

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on July 1, 2014, at 12:00 p.m., Piedmont Virginia Community College, College Drive, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from June 16, 2014.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Ms. Jane D. Dittmar, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer and Mr. Brad L. Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Thomas C. Foley, County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Jordan, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

CHARLOTTESVILLE CITY COUNCIL PRESENT: Mr. Bob Fenwick; Mr. Satyendra Huja, Ms. Kathy Galvin, Ms. Dede Smith and Ms. Kristin Szakos.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: City Manager, Maurice Jones, City Attorney, Craig Brown and Clerk, Paige Rice

The meeting was called to order at 12:39 p.m., by Chair, Ms. Dittmar, and Mayor Huja.

The following agenda was used as the basis for the meeting:

1. Welcome and Goals for the Day – Russ Linden
2. Introductions
3. Ground Rules
4. Current Areas of Collaboration
5. Factors that Contributed to Positive Collaboration
6. Issue Areas for Additional Collaboration
 - A. Affordable Housing
 - B. CATEC
 - C. Courts Project
 - D. Economic Development
 - E. Public Safety (Law Enforcement; Fire and EMS)
 - F. Rivanna River Planning
 - G. Solid Waste
 - H. Transportation/Transit
7. Immediate Focus Areas
8. Wrap up. What did we accomplish? Next Steps?

Mr. Huja opened the meeting by stating that the City and the County are one community, and everyone needs to work together as a team. He said his hope for the meeting was to mend some relationships, discuss solid waste issues, and appoint some committees to work on addressing those issues.

Ms. Dittmar thanked Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) for hosting the meeting and reviewed the schedule for the meeting. She welcomed attendees and introduced the meeting facilitator, Russ Linden. She said Mr. Linden has been a professor at the University of Virginia (UVA) and directed the Center for Public Service there, and is currently an adjunct at UVA and the Federal Executive Institute. She stated that his interests in consulting include collaborating across organizational boundaries, managing the human side of change, and strategic planning. Ms. Dittmar said Mr. Linden had consulted with over four dozen state and local agencies, including Lynchburg, Prince William County, Charlottesville, Fairfax County, the towns of Herndon, Leesburg and Blacksburg; Stafford County, Staunton, Roanoke City and County, Loudoun, Montgomery, James City, Norfolk and Virginia Beach. She stated that Mr. Linden was volunteering his time for the meeting today.

Mr. Linden addressed the Board and Council and stated that this type of meeting often takes place after there is a big problem, or in the middle of a big problem, but the way this group is proactively approaching it is preferred. He emphasized the importance of teamwork and serving the entire community, not just the constituents of the district officials represent. Mr. Linden said he had spoken with Ms. Dittmar about areas for the City and County which might need more collaboration, and provided some general ground rules for discussion. He stated that public service is not just about being nice, it is about being smart, and asked participants if they had any ground rules or norms they would like to add at the outset to help them achieve their goals.

Ms. Szakos commented that the vent near her was loud, and asked that all participants speak clearly and enunciate.

Ms. Dittmar said they all have different experiences and come to opinions based on those, and asked Board and Council members to provide examples of what led them to their opinions.

Mr. Linden said the agenda includes an inventory of current areas of collaboration, and the purpose of looking at that is not to revisit and relitigate past disagreements, but to determine how they can build on what they are already doing, learn from past collaborations and what is making them work.

Mr. Tom Foley stated that when the Board began talking about a joint meeting, staff provided some background on things the County was already doing in partnership with the City. He stated that there have already been discussions in the past about consolidation, which sometimes creates controversy, but the County and the City already cooperate in many different ways – both formal and informal. Mr. Foley explained that joint exercise of power agreements are a more formal way of collaboration, such as with the Emergency Communications Center (ECC) system; regional authorities such as the library and jail systems are also examples of formal cooperation; the SPCA has a cooperative City/County funding agreement; the recently renegotiated City/County fire services agreement; mutual aid and cooperative agreements such as the Jefferson Area Drug Enforcement (JADE) regional narcotics task force; and joint property ownership such as Darden Towe Park and the Lewis & Clark Exploratory Center. He stated that there are also cooperative regional school initiatives including Charlottesville/Albemarle Technical Education Center (CATEC). Mr. Foley noted that staff created another list of less known partnerships, such as the joint budget review team, the Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development, and the new YMCA building at McIntire Park. He said it is a long list, and there are several items which are important for them to move forward on. Mr. Foley said he and Mr. Linden gave some thought on why some of these initiatives have been successful.

Mr. Maurice Jones addressed the Board and Council and said that one of the things he and Mr. Foley identified was the need to better communicate to the public all of the successful partnerships that are in place. He said they explored the conditions for collaboration, i.e. what has worked in the past and what could be done in the future. Mr. Jones said there are always financial considerations, with the measure being whether they are delivering effective and efficient services to residents. He said both bodies have a fiduciary responsibility to represent residents well and to make sure the services offered are being done so in an efficient way. He stated that, in a joint meeting with Delegate Toscano several years earlier, it was agreed that if they are looking for opportunities to work together, they need to establish whether those collaborations will help save money and also determine whether there are opportunities to provide better service than what is being offered currently. He stated that the goal of protecting natural resources really drove the Board and Council together many years ago with the establishment of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority and the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority so recognizing that need will continue to drive them toward collaboration. Mr. Jones said many times state and federal mandates will force them to come to the table and work together, and regular interaction between the two elected bodies will be vitally important. He stated that, over the four years he has been City Manager, City Council and the Board have met just four times, three around water issues, and once at the request of Delegate Toscano. He suggested the two entities consider increased frequency of joint meetings, and hoped that commitment will come out of this meeting. Mr. Jones said there must be some willingness to compromise and, with each existing partnership, there were things the City and County had to give up. He stated that the best decisions are made when the local bodies and their staffs are thinking long-term, not for short-term gain and through the lens of day to day activities. He said they must be open-minded, listen to each other, embrace different viewpoints, and also be bold in their efforts. Mr. Jones asked them to also consider times that they have not worked well together, not to refight old issues but to figure out how to move forward.

Ms. Dittmar agreed that it is important to focus on the financial feasibility, both for local government and for the citizens.

Ms. Palmer commented that there are situations where it would save staff time if the Council and Board communicated better and more often on the smaller projects.

Mr. Linden cited an example of a meeting wherein members of the Governor's staff had actually never met each other and noted that, in Louisiana, some of the state cabinet members are elected.

Ms. Galvin said conditions for good collaboration are applicable not only to elected officials, but also to staff, because elected officials come and go. She stated that a culture of collaboration between staffs is just as important for the long-term health of the community.

Mr. Fenwick said it is easy to say that they can communicate what they are doing, but the timely delivery of services is equally important. He explained that, if staff had been communicating more efficiently regarding the zoning issues related to McIntire Road and the County Office Building, it would have gone a lot smoother. He emphasized that phone calls between the two staffs should become a habit.

Ms. Palmer said City Council probably feels the same way as the County does about its staff – they are very professional, the Board respects their judgment, and they are working very hard – but, at the same time, it is important for the Council and the Board to see explicitly what the other side's concerns are. She noted that the recent communication between them was very valuable and helpful to her.

Ms. Szakos said, with any kind of collaboration, it is important to ask rather than drawing conclusions about why things are being done the way they are.

Mr. Linden stated that one of the most natural human characteristics is to assume, and sometimes that can be very efficient, but sometimes not.

Ms. McKeel emphasized that they are one community and many citizens do not even realize where the lines are that separate the County and the City. She said working together as often as possible benefits the way the community feels about the work elected officials are trying to do, and it also makes the work easier.

Mr. Linden asked elected officials to do a short information exchange exercise with the following prompts: where they grew up, something about their family that made them proud, and something about them that most people do not know.

The group reconvened, and Mr. Linden asked them to reveal something they learned in the exercise.

Ms. Palmer said she learned that Ms. Galvin had almost become an Irish folk singer instead of an architect.

Ms. Galvin stated that Ms. Palmer has a passion for amphibians, and Ms. McKeel had been a caterer.

Ms. McKeel said Ms. Galvin was from Brockton, Massachusetts, a town that provided shoes for much of the Union Army.

Mr. Fenwick said he learned that Ms. Dittmar was born in a car, and Mr. Huja was born in a place without borders which is an area that is now in Pakistan.

Ms. Dittmar said she learned that Mr. Fenwick writes children's book and adventure novels, and Mr. Huja writes poetry; both are published.

Mr. Huja stated that Ms. Dittmar's father was a science advisor to several Presidents. He said Mr. Fenwick was born in St. Louis, and he grew up in a traditional Irish household.

Ms. Mallek said she learned that Mr. Boyd had grown up in Washington, D.C. and moved to the Carolinas, and was an early information technology wizard.

Ms. Szakos said Ms. Mallek was the descendant of a pirate and also Eric the Red.

Mr. Boyd said he had learned Ms. Szakos was born in New York but grew up in Mississippi, and had studied for the ministry.

Ms. Smith said Mr. Sheffield was born in Ohio and grew up in Virginia in a large family, and loves to tinker with his hands.

Mr. Sheffield said he learned Ms. Smith used to travel with someone who required an iron lung, and has adult children who both do art on the side as a hobby.

Mr. Linden stated that he had distributed information to them about the importance of trust in relationships, especially in development and implementation of policy. He emphasized that when policy disagreements happen, if they know each other, they can go back to that bond while exploring a resolution.

Mr. Linden said the next item on the agenda was the core of the meeting when the group will begin to talk about the eight identified issues, and to see where more collaboration might be required.

Mr. Jones said he and Mr. Foley would like to go through the eight items and get input from Board and Council members, to include specific suggestions on how to move forward.

The Board and Council moved onto discussion of specific collaborative items.

Mr. Boyd said, over the past several days, information has come into his office that there is a major development scheduled to start along the Rivanna River on Route 20, and this might be an ideal time to consider what they will do with planning there so they can take advantage of that site. He said, as a first step, it would help for the City to realize what kind of development would be put there.

Ms. Mallek said this is the project on the west side of Route 20, right on Rt. 250, and the building closest to the river would be focused to the river which is the first building that has taken this approach.

Mr. Boyd said the City and the County have both worked on the trail system, so that is a good start but, if they are going to do some kind of urban development there, it might be an ideal time to consider how they might collaborate with the developer.

Ms. Szakos agreed, and said that it is important for them to work together and communicate well so the development is harmonious.

Ms. Galvin said, when the County does its master plan updating on the border of the City that would be a good time to engage the City so the planning is coordinated.

They agreed that “watch the borders” and work together on them was a pertinent theme for their discussions.

Ms. Palmer said it is important for them to check in when they do master planning on the Southern Neighborhood, which would take place in July.

Ms. Dittmar asked about the process for checking in.

Board and Council members said that they did not really check in.

Mr. Boyd said the Planning Commission for both the City and the County should be involved.

Ms. Galvin said it was the goal of the Livable Communities Project, but it has not been operationalized.

Ms. McKeel said this gets back to the importance of having staff following it, in addition to Board and Council, and both need to be communicating well.

Mr. Huja stated that planning staff needed to communicate regarding the Rivanna River project.

Ms. Palmer said it is broader than just the Rivanna project. She also stated that they should consider having planning staff members attend community meetings such as the one for Woolen Mills, so they can hear feedback from County residents as to what they want for that area.

Ms. Galvin said the point she raises is that Woolen Mills is a small area plan in the City, and they have not figured out how to prioritize those plans.

Ms. Dittmar said some of that work had been done, because she had a conversation with Ann Rosensweig who developed some Entrance Corridor ideas and asked if they could just build on that.

Mr. Jones said there is some preliminary work being done on that, but nothing substantial as of yet. He said one of the issues they encounter is that some of the property is owned by private entities, so it presents a challenge in trying to plan for redevelopment. He stated that the City has tried to take advantage of opportunities along the river when they have had them, to acquire easements and property but, if private sector people are not coming along then, there is only so much they can do in terms of redevelopment.

Ms. Galvin said the City and the County just completed a \$1 million federally funded “Livable Communities” grant to help improve cooperation, and their planning commissions have met and there are shared goals in their Comprehensive Plans but there has been no movement yet to do actual active planning ahead of the development.

Ms. Mallek said part of the reason is that the County is behind with its comprehensive planning, which is currently underway.

Mr. Fenwick said this is perhaps one of those times when a long-term look might be beneficial, as someone who would not sell now might in the future. He stated that they have a number of committees working on the Rivanna River currently, and perhaps a first step would be to convene a representative from each entity so they get to know each other and then bring it to the Board and Council to make it a more formal arrangement. Mr. Fenwick noted that there are a number of cities around the country that have made the river a centerpiece of their downtown or on a contiguous border. He said they are all looking for revenue and, if this could be planned and managed properly, it could be very beneficial for the community.

Mr. Huja stated that it should be a joint committee with composition from both sides.

Ms. Smith said there are other partners to also be considered in this type of planning, such as Monticello which is within the plans for trails, the parks and recreation departments, etc.

Ms. Galvin said she wanted to make sure they did not get caught up in the weeds of establishing this committee, and it would be helpful to have staff coordinate it.

Ms. Palmer said it would probably be more effective to have the planning entities get together to see what they have, especially since they are in the process this summer of looking at the area plans. She said this particular area is important for bike and pedestrian corridors, so they need to include that as part of the discussion.

Ms. Mallek said, rather than do everything themselves, they could ask the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) to do some of this work.

Ms. Palmer commented that it would be important for her and Ms. Dittmar to stay in the loop because of the Southern Neighborhood area planning underway this summer.

Mr. Linden said the question seems to be how to get started, and how to pull the interested parties together.

Mr. Boyd stated that he recognized the importance of private property rights along the corridor, and perhaps just sharing data back and forth between staffs would be a good starting point. He said the Route 250 Corridor Study was also in process, and that group was coming up with several ideas including river crossings. He emphasized the importance of coordinating information, although there is no separate money to do anything.

Ms. Galvin said it is important to have coordination in the planning and the development, because development around the river would be the next phase after the plan.

Ms. Szakos said it makes sense to her to do overarching river planning in tandem, so they are not working at cross purposes, and she agreed with the importance of sharing details at the staff level.

Mr. Huja said there needs to be an overall plan.

Ms. Szakos said they need the big model as well as the everyday communications.

Ms. Dittmar asked if that should happen at the Planning Commissions' level.

Mr. Fenwick said the TJPDC director was present and listening, and it has already been suggested that they coordinate this.

Ms. Mallek said they have the land cover map that shows where the floodplains are, and her guess is that there is very little land available for development on the County side because of the floodplain. She added that the natural resource protection is the most important element, with recreational use as part of that. She said, at a minimum, there might be access points and, hopefully, people will turn toward the river as the focus for development.

Ms. Galvin commented that it seems TJPDC would play a facilitation role.

Mr. Fenwick said the elected officials could give TJPDC the charge right now to get it started and, if it looks like it is not going in the direction the two elected boards want it to go, it could be changed.

Ms. Mallek said that item could be put on an agenda for August.

Mr. Boyd said what is needed is a vision for what they want in that area, and that must be a starting point.

Ms. Galvin said that is an opportunity for the City and County to work on together.

Mr. Sheffield stated that once the Lewis & Clark Exploratory Center opens, there will be more recreational activities related to the river.

Ms. Smith said there are many destinations now which encourage use of the river.

Ms. Szakos said, during the Route 29 planning process, the idea of an express bus service from downtown up Route 29 to the County line was discussed and, while it did not get funded by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB), everyone around the table liked the idea and she would like to see those conversations continue.

Ms. Smith said, as the City is currently reassessing its street network and street sizes, they need to be talking with the County because the majority of those streets go into the County.

Ms. Galvin said that item came up in their bicycle/pedestrian planning meetings, and several County residents participated in that event and stated that they wanted to be integrated in what the City's bike/pedestrian plan is because there is currently a major disconnect.

Mr. Boyd said they should probably take a step back and talk about a Regional Transit Authority (RTA).

Mr. Sheffield said he felt it was the right time for it, as some of the dynamics and funding models were changing. He stated that they needed to identify the barriers they were facing such as financial dynamics, resources, territorial issues, etc.

Ms. Palmer asked if they were at a population level to make an authority feasible.

Mr. Sheffield said he felt they were approaching it, and said that the typical level for a transit authority was 200,000 with the Charlottesville/Albemarle metropolitan statistical area (MSA) at about 220,000 currently, including parts of Fluvanna and other commuter areas. He stated that it is based on travelship, and the feds have the power to draw a "bubble" around an area to incorporate other localities, but that would also mean the City would lose its federal money in favor of assigning it to the service district. Mr. Sheffield said the dynamics are changing, and the reason this model is approaching is because of growth spurts in certain areas like Crozet and Old Trail which shift travel demands. He added that the County's Neighborhood Model is currently focused on all kinds of transportation issues.

Ms. Szakos asked him to explain why federal transportation dollars would go away.

Mr. Sheffield said that is a federal policy when an area exceeds the 200,000 population.

Ms. Galvin said there is an assumption the City can sustain it themselves.

Ms. Mallek noted that there could be opportunities for park and ride, and there may be employees who do not mind working in the City with that option available to them.

Ms. Galvin said this brings up the need for shared planning and, if they can do park and ride and have a regional transit authority that can let people drive in, it saves the City a major congestion problem. She stated that she would like to tie it to economic development as well.

Mr. Huja asked how this might work financially.

Mr. Sheffield said there needs to be a larger discussion on the approach, and whether they want each locality to contribute to the RTA as they do now in a sense, or whether they want to pursue a more collective taxing authority.

Ms. Palmer commented that they do not know if they will lose funding because the feds do not yet know how the lines will be drawn.

Ms. Mallek stated that they are already at the 220,000 population level.

Ms. Galvin commented that there is time sensitivity to this issue.

Mr. Sheffield said he believed there was, and the reason he felt this was possibly coming was because of the development patterns in both the City and the County and the way jobs are developing in the region specifically up Route 29 North and the Hollymead area.

Board and Council members agreed they needed to get the University of Virginia (UVA) to the table for these discussions, as they are a major stakeholder in the transit discussion.

Mr. Sheffield said UVA has the most powerful sets of data available as well.

Ms. Mallek stated that it is important for the Board and Council to have agreement among themselves before they talk to UVA, as they would be more likely to get engaged at that point rather than helping work through problems.

Ms. McKeel said there seems to be a lot of interest around a Regional Transit Authority, and asked Mr. Sheffield what the first step should be.

Mr. Sheffield suggested forming a small working group to lay out an approach, i.e. who needs to be involved, what properties are involved, etc.

Ms. McKeel suggested having two Councilors and two Board members and, when they are ready, bring in UVA.

Mr. Sheffield said he is hesitant of that only because he did not want to exclude anyone from that discussion, and stated that a first step could be to review what had previously been done, and talk about what has changed since the 2008 Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) plan.

Mr. Fenwick stated that his only concern would be to not have UVA involved early on, and have the City and County come up with a big plan only to have the University say they wish they would have been included earlier.

Ms. McKeel commented that they do have the Planning and Coordination Council (PACC).

Ms. Galvin said that was a whole separate issue.

Ms. Dittmar said she liked Mr. Fenwick's idea of at least inviting staff from UVA.

Ms. Galvin stated that they somehow need to get in synch with the Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development (CVPED) to locate economic development in a way that benefits the Charlottesville/Albemarle region which is different than the TJPDC's region. She added that the transit shed needs to reach those areas because, right now, it stops just outside them.

Ms. McKeel said this was a good time to begin this effort, as the County is launching its economic development office this fiscal year.

Ms. Szakos stated that she would like to think in terms of the transit shed when they begin talking about joint planning.

Board and Council members expressed concerns about the reverse commute possibilities.

Ms. Galvin said they also need to discuss how to prepare and how to diversify the economy, with a focus on areas like the Strategic Investment Area. She said they want to expand to include well-paying jobs that may not require a college degree.

Ms. Dittmar said there are locations in the County for businesses, but they have deficits such as lack of access, and there is a lot of investment that needs to happen. She stated that jurisdictions around the Commonwealth are cooperating across the borders, so you can invest in one jurisdiction and share the tax benefit with both.

Mr. Huja stated that he had attended a meeting the previous day on regional job opportunities.

Ms. Galvin said they were already working together on a grant to do a farm-to-table approach for flash-freezing and local growing, but she wants to make sure they pay attention to the details in addition to having great, lofty goals. She emphasized that they must prepare the sites first to get the businesses to come.

Mr. Foley stated that they share target industries, so they need a joint strategy on how to attract and retain those.

Mr. Linden asked if there was any data available on businesses that chose not to locate here in an effort to find out why.

Ms. Szakos said CVPED had done exit interviews for unsuccessful location attempts, or for businesses that have been here and left.

Ms. Catlin stated that they did keep track of those decisional factors, and finding sites that are ready tops that list.

Mr. Linden said determining those factors would be helpful as they move forward.

Ms. Galvin said that is a keynote question they could get staff to evaluate, and it is been collected but not packaged and analyzed.

Mr. Boyd stated that the County recently had a McGuire Woods consultant who was helping a company relocate here, with internet and modern techniques, the County never knew they were looking. He said he felt they were losing a lot of smaller and start-up companies too, and that is part of the reason why they started an enhanced economic development effort.

Mr. Foley said they are still tracking in many ways on a regional level to determine what types of sites are being sought.

Board and Council members stated that their staffs should look at that together.

Mr. Foley said a group of county administrators in the Commonwealth have been talking about forming a regional economic development cooperative, and it is helpful to have this direction from the Board and Council.

Ms. Szakos said she had conversed with people from biotech company startups, and they were talking about smaller urban spaces for collaboration rather than big industrial park buildings and there is a modern idea of what an "industrial park" looks like.

Ms. McKeel commented that those types of businesses do not want to be out in the middle of nowhere.

Ms. Palmer said, in the Board's discussion of the new economic development director, it was clear that that person would be more focused on local economies and developing smaller businesses rather than going out and trying to attract clients for an industrial park. She said the County keeps the industrial zoned land that they have, and it is often that a landowner will come in and ask for that land to be rezoned for residential or mixed use.

Ms. Galvin stated that it cannot only be the "creative class" with all the start-up businesses, as they also need jobs for less educated employees to help address the poverty issue. She said, with Micro-Aire manufacturing on Airport Road, there are excellent paying manufacturing jobs but it is just outside of the transit route so City clients are not able to reach it even if they were trained. Ms. Galvin emphasized the importance of benefitting from each other's strong suit and tie it together with a good regional transportation network.

Note: The Board and Council recessed their meeting at 2:18 p.m., and reconvened at 2:33 p.m.

Ms. McKeel said CATEC has talked about ramping up their program, possibly moving to PVCC and, if they leave their current site, that opens up a building which is jointly owned by the County and the City. She stated that, in talking about economic development, that building may lend itself very nicely to that.

Ms. Smith asked if the building is owned by the schools or the County.

Ms. McKeel stated that both School Boards own it but, ultimately, it is the County and the City.

Mr. Davis clarified that it is titled in the name of the County and City School Boards.

Ms. McKeel said it is something they should consider for the future, as it is in a great location.

Mr. Linden reviewed the list of discussion priorities: CATEC, solid waste, public safety, courts and affordable housing.

Mr. Huja said, regarding the courts projects, the County was looking at the possibility of staying in the City versus building out in the County.

Ms. Mallek said her understanding was the City was going to be looking at ways they might be involved in helping the County stay downtown so the County was waiting to hear back on that.

Mr. Huja said he sent a letter saying the City could help with parking.

Ms. Mallek said they would need more detail about what that means.

Ms. Szakos said whatever happens with the courts affects both the City and the County, and she would like to figure out how to keep it downtown as the whole community benefits so they should start with that as a unified goal.

Ms. Dittmar said there are several moving parts involved, including a study done several years earlier that resulted in the joint purchase of property so they have the opportunity to do courts together if they so choose. She said one decision would be whether to combine efforts with General District as they have with Juvenile & Domestic Relations, and part of that would be the decision by the City as to whether to renovate or build new courts and, if not now, do they want a partner who would help defray those costs in the future. The second issue, she said, is if they do not use that land jointly and stay downtown, how they will resolve the parking issues. She said it is time now to dig deeper and see what is possible.

Ms. Smith asked if the County has identified a number of parking spaces that are needed for its long-term plans.

Ms. Mallek said the number they had calculated was 60-75 spaces which need to be available for court customers that are currently not available.

Mr. Huja stated that Bob Stroh had told him only twice in the history of downtown were both Market Street and Water Street garages full.

Ms. Galvin said her understanding was that a master plan had been done showing how growth could happen and, when the price tag of \$52 million was revealed, there was a sudden change of direction. She said, at that point, the citizens' steering committee was disbanded and a smaller group was formed, with a smaller intervention done at \$25 million. She emphasized that there was a bigger vision done somewhere.

Ms. Dittmar said the plan had included the Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court but that has already been done, and operating costs for the other courts could be combined with the joint clerks similar to that court system.

Mr. Boyd said he was not aware that they could legally combine the district courts and, if that is possible, they should pursue it further because that may change the dynamics. He said he would also like to know what the City is willing to put on the table for discussion, and how much they are willing to help with some of the costs, such as a combined court, settlement for the buildings, the parking, etc. Mr. Boyd emphasized that it is to the City's advantage to keep it downtown, but it is not to the County's advantage and they now have more cost information to consider.

Ms. Szakos said one of the ways that the City and the County come into conflict is thinking "we and they" and, to her, the downtown is the downtown for the area and when the courts are downtown, the City bears the burden of the parking, traffic and congestion. She said, while the City realizes economic benefit, it also pays for a lot of that for people who do not pay taxes in the City. She added that the courts do not pay taxes in the City, so that is land which is not taxable and saying that "it only benefits the City and costs the County" keeps them from working together on it.

Mr. Boyd said he would not disagree with that thought process, but he has been to these meetings and sessions before and the City keeps coming back to what the County is going to put on the table to accomplish this so he is turning it around to say both entities must put something forward in order to make it work.

Ms. Szakos said everyone must look at what would benefit the wider community, not just one locality over the other.

Mr. Huja said they must view the court personnel as "customers," and those personnel like being in a central location.

Ms. Mallek said the customers are the people who actually have to come to court and use it, some of whom are elderly and cannot easily walk the distance from either garage. She stated that,

despite what Bob Stroh said, there have been five times since January 1 that she has not been able to find a parking space.

Ms. Dittmar stated that there are many Albemarle County citizens who work in the Court Square district who have appealed to the Board to consider carefully keeping the courts in the historic area for numerous reasons including nostalgia, Jeffersonian tradition, history, etc. She said they need to move forward, not waste any more time, see what they can do about sharing courts and resolving the parking, and asked if Mr. Huja was suggesting forming a committee.

Mr. Huja said he would recommend two from the Board, two from Council, and staffs from both localities.

Mr. Fenwick suggested including people from the legal community.

Mr. Huja said that would come later.

Ms. Palmer stated that she agrees with Mayor Huja, and there should be two people from the Council, two from the Board, and staff members so they can nail down some of these issues.

Ms. Mallek said, at the County's meeting about a month ago, there were a list of questions that Mr. Foley was going to work with Mr. Jones on, and staff would need to discuss these things before they meet with the Board. She said, in one-on-one discussions, she has gotten the impression that Council members have not made a decision as to how to proceed, so staff does not have that direction.

Mr. Huja said Council would take care of that aspect.

Ms. Dittmar asked if they would want the committee to come back to each body with ideas.

Mr. Sheffield said the meetings could be open to the public, and representatives from the legal community would help inform it. He said it was important to have the users of the courts help inform the discussion.

Ms. Palmer said the two main issues which have been identified were: whether the City wanted to do any collaboration on the General District Court, and how it is going to do parking.

Mr. Sheffield said he did not want to have a discussion that was void of input from the stakeholders

Ms. Smith said the judicial community is where the "mutual interest" is, and her concern was that they have real information and numbers to deal with, as they have heard contradictory analyses of the comparative costs. She stated that they also need to eliminate assumptions, such as the City doing anything to keep the courts there because of the economic benefit and she has not seen an economic benefit analysis. Ms. Smith said what they have seen happen at Martha Jefferson Hospital is an entity that is gone from a tax-exempt hospital to a taxpaying, very viable business. She stated that the economic benefit may turn out to be true, but they should not take it for granted without the information.

Ms. Szakos said, even if they move the General District Court out, they will still have Circuit Court and Federal Court people driving in and out, so they would no longer be able to just walk. She said they have all talked about wanting walkable communities, and this is one they have had.

Ms. Palmer said she has never felt the City should pay the County to keep the courts there because of an economic advantage.

Ms. Galvin said she appreciated Madison Spencer's overview of where the spaces could be, and she would like to see where it needs to go and how.

Mr. Sheffield said the County is talking about spending at least \$40 million in building costs, and constituents are going to hold the County accountable for this decision which may involve a tax increase. He said the City is looking from the outside in but, at the end of the day, the residents will be looking at the Board for that accountability.

Ms. Palmer said they already have a two-penny increase on the tax rate over the next two years just to pay for the courts complex.

Ms. Dittmar said, depending on how things work out with the City, they may not have to do the tax increase if a partnership can be realized.

Board and Council members agreed.

Mr. Sheffield said that is exactly the kind of information they would want to share with constituents, demonstrating what they saved and what they gained in efficiency so that is a win/win for everybody.

Mr. Fenwick asked for clarification about the makeup of the committee.

Mr. Huja said it there would be eight people total: two Board members, two Council members, one judge, one bar association member, and one staff person from each locality.

Board and Council agreed that it would be open to the public.

Mr. Boyd said Ms. Smith's example of Martha Jefferson Hospital was excellent to use in comparison because the doctors originally did not want to move out to the new location at Pantops, but it is a great model to use in determining success.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the City was planning to evaluate the economic impact of the courts moving.

Ms. Galvin said that was something the committee could do.

Mr. Huja suggested they start with the data they already have.

Mr. Linden commended the Board and Council for discussing this item, as they are likely getting pressured about it which can quickly politicize it and make it harder to make a professional decision which is a win/win. He said some of them are carrying different facts and they need to be checked out, such as whether or not the parking lots are rarely full or frequently full. Mr. Linden said there are some assumptions that should be checked out, such as what is in it for each side, and moving forward with those instead of believing assumptions will lead to progress. He confirmed the composition of the committee as discussed.

Ms. Szakos said she would also like to include someone from the public defender's office.

Ms. Palmer said she wanted to briefly discuss recycling and felt that there was potential to save the City money in the long run. She said the County established a recycling committee comprised of industry professionals, Teri Kent of Better World Betty, Ms. Mallek's husband, and someone from UVA Facilities Management responsible for its recycling. She said she has been told by the consultant that did the 2007 study for the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) that if they had the volume from the City, the County and UVA, they would have enough volume to pay for a first-class recycling facility that would pay for itself. Ms. Palmer said she and Ms. McKeel are the representatives on the TJPDC, and she has also been attending the Mayors & Chairs meetings. She noted that TJPDC Executive Director, Chip Boyles, is very interested in helping with something regional on that end. Ms. Palmer said they recognize that the County has a lot to do to catch up to the City, but they are working hard on that, they have a timeframe for early next year and are trying to incorporate it into the CIP for FY16. She said they also consider this to be a jobs issue, because it can create jobs. She stated that they are still under the gun to deal with the Ivy facility, and are trying to not get the committee bogged down in that although the decisions would inform each other. Ms. Palmer said they are also looking at solid waste with their Comp Plan discussions in August, so they should have policy decisions at that point. She said she would like the City to consider having someone from its Public Works Department help in some way for information-sharing purposes, and stated that the long-term goal is to combine the volume of recyclables to increase the diversion rate which will lower the cost of trash in general.

Mr. Huja asked if they were interested in having a staff member participate.

Ms. Palmer said they would like to include someone who knows about the City's recycling program, and she could get the meeting times and the committee's charge to them in the event they will participate. She stated that they are trying to be aggressive with their planning, and hope to get a 50-year solid waste management plan out of this.

Ms. Szakos stated that she traveled to Seattle, Washington last year for a National League of Cities meeting, and one of the mobile workshops was to visit the materials utilization facility and the jobs it provides are low-skilled, but are quite well-paying. She said it is an industry that could support itself locally, but not just with the City's recycling, and the more stuff one has to sell the better a market you can sell it to and at a better price.

Ms. Palmer said they are looking at the recycling at this point as a collaboration with the City and UVA and, while the committee is in its infancy, they are moving ahead quickly and enthusiastically.

Mr. Boyd said he appreciates what they are doing, but the County has been down this road before and they need to make a decision with or without the City on board.

Ms. Palmer mentioned that the Director of Facilities Management for UVA said she wanted to be on the committee herself but had a conflict with the time but would send someone in her place, a staff member who oversees their entire recycling effort.

Mr. Boyd said sitting down and talking about it is one thing, but committing to a collaborative effort is another matter. He said those decisions need to be concentrated on first, before much planning is done. He emphasized that this is like the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority all over again, which the City backed out of.

Ms. Palmer said they do not know where the structure will go in the future, but they need a long-term solid waste management plan and need to figure out how to make it work.

Mr. Boyd said it seems the City is already on its own path, and the big question is whether they would think differently about that now.

Ms. Smith said this speaks to what they talked about at the beginning of the meeting which is would a joint effort save them money.

Ms. Galvin said the RSWA was originally intended to do that, but it did not meet expectations at the time and this is another cycle.

Mr. Boyd stated that he is all for revisiting it, but there are some basic questions that need to be answered before they go too far down the path.

Ms. Palmer said they have an imminent decision, but they also need to have a long-term plan.

Ms. Szakos said some of the past history may show that the idea of collaborating on trash may not be very useful because they did not have common goals and needs from that process, but shared recycling seems to be beneficial to both of them.

Mr. Boyd said, in the context of solid waste, you cannot separate the two.

Council members indicated that there are different contracts.

Ms. Palmer said one can actually separate the recycling from the trash.

Ms. Smith indicated that the City just switched to a different model, which is different from what they have used in the past.

Mr. Linden asked if, at the macro level, there was a win/win possibility for the recycling part of solid waste.

Board and Council members agreed that it was worth exploring.

Mr. Sheffield said it was especially worth it in the urban area of the County, where they have the residential capacity.

Mr. Linden asked them if they wanted to proceed with the public safety or affordable housing discussion.

Ms. Szakos said the City and County had just finished the fire services agreement and, at this point, the groups may not need to spend a lot of time on it.

Ms. Galvin said there has been major collaboration with the respective police departments regarding the gang awareness task force research.

Ms. McKeel said the training facility was also a great model for collaboration.

Mr. Linden said this region is seen as a model in the state for collaborative policing, adding that the jail, the 9-1-1 system, etc. are great examples.

Ms. Galvin stated that the City and the County record its data in very different ways, and the County's way of assessing affordable housing deals with numbers of units and sources of funding, whereas the City has a lot of programs and services to reduce costs. She suggested they start collecting information in the same way so they can see where there might be gaps in service delivery and gaps in geography where there is no housing.

Ms. Mallek said there are different parameters altogether in the way they deal with the federal government, as well as types of houses, so it is a completely different model of operation that can only be unified to a point. She said the property tax waiver also exists on the County side, even though it was not noted in the report.

Mr. Huja stated that he would like the Housing Choice Vouchers to be administered centrally, rather than having the County, the City and the Piedmont Housing Authority (PHA) all do them.

Ms. Mallek said PHA shares their information with the County.

Mr. Foley said this was something that could be evaluated.

Ms. Smith said what struck her in looking at the information was the heavy County investment in the Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP), which the City also does for its housing rehabilitation. She said where the boundaries cross is with Habitat for Humanity, as the City gives a lot of money to build houses in the City, but they often go to families in the County. Ms. Smith said it did not appear that the County provides funding to Habitat for Humanity.

Ms. Mallek said the County does fund Habitat, but she was not sure by how much.

Ms. Smith asked if there was interest in joining efforts for Habitat because there is such a crossover.

Ms. McKeel said she would like to better understand how the International Rescue Committee (IRC) population affects affordable housing, and how the waiting lists work.

Ms. Szakos stated that about 80% of the people who come through IRC are placed in the City but, after that, they move and those at the lower socio-economic levels tend to move more often. She emphasized that they usually do not go into public housing; they go into apartments and other low-cost housing.

Board and Council members agreed that they put stress on the schools.

Ms. Mallek said the IRC follows them for a limited amount of time, so they do not really know what happens for the long term.

Ms. Galvin said it raises an issue that they do not have good demographic data on their own public housing sites, and that has been the perception of some of the residents of public housing.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would like to see an Orange Dot report for the County, similar to the one that was done for the City.

Ms. Galvin said it would be great if they could jointly work on the "Growing Opportunity" report, which is also part of economic development.

Ms. Szakos said it got subsumed into the Chamber, and they might be able to encourage the Chamber to do a regional Orange Dot report.

Ms. Dittmar said she had spoken with Ridge Schuyler, who was very interested in the possibility that the County might want this but he wants to be able to show success in the City's effort before asking for money for an additional study.

Ms. McKeel asked what kind of time frame would that mean.

Mr. Huja said it would be another two years.

Ms. Galvin said she did not want to lose the consensus they have established here to work on enhancing economic mobility among low-income populations.

Ms. Smith said the important thing to remember with economic development is that their borders are very fluid.

Ms. McKeel stated that the schools would tell them that it would simplify their lives if they could keep the same students and families; it would make things much easier.

Ms. Smith said this sounds like consolidation.

Ms. Szakos said it might be helpful to keep the social work so that the staff levels stay the same on both the City and County sides.

Ms. Galvin said Family Support workers and economic mobility issues should be put on the list because those are shared challenges.

Ms. Smith said joint data should also be added.

Ms. Szakos stated that the Commission on Children and Families had developed a "Stepping Stones" report that was very helpful, especially to nonprofits who needed that data for grant proposals, and there is no longer a regional report. She said she would like to see that happen again.

Ms. Dittmar said the County School Board has purview over decision making for the schools, and asked if the School Boards would talk about the issues related to state funding.

Ms. Galvin stated that their purview is policy; the localities' purview is funding so, if there is anything done that would increase financial gain, then it is something the local elected bodies can participate in but it cannot get into the area of policy.

Ms. Szakos suggested issuing a statement from the Board and Council today, asking the School Boards to consider having a similar meeting.

Ms. McKeel stated that they used to meet together fairly routinely, which was a successful model, but that effort has dwindled over the years.

Mr. Linden said the list of initiatives they have come up with is ambitious; however, if they are willing to focus on two or three for this fiscal year, it will make better use of time and help the community understand where the priorities are. He emphasized that focusing on two or three major initiatives and collaborations this year does not preclude them from adding another one or two in FY16.

Ms. Szakos suggested pulling out the items that have committees looking at them, such as the recycling group effort, as it is in an exploratory phase. She said she would like to see the transit authority idea lifted up, as it is a bigger issue.

Mr. Huja said courts should be elevated also.

Ms. Dittmar said courts must be dealt with in the short term.

Mr. Linden suggested that each member use a mythical one hundred dollars, go around the room and write down how they would divide that funding up and also assign priority for each item.

Board and Council members assigned funding to their chosen priorities as posted.

Mr. Linden said ten members voted for the Courts Project with \$400 total, and that would definitely be on the agenda; Economic Development had five votes with \$105 total; Rivanna River planning had eight votes with \$145 total; Solid Waste had \$60 with four votes; Transportation had \$305 with 11 votes.

Ms. Palmer said she put money on transportation for bikes and Rivanna River planning, which was the same as shared borders for her so there was overlap.

Mr. Linden said the numbers are provided just for guidance.

Ms. Galvin asked if the Rivanna River planning could go under the topic related to shared borders planning.

Ms. Szakos said shared borders cover more than just that area and, at the staff level, she would like to see them focus on all of them.

Ms. Dittmar said there would be a master planning meeting held on July 24, 5:30 p.m. at Monticello High School to cover the Southern Neighborhood which would include 5th Street, Avon Street, Route 20 coming out of the City into the County, the Rivanna River, and Light Industrial properties in the area.

Ms. Catlin agreed to provide all information on the July 24th meeting to City Council Clerk, Paige Rice.

Ms. Galvin reported that there would be a meeting on August 5 related to the West Main improvements, and invited Board members to attend.

Mr. Huja suggested he and Ms. Dittmar, along with respective staffs, work on the three priority items.

Mr. Linden said, in speaking with Mr. Jones and Mr. Foley, it would be helpful in moving forward to know what the next steps are for each such as the clarity provided for composition of the courts committee.

Mr. Linden also asked for the next steps on the Transportation items.

Ms. Szakos suggested asking TJPDC and CAT staff members to tee up the conversation before getting started, and to ultimately look at a configuration of two board members/two council members and two staff would be helpful.

Mr. Boyd suggested revisiting the report from the last time this was studied.

Mr. Huja said Ms. Szakos, Mr. Sheffield and Chip Boyles as well as John Jones should also be part of these discussions.

Ms. Smith said it would be helpful to have a County representative involved in the bike/pedestrian master plan discussions also.

Mr. Linden said some things came out clearly and others need more work. He added that, with the Transportation item, they are at a pre-planning phase that would include Ms. Szakos, Mr. Sheffield, John Jones of CAT and Chip Boyles of TJPDC.

Ms. Galvin stated that there seemed to be a bias to public transportation as opposed to bike/ped, and, if they are going to do initial planning, they should involve Amanda Ponson.

Ms. Szakos asked if the County had a bike/pedestrian person.

Mr. Sheffield said David Benish would be the closest.

Mr. Linden said the last item to address was the Rivanna River planning item.

Mr. Huja said two members from each Planning Commission should be involved.

Mr. Fenwick asked if the TJPDC could reach out to all the river groups now.

Mr. Boyles said they have already begun meeting with some of the nonprofits as well as the governmental entities, and this would be an additional arm of that.

Ms. McKeel asked if there would be a staff person from the City for Ms. Palmer's recycling group, and it was confirmed that there would be.

Mr. Foley asked for clarification about the County's involvement with the bike and pedestrian master plan.

Ms. Smith explained that they would like to have that input in the master plan so the connectivity goes across the borders when working with bikeways, sidewalks, etc.

Ms. Palmer said they have some very specific sites they would like to connect into the southern portion of the County.

Ms. Smith said the City has hired a group to do this, so now is the time.

Ms. Mallek asked if the group would be using the data collected by the bike project the previous year where there were hundreds of bikers.

Council members assured her that it would be used, adding that Sarah Rose was part of that open house.

Mr. Linden asked Board and Council members to offer one item that was made clearer as a result of the meeting that day.

Ms. Palmer said she learned if Board and Council members continued to meet on a regular basis, they can actually get things done and have collaborations that work smoother and faster.

Ms. Mallek said she would like to meet quarterly.

Ms. Smith said the need to be collaborating and cooperating on these issues became clearer.

Ms. Galvin said it was refreshingly easy today, and she would like to move forward.

Mr. Fenwick said he would like to move forward smoother, faster, and with an eye to saving money.

Ms. McKeel said it was interesting to her how similar the issues and challenges are.

Ms. Szakos said she found it helpful in areas where they had made assumptions, to be able to hash those out and discuss them and, even in areas where there is not total agreement, they were able to discuss it rationally.

Ms. Dittmar said she was grateful for today's meeting and felt they can get much more accomplished working together.

Mr. Huja agreed that the process was very helpful, and felt that they should talk more often and take advantage of opportunities to cooperate.

Mr. Linden thanked them for being invested and involved, and for having him facilitate. He encouraged them to recognize the past, but not necessarily let it control the future.

With no further business to come forward, the meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 02/04/2015
Initials: EWJ