to discuss the project.

Mr. Benish stated that he would turn over the remainder of the presentation to Daniel Hyer of Line + Grade Civil Engineering, the lead consultant with the consultant team. He said that also present were Serena Gruia, who has been doing the public engagement process for the plan; Kevin McDermott, the

development and transportation manager in CDD planning division; and Charles Rapp, the planning division director. He said they were all available to answer questions the Board may have and receive any comments. He said that those present and Rachel Falkenstein, the development manager for long-range planning and consulting, constitute the team that has been working on this project.

Mr. Daniel Hyer stated that the outline of his presentation included an introduction that covered about six months of work in 10 minutes, and then the Board could ask questions if anything was unclear or if there were noteworthy comments. He said the second 10 minutes would be oriented around the conceptual solutions that had currently been developed in response to the items that had been studied. He said the final hour would be for questions or dialogue as the Board sees fit.

Mr. Hyer said that the corridor study had been broken into Phase I and Phase II. He said that Phase I is specifically from the Rio/US-29 small area plan to the John Warner Parkway/Rio intersection, and Phase II goes from John Warner Parkway/Rio intersection to the City of Charlottesville jurisdictional boundary. He said that the two areas were purposefully overlapped because the phases cannot be designed in a vacuum, and they must keep projects integrated. He stated that it was the logical phasing of the work. He said that most of the work done to date was for Phase I; they were actively working on Phase II and would have more to share about it specifically in the near future.

Mr. Hyer stated that he wanted to bring attention to what had been identified as a “call to action” on the project. He said their guiding statement and goal was to restore a human scale along Rio Road and unify the community that lives along and adjacent to the corridor, while making provisions for safe and effective transport of the many members of the community that use the corridor for travel and commuting.

Mr. Hyer said specifically, they wanted to focus on what they meant by the term “human scale.” He stated that there were four specific criteria for restoring a human scale. He stated that the first item was safety, with roads and sidewalks that are safe for families, neighbors, and friends. He said that the next item was access, and they wanted equal access to places where they walk, bike, and drive. Third, he continued, was to protect the environment and to create vibrant public spaces with their work. He said the right-of-way is the public realm and belongs to the citizens, so they want that space to be used well. He said the final item was to provide optimal travel and reasonable solutions to known transportation challenges. He said their work to date and going forward was to integrate those four specific criteria across everything they do to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Hyer said the Board would notice there is a very specific difference between Phase I and Phase II. He said in Phase I, the primary goal was to integrate a lot of the work done in recent years, including transportation studies done by various users and groups and development projects that have proposed TIA studies. He said they wanted to integrate the knowledge that had been developed to date and bring it together into a cohesive corridor plan. He said they are standing on the shoulders of many others who have done the work already. He continued that there was a lot that had happened along the corridor to date, and they wanted to use that to inform their work.

Mr. Hyer said there was a marked shift in Phase II, reflecting a very different road. He said that Rio Road from the City line to the John Warner Parkway intersection still resembles a rural road in many locations. He said the challenges along that part of the corridor would be different, and a lot of the work would be trying to set the stage for an appropriate public realm in front of future development projects.

Mr. Hyer said that there was a noticeable difference between the two phases, and Phase I was the primary goal of the current conversation. He said that something very important as they go into this work is to understand who is using the road, who lives along the road, and how the road is used. He stated that they began this research with census data, and there are three census tracts adjacent to the corridor: 106.01, 106.02, and 8. He said that 8 is largely in the City of Charlottesville but, nonetheless, still a part of the community. He said there is a spectrum and range in the demographics and characterizations of the people who live along the corridor. He said it was surprising to him that they found there was a larger percentage of the population along this corridor in poverty or below the median income, largely in the census tract 106.01. He said that they should be particularly aware of how different members of the community rely on the corridor in different ways, whether it was public transportation or riding a bicycle or another use. He said that knowing who was using the corridor and how it was being used informed a lot of the decision-making in their work.

Mr. Hyer said that the deficiencies of the corridor needed to be understood, specifically those relating to bicycle and pedestrian safety. He said that he felt it would be difficult for anyone to say that the corridor is actually safe for pedestrians and cyclists, and there was now data to back that up. He said the spark lines shown in his presentation represented the deficiency of the infrastructure as related to pedestrians and cyclists. He showed the Board where the infrastructure should be coming in on a metric and noted that largely the infrastructure is completely inadequate or missing. He said that they had been able to put specific data to the experience of pedestrians and the deficiencies that existed for pedestrians and cyclists alike, and one of the primary starting points for this project was understanding what is efficient and what needs to be addressed.

Mr. Hyer said that when safety was being discussed, that included vehicular safety. He stated that there are a lot of accidents that happen along this specific corridor, and the data available from VDOT states that there were 240 accidents that occurred between 2013 and 2020. He stated that these accidents correspond with areas of the corridor that have access management challenges. He said that safety and access management often go hand and hand. He stated that access management is defined

as the availability of various commercial entrances or roadway intersections to comply with necessary spacing standards and design criteria as developed by VDOT and AASHTO (the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) even above that. He said that where they have seen deficiencies and access management spacing standards, they are also seeing a lack of safety. He said a good example of this was the Hillsdale/Old Brook/Northfield intersection, which is basically two intersections on top of each other. He said that another challenge related to access management was understanding the balance between access and mobility. He said that someone who lived on Belvedere and wanted to shop at Aldi would have a different relationship to the corridor than someone who works in downtown Charlottesville and lives in Greene County. He said this was the balance between access and mobility. He said that the corridor needs to be able to do both and to do it well.

Mr. Hyer said that the more they studied the nuance of the corridor and the development of the residential areas adjacent to the corridor, they became curious about the guidance of historical development patterns. He said it was interesting to note that the advice and the design guidance from the Federal Highway Administration in the 1940's through the 1960's did not want vehicles to pass through residential areas for the concern of safety. He said that while doing that, the development patterns forced all the traffic to the arterial roadways, which includes Rio Road. He said that by doing that, they have funneled everyone to the same road, and as populations have grown and roads are required to do more things, there was now a road that carried tens of thousands of people a day—with no alternative for cars to get from the downtown Charlottesville area to Rio Road to US-29 North. He said that there was Hillsdale and Hydraulic Road that were accessible, but they were all arterial, and there was no network of smaller streets to handle the capacity. He stated that he did not believe the population would decline, so the proposed solutions needed to be adaptive and responsive to a growing population whose needs will change over time.

Mr. Hyer said that they had evaluated the parcels along the corridor that were most prone to be redeveloped in the future, some of which the Board was already aware of. He said that they needed to guide that development so that the work that happened over time as properties changed hands or were redeveloped could actually promote the goals that they wanted to see along this corridor. He said specific goals they wanted to meet are the human scale and the public realm.

Mr. Hyer said that their work had tried to understand what makes the public realm vibrant. He said that public realm is defined as the space where people are—whether they are walking, jogging, or using a bicycle. He said they want that space to be seen and understood and characterized as a public space.

Mr. Hyer said that their team had in recent weeks compiled all the information they had worked through and attempted to disseminate it through means that were accessible and equitable for all the people along the corridor who were interested. He said this work had been largely done by Ms. Gruia. He stated that between podcasts, videos, and pop-up events, she had done a great job canvassing and getting information to the public for their response. He concluded his introduction and said he would move forward into conceptual solutions as soon as he answered any questions from the Board.

Mr. Gallaway opened the floor to questions from the Board.

Ms. Price said she did not have any questions but was impressed with Mr. Hyer's presentation.

Ms. McKeel thanked Mr. Hyer for his work with public outreach. She said she was impressed with the podcasts that Mr. Hyer's group produced for the public and appreciated that they had used technology as a way to better inform the public.

Mr. Gallaway mentioned that the County had only done one other corridor study of this scale. He asked for Deputy County Executive Doug Walker to elaborate on why corridor studies were done, how they worked, and how the County used them so that the diagrams and figures that they produce make sense to people when they see them.

Mr. Doug Walker began by saying that comprehensive planning takes time and happens incrementally, technically in five-year increments but usually longer. He continued that subplans begin to develop from these comprehensive plans, such as master plans, small area plans, and zoning—each reflecting the different goals, desires, and styles of the planners. He said that this results in the creation of a corridor with varying degrees of development. He said that corridor studies allow the County to evaluate all the previous development, figure out ways to mitigate the conflicts between the various development plans, and to plan for the future accordingly.

Mr. Gallaway thanked Mr. Walker. He said that he wanted to emphasize that the corridor study is a planning tool and a starting point—not a set of projects that they are voting on.

Mr. Hyer began the second part of his presentation, focusing on conceptual solutions and next steps and outlining several issues with the corridor's roadway. He said that the wide road with gradual turns promoted speeding, a challenge on the thoroughfare, and the continuous dual left-turn lane running the length of the road added conflict points for drivers. He said the left-turn lane also created a large, unnecessary amount of impervious surface that generated significant volumes of runoff, which was an environmental consideration. He continued that the road had limited uses for other modes of transit besides vehicular traffic and elaborated on what the County could do to address these issues. To promote slower travel speeds, he said that the County could make the road narrower. He said one way to narrow the road is by introducing a raised median and making travel lanes only as wide as they need to

be. He continued that a raised median would not only reduce conflict points in the road where cars could collide head-on, but it would also reduce impervious surfaces and reduce runoff. To further reduce the amount of impervious surface, he suggested combining the bike lanes into a mixed-use path along the north side of Rio Road. He said this would ultimately create the northbound trail connection that links the John Warner Parkway to Berkmar, which would let someone bike from downtown Charlottesville to the airport. He said although feedback to these concepts had been limited, the public seemed to have similar concerns as the County regarding the roadway—a general concern about the volume of vehicles and the speed at which they travel. Moving forward, he said that the goal is to refine these conceptual solutions, not to change them, unless they receive some significant feedback either from the public or the Board.

Mr. Hyer discussed the lack of public realm, or space where people believe they can and should exist along the roadway. He said the current design ecosystem of the corridor is suburban and spread out, with the roadway and parking lots being the prominent features. To change this, he said that the County should introduce physical constraints to separate the pedestrians from the cars. He introduced four concepts created by a design team of urban planners and architects from Fall Line showing varying levels of “engagement zones” along the corridor. He said the engagement zones are indicative of how the land will be used over time; for commercial use, the County would like to see a high-engagement zone, a mixed-use space would need a medium engagement zone, a residential use space would need a low-engagement zone, and an unchanged, undeveloped space would need a no-engagement zone. He said they tried to accommodate for parcels that will not turn over and account for parcels that will develop and change.

Ultimately, he said, the engagement zones would be a tool for the County to determine what the frontage areas should look like. He listed benefits to this approach, namely that this is essentially a public amenity because the corridor is public space. He continued that the engagement zones increase accessibility and access, and the environment created by the zones will eventually promote the safety features they are trying to achieve. He said that the concepts developed by Fall Line are adequate and well-developed for this corridor. He said only one public comment somewhat related to the public realm concept had been received, which said, “human scale is going to be difficult to accomplish along this corridor.” He said he agreed with this comment, and that is why the County must start work towards the public realm as soon as possible.

Mr. Hyer addressed the Hillsdale/Old Brook/Northfield intersection, noting that it is the worst-performing intersection in the County. He said the County wants to use this intersection to indicate the context change from small area development to residential development. Next, he said the County needs to change the intersection from an eight-way intersection to a singular intersection, thus reconciling the access management problems. Another goal he listed is integrating inclusive pedestrian access into this intersection. While there is some pedestrian access, he said it is not uniform, consistent, or predictable. He pointed out that the center of this intersection is the topographical high point of the whole corridor, and this provides a unique opportunity to do something interesting.

Mr. Hyer stated that another goal for this intersection is to slow southbound vehicles coming off Route 29. He said the concept they devised to solve the problems facing the intersection is to create a peanut-shaped roundabout. He continued that this is the only way the intersections can be combined into one without drastically changing the roadways, such as permanently shutting down roads and diverting traffic. He emphasized this is just a concept at the moment and is open to refinement. He said feedback has been mixed. While VDOT supported the design, Mr. Hyer said a number of citizens said that it looks confusing. He continued that the public response is expected since the peanut roundabout is a unique piece of infrastructure, that, while becoming increasingly more common, will still require a public education component if it moves forward. He said even though the public expressed confusion, they also expressed the sentiment that the intersection needed improvement. He said that any other items trying to address the problems at this intersection, such as changing the signal times, would not likely succeed, and other solutions would prove to be more invasive with less benefit. He said that development needs to address what happens at Hillsdale and the Fashion Square Mall parking lot. He said the area around Fashion Square Mall was included in the small area plan, but he does not believe both interventions, at Hillsdale/Old Brook/Northfield and at Fashion Square Mall, need to happen. He said they did not need both, but they do need one or the other. He said he would like the Board’s feedback about which one to move forward with.

Mr. Hyer stated that the goal for the Belvedere intersection is to minimize the conflict points—as it is unsafe and has a lot of delays—so the goal is to increase service by removing delays and consolidating and simplifying access. He acknowledged that the concept solution they have is not a perfect solution and explained the proposed intersection change, called a “green T” intersection. He said it limits to some degree all of the access problems by reducing the number of lanes that left turns need to cross and adding dedicated lanes for left turns to merge into. He said this design does not allow easy access to City Church, but the church had provided feedback about ways to make it better. He said pedestrian access has also not been fully figured out because pedestrian movements in the area have not been fully understood due to fewer people not using it as much. He said the concept needs further polish, but it is largely the right direction.

Mr. Hyer stated that the goal for the John Warner/Rio intersection is to minimize conflict points, address access management issues such as delays, consolidate and simplify the infrastructure, remove impermeable surfaces and reduce stormwater runoff, and enhance the public realm through expanded outdoor spaces. He said the concept they propose is a roundabout, and VDOT is also planning a roundabout for that intersection to be placed directly in the middle of the current intersection. He explained that their roundabout differs because it will be placed about 200 feet off-center from the current

intersection. By changing the intersection to a roundabout, he said that they will be able to minimize conflict points, increase the level of access, consolidate and simplify infrastructure, substantially reduce stormwater runoff, and consolidate public land that can be utilized for the public realm.

Mr. Hyer said that feedback has been mixed: VDOT positively responded to the plan, but residents were critical and concerned—with the public's response based in confusion about how to navigate the roundabout. He said the next steps include educating people about roundabouts and further refining the concept based on stakeholder feedback. He said a decision needs to come soon because VDOT already has a project planned for this intersection. He clarified that this design does reduce conflict points by 40%, increases bike and pedestrian access, reduces impervious surfaces by 20%, and consolidates public space. He then outlined a roadmap for what comes next with the planning as a whole. He said the next step is to keep working on Phase II and to get Phase II caught up to Phase I. He said they will come back to the Board before the end of 2021 to get determinations on the questions they raised. He ended his presentation by saying they intend to have a draft corridor plan by the first quarter of 2022, and he offered to answer questions.

Ms. Mallek asked to see the two planned roundabouts for the John Warner and Rio intersection side by side. She said the concept for the Belvedere intersection was a significant improvement over the previous proposal she had seen. She said she used a road to merge onto Rio recently and found it challenging; the speed of traffic made it difficult for her to merge, so slowing down traffic is one of her priorities. She said she supported developing the Hillsdale/Old Brook/Northfield intersection over Fashion Square Mall because they would not have to redevelop private property.

Ms. Price asked if it was possible to move the proposed roundabout at John Warner further south, closer to the existing intersection. She said that one of the principal concerns of community members was that it appeared the proposal was moving traffic closer to the homes rather than farther away.

Mr. Hyer responded that they intend to move their version of the roundabout further to the south. He said there is a limit to how far south they can move the roundabout while still maintaining four entrances and without recreating the VDOT design. He said the primary and only difference in the two roundabouts is a non-compliant access management conflict point created by the VDOT plan where Dunlora intersects with Rio leading into the VDOT roundabout. He said that point would create traffic delays back into the neighborhood, and their plan removes the conflict by creating a fourth entrance.

Ms. Price suggested that they move the proposed roundabout slightly to the east-southeast to provide a buffer between the traffic and the neighborhood. She said she found the concept proposed for the Belvedere intersection an improvement because it reduced conflict points, and she acknowledged that it was not always possible to remove every conflict point. She said she found the peanut roundabout an interesting solution for the Hillsdale/Old Brook/Northfield intersection and commended the team for their design.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she uses the Hillsdale/Old Brook/Northfield Intersection often throughout the week, and she finds the proposal for that intersection much more favorable than what is currently in place. She agreed with the need to educate people on how to use the roundabout and mentioned specific outreach to Our Lady of Peace, an assisted living home located south of the intersection on Hillsdale. She said she agreed that each of the proposed concepts is an improvement over the existing intersections. She also agreed with Ms. Price that the roundabout proposed for John Warner should be moved further south. She asked where the entrance for CATEC was located in the proposal for the John Warner intersection.

Mr. Hyer answered that the entrance was not currently displayed in the images, and they had not yet incorporated the feedback they received from CATEC regarding the entrance. He said that it was likely that they would be able to incorporate most of the feedback they received regarding the John Warner roundabout.

Ms. Palmer said she agreed with the traffic problems that Mr. Hyer had enumerated. She said she found the combination of pedestrian and bike lanes along the north side of Rio Road compelling but was concerned about implementation. She asked for clarification on where the mixed-use path improvements would begin and end.

Mr. Hyer explained that the improvements would stretch from the Hillsdale/Old Brook/Northfield intersection southbound towards the John Warner Parkway trail, which is the terminus of Phase I. He said this leaves a gap in the small area plan zone, and there would be a break in the mixed-use path closer to Route 29. He said this would likely require its own study to extend the mixed-use path to Berkmar.

Ms. Palmer said the only problems she foresaw were with appropriating funding and maintaining the roadways and greenspace.

Mr. Hyer said that the green space pictured in the concepts does not have to be grass turf and could be other green vegetation that required less maintenance. He said his ideal path forward would be to start development of the corridor at the ends—at John Warner Parkway and at Hillsdale—and work toward the middle. He continued that none of the proposed road improvements required significant building and were comparatively simpler to implement than other transportation projects.

Ms. McKeel said she thought the peanut roundabout was an outstanding idea. She mentioned a previous meeting at which she had discussed how roundabouts greatly improve pedestrian and cyclist safety, and this should be part of public education about the traffic improvements. She said she approved of the concept for the Belvedere intersection and acknowledged that there was only so much improvement that could be done, with the proposed concept seeming to fix several problems. She expressed similar concerns about the proximity of the proposed John Warner/Rio Road roundabout to the neighborhood and said she also wanted to see it shifted further south. She continued that she liked the utilization of public space and the implementations of pedestrian paths around the John Warner roundabout. She echoed Ms. Palmer's concerns about road maintenance. She said there were several roads that had grass two to three feet tall. She said they would have to start dedicating more resources to roadside maintenance.

Ms. Mallek asked to clarify if the plan to add the mixed-use path would just require a reorganization of the existing road structure.

Mr. Hyer confirmed that it would.

Ms. Mallek expressed concern about the traffic flow in the proposal for the John Warner roundabout, stating that the proposal diverts all traffic to a road that currently sees very little traffic, and she would like to see a solution that would keep that road quiet.

Mr. Gallaway asked if they had considered what would happen with the peanut roundabout at the Hillsdale/Old Brook/Northfield intersection if Hillsdale Road were redirected through Fashion Square Mall. He said that if Hillsdale were redirected, the peanut roundabout would not be effective because the traffic demand would not be there. He said the answer to his question would help answer whether or not it would be worth it to redirect Hillsdale.

Mr. Hyer explained that they had explored the possibility of redirecting Hillsdale and had considered several concepts before settling on the one before the Board. He continued that when they considered redirecting Hillsdale to behind the mall, they proposed closing down the intersection at Hillsdale and Rio. He said this path forward was more invasive because the access management challenges would still be present even though fewer cars were likely to use the intersection. He said the team had eventually stopped considering this route, but they could reconsider it if needed.

Mr. Gallaway said that rerouting Hillsdale was still on the transportation priorities list and continued to get input, and as long as that remained true, it was worth exploring that option. He said while the corridor is residential, it is also an arterial road—and those two aspects must be balanced. He said narrowing the lanes and adding the raised medians would be effective in slowing traffic, but that would also create other operational issues for the thoroughfare. He asked if people would still be able to make left turns with the raised median in place.

Mr. Hyer responded that almost all the left turns remain accessible through median breaks. He said some left turns receive a partial-access condition instead of a full-access condition, but the intent was not to create a closed median the whole way.

Mr. Gallaway asked if they could put traffic signals at the Belvedere intersection.

Mr. Hyer replied that they could put a signal at the Belvedere intersection, possibly only in one direction. He said that before they put a signal at Belvedere, they would have to evaluate whether or not it would comply with intersection spacing for high-volume roadways. He said it would have to go through a VDOT signal warrant analysis. He said the most likely kind of signal would be a peak-hour signal that operates for one hour in the morning and one hour at night. He said he is not convinced that with the roundabout at John Warner that this will continue to be a problem. He said another consideration is to continue a single lane of traffic from the John Warner roundabout up to the Belvedere intersection. He said it sounds like they need to spend more time evaluating the best path forward for this intersection.

(Ms. Palmer left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.)

Mr. Gallaway questioned the feasibility of the public space plan for the John Warner roundabout because that land needed to have stormwater management functionality. He mentioned how they had tried to plant a wildflower meadow in that same space but failed because of the functional need. He said there were a lot of logistical concerns for things that Line + Grade would not be tasked with, such as the programming of open space, that was making him react poorly to this presentation. He said he thought they did not have all of the pertinent information as to why some of their proposals may not be practical, such as the difficulty of maintaining open space in the center of the roundabout and how they had struggled with a similar thing in the wildflower meadow over the last three years. He agreed that the proposed roundabout should shift to where the intersection currently exists because, when VDOT originally built the intersection, they intended for it to be further from the neighborhoods. He said that Mr. Hyer's presentation convinced him that a roundabout is the best solution for this intersection, and all that is left is to determine the best placement and design. He said he knew this proposal relied upon VDOT's 2016 traffic data and asked what else went into their projections for traffic use, especially considering the increased development and other high-traffic uses such as the Center at Belvedere and SOCA at Penn Park.

Mr. Hyer stated that the projections are the next step and would be dependent on what they believed the infrastructure they propose could handle. He said that future traffic volumes would not be

associated with these already developed developments because they are limited in how dense they can get, but they will be based on the development of the corridor itself. He said they have not calculated the impact because they wanted feedback on the designs first.

(Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley left the meeting at 6:18 p.m.)

Mr. Gallaway said there have been multiple kinds of intersections proposed over the last few years including a signalized intersection, an r-cut, a green T, and now possibly a signalized green T. He said none of them were bad ideas, but it all is relative to the traffic volume and what they think will be most effective. He said they have to be open-minded to find the best solution to the traffic problems. He said he appreciates that this is looking at the whole corridor and that with the feedback and the competition between human scale, the current resident, and the through traffic is something they need to continue to work on to address. He said he understands more now but expressed his interest to discuss the two proposed roundabouts with County staff before the next time this was before the Board since he still had questions but did not think they would be ones he could get answers for at that time.

Mr. Gallaway summarized his understanding of the process, saying that now that Line + Grade had received feedback from the Board and the public that they would be going back to work on Phase II as well as another presentation for the next iteration of Phase I. He asked if this understanding was correct.

Mr. Walker said that he wanted to ensure the project team had everything they needed from this discussion to be able to move forward. He said he thought that the discussion about the roundabout with respect to Dunlora and the John Warner Parkway was critical to the timing. He said that the team would have to comment on what else would be needed. He said they have a general sense of preference for how to move the roundabout closer to where the VDOT proposal is. He stated that he heard some general acknowledgement from the Board and from Mr. Hyer on behalf of the project management team about those other conflict points such as Belvedere and where Hillsdale intersects with Rio. He said he wanted to make sure that Mr. Hyer and the project team have what they need from the conversation. He said what he was hearing from Board members was to scrap the project and start over. He said he also heard some general support and some encouragement that the project was heading in the right direction. He asked if Mr. Hyer or Board members had anything to add.

Mr. Hyer responded that with the specific section of Hillsdale towards Rio, many of their assumptions had been relatively close to what the Board wanted and they were headed down the right path. He said that they had acknowledged that they needed to do some refining and that lots of good things had been said during the meeting today. He said that he feels bad that the plan has become dualistic between one option or the other at the John Warner Parkway, because the attempt of the work was never to establish one option as bad and one as good. He asked if it was worth refining the idea that they already had, or if it was preferable to stick with the VDOT option. He said that if the VDOT option were preferable, the team did not have to do much more work and could just use the VDOT plan. He said that to be respectful of time and resources, it would be beneficial to know that. He said there was no right or wrong answer, but he did not want to refine a plan that was not valuable anyway.

Mr. Gallaway stated that it seemed that everyone was in consensus that the current location is not where they wanted it. He said that whether it was adjusted or moved, there was some value and benefit to what had been presented, but the current location was not agreeable.

Ms. Mallek said she would prefer refining the VDOT location. She asked if there was someone on staff who could give a round figure for the right of way that would be required to take all the businesses and buildings and extend Hillsdale through Fashion Square. She said that if there were a certain number associated with that project, the Board needed to know right away because it would change the viability of that alternative. She said she had no idea what the answer was. She said she was not expecting an answer that day but that it was important to consider.

Ms. Price said that this particular intersection is a very significant and expensive project. She said that she would like to look at what had been proposed, along with some modifications, because they want to do it correctly the first time and not rely on a previous decision that could be improved upon. She stated that she supported continuing to explore this. She said that her thoughts would be moving the roundabout slightly to the southeast, but what was presented looked like it could be a very good alternative.

Ms. McKeel informed Mr. Gallaway that Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley had left the meeting and that she would have to leave soon as well.

Mr. Walker stated that Ms. Palmer had also left the meeting.

Ms. McKeel stated that she agreed with Ms. Price in looking at modifying the plan, but it was a major piece of transportation in that area, and it was imperative that the Board get it right. She said she did not want to go back to the previous plan that they had in the past. She said that while she appreciated Ms. Mallek's comments about money, she was more concerned with what to do and how to do something correctly and figure out how to pay for it after that. She said this was because when items, processes, and projects were shortcut, it invariably causes problems. She stated that if it was worth doing, it was worth doing correctly, and there was only one chance to get the project right.

Mr. Gallaway stated that if they had voted on and moved forward with the VDOT project funded

by the state, that was the project that should be completed. He said there were things presented in this study that could help make it a reality, but he was not interested in delaying a state-funded project that is already available. He said that there were elements beyond what had been presented visually that did not make it an easy reality. He said that perhaps that was a conversation that he needed to have with staff in meetings before the project would come back before the Board. He said that it was not only about moving the roundabout or the Smart Scale funding; there were other elements that would lead to a cascade of issues that would not be conceived in a corridor study, and perhaps that should be considered for the next iteration of the process. He said he believed they could learn things from the study and apply that to the current item that the Board had voted on and move forward to help improve it. He said it sounded as though it was a split decision.

Mr. Hyer said that was fine with him and said they could build two roundabouts.

Mr. Walker stated that he believed the expectation was that if further conversation were necessary, they would come back before the Board in December, recognizing that that was the time that would be optimal to give direction so that they would not hold up VDOT and their work as they moved forward with their project as it was currently contemplated.

Mr. Benish said that the project team's next steps would be to take the input that had been received from all groups, including the Board of Supervisors, and work through the potential changes. He stated that they would have to look at what the next public process is and make sure that the public had the ability to see what the next iterations were. He said they would have to get that plan together, but accommodations had been made for a meeting with the Board for as early as December. He said that whether they could make that date needed to be reassessed, but the team had made time for that and hoped to return to the Board as soon as they had done adequate work on the project.

Mr. Gallaway thanked Mr. Hyer for his presentation and thanked all who are involved in the project, stating that this conversation would continue after the team took the Board's feedback and made adjustments.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn to October 14, 2021, 11:00 a.m. electronic meeting pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(16).

At 6:26 p.m., Mr. Gallaway stated that the Board would adjourn to October 14, 2021 at 11:00 a.m., 1500 State Farm Blvd, Charlottesville, VA 22909 for an economic development announcement.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date 07/19/2023
Initials CKB