

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on August 6, 2014, at 9:00 a.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Ms. Jane D. Dittmar, Ms. Ann 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.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m., by the Chair, Ms. Dittmar.

Agenda Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.
Agenda Item No. 3. Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Mr. Sheffield said that he would like to discuss Item 8.7, the Photo-Safe camera issue. He suggested including it with the Route 29 Advisory Panel update or following approval of the consent agenda.

Ms. Palmer stated that the Principal from Yancey Elementary School has arrived, and he may want to provide an update on the project to the Board on Item 8.5.

Mr. Boyd said he also would like to pull Item 8.5 for further discussion.

Mr. Sheffield **moved** to adopt the agenda as amended. Ms. Palmer **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 5. Brief Announcements by Board Members.

Ms. Ms. McKeel reported that the Best Buy ramp project is in the works; it is a City project in conjunction with VDOT. There will be a meeting on August 7, 2014 at the Holiday Inn on Emmet Street from 5:30 p.m.-7:30 p.m. to talk about the sound wall proposed to go along that project. Ms. McKeel said that County citizens as well as Charlottesville residents are possibly affected along that right-of-way. Notices have been sent to all residents in that right-of-way.

She stated that on Friday, August 1, 2014, there was a Putt-Putt tournament held on the Rio Road course. At the evening reception, Mr. L.F. Wood was inducted into the 2014 Putters Association. She attended the banquet and read the following recognition on behalf of the County:

RECOGNITION

WHEREAS, Lloyd "L.F." Wood opened his Putt-Putt Golf Course franchise in 1959 along Hydraulic Road, and later relocated it to Rio Road; and

WHEREAS, for 45 years, generations of fathers, mothers and children have enjoyed wholesome family entertainment on his Putt-Putt Golf Course of America franchise at 1515 Putt-Putt Place; and

WHEREAS, Lloyd "L.F." Wood has hosted hundreds upon hundreds of Professional Putters Association and Amateur Putters Association putting competitions, including PPA/APA Virginia State Championships, PPA/APA Virginia Opens and the Annual Dogwood Open Classic, and thousands upon thousands of PPA and APA competitors from throughout the United States and foreign soil; and

WHEREAS, Lloyd "L.F." Wood has distinguished himself as a member of the Putt-Putt Golf Courses of America National Board of Directors, in addition to his honorable civic service to his hometown of Charlottesville, Virginia, as 1969 Outstanding Young Man of Charlottesville-Albemarle County; Past President of the Young Men's Business Club; Past President of the Piedmont Traffic Club; Associate Member of the Fraternal Order of Police; Charter Member of Albemarle Rotary Club; Dogwood Festival Committee member; Past President of Virginia Highway Safety Commission Advisory Board; Vice Chairman of Albemarle Police Foundation; Chairman of the Board Seminole Trail Fire Department;

Vice Chairman of Albemarle County Board of Zoning Appeals Precinct; Chief of Albemarle County Electoral Board; Member of the Board of Directors National Association of Counties representing Virginia; 2012 Volunteer of the Year for the Charlottesville/Albemarle Chamber of Commerce; Albemarle County Planning Commission; and member of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors from 1968 to 1975; and

WHEREAS, Lloyd "L.F." Wood has lived an exemplary life of promoting and perpetuating nothing less than good will for all citizens and residents in the County of Albemarle; and

WHEREAS, Lloyd "L.F." Wood is known throughout Albemarle County as "Mr. Putt-Putt" and is further being inducted on this date of August 1, 2014, as the 48th member of the PPA Hall of Fame; and

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Diantha H. McKeel, join with all Albemarle County Board of Supervisors in congratulating Lloyd "L.F." Wood on his induction into the PPA Hall of Fame.

Ms. Mallek reported that on Friday, August 1, 2014, Robert "Bubba" Baber passed away at age 44. She said that Mr. Baber was a fourth-generation Crozet volunteer fireman. His family was involved in the founding of the volunteer fire company in 1910 – and his 19-year-old son is currently a firefighter. Ms. Mallek stated that Mr. Baber accomplished more in his short life than many people did in 80 years, and was an inspiration to people who were considering becoming a volunteer. She added that he worked for his whole career at Barnes Lumber and could fix anything. Mr. Baber will be missed.

Mr. Boyd announced that former Supervisor Bill Roudabush also passed away on Friday, August 1, 2014. Mr. Boyd stated that Mr. Roudabush attended Clarke Elementary School and graduated from Lane High School in 1946. He said that after serving in the US Army on a tour of duty in Japan, Mr. Roudabush enrolled at UVA and graduated in 1954 with a degree in civil engineering. Mr. Boyd said that Mr. Roudabush was a past member of the Albemarle County Electoral Board, the County Board of Zoning Appeals, County Planning Commission, and served on the Board of Supervisors from 1976 to 1980. Mr. Roudabush also served as the Culpeper District member of the Commonwealth Transportation Board from 1994 to 1998. He said that Mr. Roudabush was a charter member of the Monticello Chapter of the Virginia Association of Surveyors and a past member of Charlottesville Masonic Lodge #55, past president of the Piedmont Shrine Club, exalted ruler and trustee of Elks Lodge 389, and member of the Fraternal Order of Police and Veterans of Foreign Wars. Mr. Roudabush was well known and a great servant to this community.

Ms. Dittmar reported that on September 13, 2014 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., the Town of Scottsville will host its annual Community Day, which will also recognize the founding of Albemarle County.

Ms. Dittmar said that on the first weekend in October, the James River Boys & Girls Club will hold its first blue-ribbon cutting, and will host several officials including Senator Tim Kaine.

Agenda Item No. 6. Recognitions.

Item No. 6a. Nora Gillespie, former director, Small Business Development Center (SBDC).

Ms. Mallek said it is her honor to recognize Ms. Nora Gillespie. She first met Ms. Gillespie in 2008 when she joined the Piedmont Workforce Network Board. Nora Gillespie has served as Executive Director of the Central Virginia Small Business Development Center (SBDC) for the past 11 years. She has provided exemplary service to the community's entrepreneurs, with a track record of having counseled 1,174 clients and her clients reporting \$24.5 million in capital formation. Ms. Gillespie's partnership has been incredibly important in building the community's thriving small business base, providing broad expertise to support entrepreneurs across a wide spectrum of business areas. When Ms. Gillespie joined the network in 2003, the State Division of SBDC asked her to do two "simple" things: 1. provide SBDC services to businesses in the Central Virginia region, and 2. identify an organization to host the SBDC. Ms. Gillespie not only quickly became the go-to resource for small businesses, rebuilding the SBDC reputation; and more importantly, she led the formation of the a one-stop entrepreneurial resource operation that combined the resources of the SBDC with the Workforce Center, and hosted by the Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development. This one-stop model for workforce, entrepreneurship assistance and economic development resources is only emulated in two (2) other communities in Virginia.

Ms. Gillespie not only does a great job with her clients in the Charlottesville area, she goes above and beyond to support statewide small business development initiatives – for example, she helped brainstorm a new program called the Innovation and Commercialization Assistance Program for Virginia small businesses. According to SBDC Network Director, Jody Keenan, Ms. Gillespie's work culminated this year in a database just under 33,000 second-stage companies being delivered to the SBDC local offices. Ms. Mallek thanked Ms. Gillespie for her long career.

Ms. Gillespie addressed the Board and stated that the recognition is important and meaningful to her. She acknowledged the efforts and support the County has given the center over the last 11 years, especially that given to agribusinesses in the rural area. She stated that she has enjoyed working closely with Susan Stimart and Lee Catlin.

Item No. 6b. Digital Government Award.

Ms. Dittmar said that for the twelfth year in a row, Albemarle County has been named among the top ten most technologically advanced, cutting edge county governments of its size in the U.S. by the Center for Digital Government (CDG) and the National Association of Counties (NACo) in their 2014 Digital Counties Survey. Albemarle County ranked second in the nation in utilizing information technology to deliver high quality service to its customers and citizens based on a population category of 150,000 or less; the highest ranking ever received by Albemarle. This accomplishment drew the attention of Governor Terry McAuliffe, who issued a press release congratulating the nine Virginia counties that received top rankings in the 2014 Digital Counties Survey, including Albemarle County: "These counties were recognized from among hundreds of counties that participated in the survey for successfully using technology for citizen engagement, policy, data and operations," said Governor McAuliffe. "Technology presents significant opportunities for producing more efficient and effective services to citizens. It strengthens the Commonwealth and improves our prospects for economic development. I commend these local governments for their use of technology and congratulate them on this well-deserved recognition." In addition Senator Mark Warner sent a letter extending his congratulations to the County. He stated that this honor recognizes that the County's commitment has made a lasting impact on the community.

Ms. Dittmar said that on behalf of the Board of Supervisors she would like to thank County employees for their continued dedication to innovation and accessibility and to specifically recognize those staff present from the IT Department and the website and social media team for their efforts in helping Albemarle County achieve this very distinguished recognition: IT Director Mike Culp, and staff Brian Betts, David Burnette, Gus Cullen and Elaine Pack; from the County Executive's office, Lee Catlin and Jody Lewis; County Attorney's office, Marsh Davis; Office of Management and Budget, Lindsay Harris and Matt Regis; Board of Supervisor's office, Ella Jordan and Travis Morris; Finance Department, Roccio Lamb; Community Development, Frances MacCall, J.T. Newberry and Damon Petit; and Parks and Recreation, Amy Smith.

Item No. 6c. Proclamation recognizing *August 26, 2014 as Women's Equality Day*.

Ms. McKeel asked Kobby Hoffman and Charlotte Gibson of the Charlottesville Chapter of the National Organization of Women to come forward. She then read the following proclamation recognizing August 26, 2014 as Women's Equality Day.

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, this is the **94th Anniversary** of the Nineteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution giving women the right to vote in 1920; and

WHEREAS, in 1848, 166 years ago in Seneca Falls, the need was recognized and proclaimed, but after great effort there is still more work to be done to ensure reliable protection in the U.S. Constitution for women against sex discrimination in general; and

WHEREAS, in many other ways the tasks of providing equal opportunities to women and men, and the tasks of removing burdens which fall unjustly on women as compared with men remain uncompleted.,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, does hereby proclaim

August 26, 2014, as WOMEN'S EQUALITY DAY

in remembrance of all those women and men who have worked to develop a more equitable community, which acknowledges both the real similarities and the important differences between women and men, with liberty and justice for all; and

Signed and sealed this 6th day of August 2014.

Ms. Kobby Hoffman addressed the Board and thanked the Board for the recognition. She stated that women do not have true equality with men but have made a lot of progress over the last 94 years since women were granted the right to vote. She said that they will present several books to the library on August 26, 2014 from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Ms. McKeel then **moved** to adopt the Women's Equality Day proclamation of 2014. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 7. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Mr. Mario Sukkar, a resident of the Rivanna District, said that he is a 2013 graduate of Albemarle High School and is the first speaker representing the "Solar Schools Initiative," a student-led campaign supporting the installation of solar power at Albemarle County Schools in order to save the school system money, educate about renewable energy, and reduce pollution. Mr. Sukkar congratulated the County schools for the efforts already put into the sustainability goals, with some schools having green roofs, LEED-certified buildings, and wind turbines. He stated that they are not asking for a new initiative, but for support of the one already underway. They have presented their campaign to the School Board twice – with support from teachers, taxpayers, parents, students and community members. Different representatives from these groups will explain separate reasons to support the campaign. Mr. Sukkar explained that the schools' environmental compliance manager, Lindsay Snoddy, prepared the two plans that achieve the monetary, environmental and educational goals of their campaign.

He said that the first plan involves grants, which is how Henley Middle School installed solar. This is free money for free energy. Mr. Sukkar stated that the second plan uses the power purchase agreement model, whereby a solar company buys, installs, maintains and owns the panels – while the school buys the power off the panels for a set contract period, at or below the current market rate. He said that the Energy Information Administration predicts a 2% annual increase in electric rates for the Mid-Atlantic States from now on, so a locked-in rate would mean savings. Mr. Sukkar stated that it is important to note that neither plan requires money from the Board of Supervisors, and the initiative is still being presented to the Board to show that there is support for sustainability in the community.

Mr. John Cruickshank addressed the Board, stating that he is speaking on behalf of the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club, is a retired educator, and a parent of three former Albemarle County School students who attended from K-12. Mr. Cruickshank expressed the Sierra Club's support of the Solar Schools Initiative, stating that it would be good for the environment, a good financial investment, and good for student learning as demonstrated by the Henley installation. He said that it is also an opportunity to set an example for the community that it is important to look at cleaner ways to produce energy. Virginia has not been a leader in the development of renewable energy – lagging behind most other states in the southeast. Mr. Cruickshank stated that it is important to make the transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy, and he believes that it would happen over time. He emphasized that this would provide a cleaner environment as well as a healthier population, as they use more solar, wind and geothermal energy. He said that Albemarle County has been a leader in environmental policies such as the safer chemical product conversion, and in energy efficiency. He said that he hopes the Board will take this next step.

Mr. HeeSeok Joo addressed the Board, stating that he is a graduate of Burley Middle School and Albemarle High School. He said he was present to voice his support for installing solar power in schools. Mr. Joo said that he is currently a physics major at UVA and would speak about solar technology. He explained that a solar panel works by creating direct current from photo-volt effect where electrons are ejected from semiconducting material due to sunlight. The direct current is converted into alternative current through the inverter – which is the form of electricity people use every day. Mr. Joo said that the cost of solar panels is decreasing rapidly because of cutting edge research done around the world, and the increase in installations. According to the data provided by Solar Energy Industries Association, there are now over 13,000 megawatts of cumulative solar-electric capacity in the U.S. He stated that according to Time magazine, solar costs have decreased 80% over the last five years, with jobs in this industry in Albemarle with companies including Alt Energy, Secor Solar, and Secure Futures. Mr. Joo said that Virginia currently has approximately 2,000 jobs in solar industry, and in America there are now more jobs in solar than there are coal miners. He stated that the solar initiative not only saves energy and increases jobs, but educates students as to the future and the value of energy used every day. Mr. Joo said that the principles of solar energy can be understood with basic knowledge of physics and chemistry, and students are learning those subjects now – and having solar technology in schools provides energy right in front of their eyes, which will lead them to appreciate it. He thanked the Board for its leadership in sustainability.

Mr. Robert Walters addressed the Board, stating that he is a resident of Forest Lakes, Rivanna District, and is a member of the 350 Org and a proponent of the solar initiative. Mr. Walters said he last appeared before the Board on June 4, 2014 where he asked the Board to approve a resolution opposing fracking. He has not seen anything on his request, but hopes that it is in the works. Even on that date,

Virginia Power announced its plans to build a pipeline and everyone have heard about those affected in Nelson County.

Mr. Walters said that climate change is not a far off problem – it is happening now – and the consequences are very real, disrupting economies and costing even more in the future. He stated that some of the aspects of climate change include severe drought, severe storms, sea level rise, wildfires, cold, and more. Mr. Walters said that he reviewed the 2030 Aspirations plan, and lots of those initiatives would be impacted if they do not convert to clean energy sources. He stated that 9 of the 10 warmest years on record are in the 2000s, and the last month when the world average was less than normal was in February 1985 – which makes 353 months straight with greater than average temperatures. Mr. Walter said that climate change means they need to rethink normal, and the weather is going to be “very weird” from here on.

Ms. Lisa Glassco addressed the Board, stating that she is a resident of the Rio District and is before the Board to support sustainable measures for the school system and everyone in the County. She said that in the Book of Genesis, God promised that if people cared for earth it would provide them with everything we need. Ms. Glassco said that they are in a crossroads of creation care; they have lost some of the wisdom of their ancestors because they do not live close to the land. She said that they need more sustainable lifestyles and less selfishness, and they need to love each other and respect the world around them; they need to use power from the sun and wind, make food from plants, and keep the water clean – as it is what they have been made to do. Ms. Glassco said that adding solar panels to the energy production in Albemarle County Schools and homes is certainly a step in the right direction. She said that she hopes more such steps can be taken soon.

Ms. Elinor Glassco, of the Rio District, addressed the Board, stating that she is an 8th Grader at Burley Middle School and is a part of the Solar Schools Initiative, and has recruited her friends as well. Ms. Glassco said that she believes her generation should support solar power because it saves money, does not create pollution, and will make the world cleaner for future generations. She stated that the use of solar panels will prevent actions that are harmful to the environment, such as mountaintop removal and oil spills. Ms. Glassco presented a petition with 949 signatures, with 285 of them from her fellow students, and some of them are from the online version of the petition – with some from the paper copy. She said that she and her friends have taken a class at Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) in which they learned how to make solar-powered robots, and she liked making them because they learned how clean energy works. Ms. Glassco demonstrated her solar robot.

Dr. Charles Battig addressed the Board, presenting information that disputed global warming theories. He said that fracking technology has allowed the U.S. to become the largest petroleum producer – ahead of Saudi Arabia – without running out of oil. Dr. Battig said that CO₂ has been debunked as a factor in global climate, and fracking in the U.S. has cut CO₂ more than the entire world's wind and solar efforts put together. He stated that he hopes the lessons for students present today would include the fact that producing wind and solar was free, but getting them out is not free, and the pollution associated with production of solar plans takes place in China, and rebates for solar make other power rates go up.

In terms of the FY 2013-14 County budget, Virginia Organizing asked the County for \$13,500 until challenged by the public. The funding was eventually reduced to \$4,000 and finally given to the Health Department.

Mr. John Martin addressed the Board, stating that he is a resident of Free Union. He congratulated the County on the digital government award. He added that video living stream must be just around the corner. Mr. Martin stated that the solid waste service options staff report is outstanding, and he hopes the Board will adopt staff's recommendation to go with scenario #2 for Ivy – conversion to a convenience center to be operated by the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. He said that it is important for the Board to hold onto the concept of regionality, which the Authority represents, and try to get back to a regional approach to solid waste management. Mr. Martin stated that at Ivy there is currently a \$1 service fee charged to County residents, but the charge for City residents it is \$10 – and charging the same service fee would help promote regionality.

He added that he hopes that when Transportation Secretary Layne is present later at the meeting, several points be conveyed to him: the notion that Albemarle is capable of doing great things; there is a high level of public confidence that the Rio Road project will proceed and be completed successfully; and the public will be supportive of the business community during construction times, and they in turn will be supportive of the public.

Ms. Peggy Gilges, a resident of the Jack Jouett District, said that she serves on the long-range solid waste solutions committee. This afternoon the Board will be making a decision about the Ivy MUC center. Ms. Gilges said that while that is not a part of the committee's charge, as a County resident and

user of that center, she wants to encourage the Board to maintain the professional and reliable service that citizens are accustomed to. She stated that when you start to get “into the weeds” of solid waste management, with materials reuse and recycling, you realize that it is not as simple as it appears on the surface. Ms. Gilges said that Rivanna has an excellent track record of performance for the County, the experienced people and the expertise in the field to offer a remarkable range of services, and a commitment to do it well. She stated that RSWA also brings a high level of transparency and accountability, which is very important for responsible waste management, materials reuse and recycling. Ms. Gilges stated that the Ivy facility has earned a large base of support under their management, and for the near term RSWA is the best possible partner to operate the facility.

Mr. Jeff Werner, of the Piedmont Environmental Council, addressed the Board and stated that he recently read comments in the newspaper about improvements on Route 29 being “a pending disaster” because of what happened when the road was widened in the late 1990s, but the County’s economic data disputes that. He said that between 1993 and 2000, the County increased jobs by 33%, compared to Hanover at 27%, Henrico at 37%, James City County at 25% - and the entire state average at 19%. Mr. Werner said the report indicates that “Albemarle experienced steady net job growth from 1993 to 1997, and witnessed a jump in net job growth in 2000”. He stated that Albemarle County had the lowest unemployment during that period, and total nominal retail sales have been increasing. There is no sudden drop in retail sales. Mr. Werner said that the report states that “changes in per capita value of BPOL tax revenue gives a rough idea about the intensity of business activity in a community. The higher the value of BPOL revenue per resident, the higher the level of business activity that each resident supports”. He said that in Albemarle, this increased by roughly 60% from 1994 to 2001. Mr. Werner said that whenever construction is done, it can be difficult, but the community will support the businesses – and he hopes that the Board will rely on facts, not anecdotes, when assessing the impacts of the Route 29 construction.

Mr. Dave Redding, of Eco-Village Charlottesville, 480 East Rio Road, addressed the Board, stating that he resides in the Rio District. He is before the Board to support the Solar Schools Initiative. Mr. Redding said that people are acting very irresponsibly by not doing as much as possible to limit the amount of carbon put in the air, and many parents feel the same way, signing the petition to put solar in schools. He said that at this point, it will not cost any additional money to install panels to government buildings. Mr. Redding stated that the cost of electricity from Dominion Power is always going up, and for the next 20 years, to make arrangements with a solar company, where your rate will be fixed at current value has quite a payoff.

Ms. Jody Freeman addressed the Board, stating that she and her husband just moved into Albemarle County from the City, having done six years of environmental volunteer work around the world. Ms. Freeman said that since they have been in the area, they have been active in trying to impact changes in thinking for people to be proactive, to think about the future. She stated that she is a grandparent of two children. There is much information available about the benefits of renewable energy – with installation of solar panels being a great way to make the shift. Ms. Freeman said that she is a member of the Mid-Atlantic Transition Hub, and every time they get on a conference call, Virginia is lagging behind – so they need leadership to support efforts like the Solar Schools Initiative and other measures that need to be made.

Mr. Neil Williamson, President of the Free Enterprise Forum, a privately-funded public policy organization located in the County, said that later today the Board will hear from Secretary of Transportation Aubrey Layne regarding Richmond’s plans for Route 29. It is amazing how a couple of years makes a huge difference – with two ad-hoc committees in place several years ago to discuss how the contractor should move forward with the bypass. Mr. Williamson said that at the MPO meeting on July 23, former Supervisor Dennis Rooker said that the design-build contractor should be provided flexibility in implementation. He stated that Philip Shucet’s panel is a thoughtful group, but is not designed for any “action.” Mr. Williamson said that the panel has been creatively designed to talk a great deal, but accomplish little or nothing. He stated that Supervisor Sheffield has raised many concerns during the VDAP process, only to have his ideas back-burnered. He asked if the Board will press for answers with Secretary Layne. Mr. Williamson said that the community wants to know how many lanes of traffic will be maintained during the construction of the US 29/Rio interchange, how it will impact the level of service, how long construction will take, why Rio Road is prioritized first, and what if any traffic mitigation plan VDOT has during construction. These are real questions that he gets asked daily by businesses along Route 29.

Mr. Boyd said that he wants to make a comment on the difference between the early 1990s and the present with construction, with other locations having more options available to the residents of this community. The Rio Road construction will be a disruption to businesses.

Ms. Palmer stated that she is very appreciative of the Solar Schools Initiative and the speakers who came.

Ms. Palmer said that the County is starting a solid waste initiative and is trying to develop policies for reduce, reuse, recycle – and hopes the schools will join them. They appreciate the wonderful jobs the schools are already doing.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

Ms. Dittmar said that Items 8.5 and 8.7 were pulled for discussion.

Ms. Mallek said that she needed to pull the minutes assigned to her.

Ms. Dittmar said she has some brief comments on the Albemarle Broadband Task Force update.

With regard to Item 8.9, Mr. Boyd said that he thought they were going to start the CIP report with the conceptual figures approved by the Board when they first moved forward with it, and he does not see that. He stated that the item that was the catalyst for him was the Seminole Trail Fire Department building, which started at \$1.2 million and ballooned to over \$4 million, and he wants to know from staff if the conceptual dollar amount will be included in the future.

Mr. Sheffield stated that Mr. Boyd wants to essentially track the change from concept to where things currently stand. He added that sometimes costs go in the other direction – so the Board needs to know both.

Mr. Foley said that it is good for staff to identify the source of the initial number. For that particular project, the figure came from the volunteers first before any work had been done.

Ms. Mallek stated that it did come back to the Board at every stage, and perhaps a narrative introduction would be helpful for historical purposes.

With regard to Item 8.8, Mr. Boyd said that it might be helpful for the older information on proffers to be removed. He referred to proffers that the County has received and spent the money. It is becoming a very busy report with all that history. He asked for input from other Board members.

Ms. Mallek stated that she would support segregating it and pulling those figures out, but when they shorten it the Board ends up having questions.

Mr. Sheffield said that the report breaks out the “completed” status at the bottom.

Ms. Palmer said that as a new Board member, she likes having them included because it gives her a better idea of what proffers actually do for the County.

Mr. Foley said staff would leave the report as it currently is and then revisit in the future.

With regard to Item 8.10, Mr. Boyd stated that he does not understand the matching sources in the grants report, and asked if “grants leveraging fund” were referring to outside agencies, etc.

Ms. Palmer said she was also confused a little bit by some of the information.

Mr. Foley said that is what it means, but staff could work on clarifying that for the next round.

Ms. Mallek then **moved** to pull Items 8.5 and 8.7 for further discussion, to approve Items 8.1 (as amended), 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 and 8.6 on the Consent Agenda and to accept the remaining items as information. Ms. Palmer **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

Item No. 8.1. Approval of Minutes: August 14, August 21, October 2, October 9, December 4 and December 12, 2013; and March 27 and April 10, 2014.

Ms. Mallek pulled the minutes of August 14, August 21, October 2 and October 9 2013, and carried them forward to the next meeting.

Ms. Dittmar had read her minutes of December 4 and December 12, 2013, and March 27, 2014, and found them to be in order.

Ms. Palmer had read the minutes of April 10, 2014, and found them to be in order.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved the minutes as read.

Item No. 8.2. FY 2015 Budget Amendment and Appropriations.

The executive summary states that Virginia Code § 15.2-2507 provides that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget; provided, however, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The Code section applies to all County funds, i.e., General Fund, Capital Funds, E911, School Self-Sustaining, etc.

The total increase to the FY 15 budget due to the appropriation itemized below is \$1,717,200.49. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the amount of the cumulative appropriations does not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

This request involves the approval of sixteen (16) appropriations as follows:

- One (1) appropriation (#2015014) to re-appropriate \$6,097.00 to the Human Resources Department from General Fund fund balance for a summer intern;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015015) to appropriate \$18,650.00 from the Coalition Assisting Residents in Emergency Situations (CARES) Program Contingency to the Monticello Area Community Action Agency (MACAA). This appropriation will not increase the County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015016) to appropriate and re-appropriate a total of \$784,456.61 for the Emergency Communications Center;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015017) to appropriate \$10,000.00 from the Reserve for Contingencies for the use of the Yancey Elementary School building for community programs. This appropriation will not increase the total County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015018) to appropriate \$14,428.30 for the Virginia Public School Authority (VPSA) Refunding Credit. This appropriation will not increase the total County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015019) to re-appropriate \$109,526.39 for the County's Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Service Contribution;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015020) to appropriate \$706,442.00 in expenditures from the Volunteer Fire Rescue appropriation category to the Fire Rescue Department appropriation category. This appropriation will not increase the total County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015021) to appropriate \$32,951.00 from the Reserve for Contingencies to the Department of Fire Rescue for increased volunteer-related insurance costs. This appropriation will not increase the County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015022) to appropriate \$20,000.00 from the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) to the General Fund for Western Albemarle Rescue Squad's bay upgrade project. This appropriation will not increase the County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015023) to re-appropriate \$54,402.49 in funding for various Capital Improvement Program projects;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015024) to appropriate \$74,049.00 for Public Defenders salary supplements pursuant to the Board's direction on July 2, 2014. This appropriation will not increase the County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015025) to appropriate \$157,375.00 for the Carrsbrook Pipe Repair;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015026) to appropriate \$253,256.00 in funding associated with a Strategic Prevention Framework – State Incentive Grant (SPF-SIG) and the addition of the UVA pass-thru BASICS contract;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015027) to transfer \$17,500.00 from the Grants Leveraging Fund to the City of Charlottesville for the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs awarded study the County is co-sponsoring with the City. This appropriation will not increase the County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015028) to appropriate \$301,269.00 in funding for Offender Aid and Restoration grants; and
- One (1) appropriation (#2015029) to appropriate \$50,818.00 for the Department of Justice grant for the police department.

Staff recommends approval of appropriations #2015014, #2015015, #2015016, #2015017, #2015018, #2015019, #2015020, #2015021, #2015022, #2015023, #2015024, #2015025, #2015026, #2015027, #2015028 and #2014129 for local government and school division programs and projects as described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #2015014 **\$6,097.00**

Source: General Fund fund balance \$ 6,097.00

This request is to re-appropriate \$6,097.00 to the Human Resources Department from General Fund fund balance for a summer intern. The intern is primarily responsible for developing communication materials on behalf of the Human Resources department that will be circulated to both Local Government and School Division employees. This amount is the balance of an FY14 appropriation approved by the Board on May 7, 2014. The original appropriation anticipated these expenditures would take place in both FY14 and FY15 due to the work schedule of the intership.

Appropriation #2015015 **\$0.00**

This appropriation will not increase the County budget.

Sources: CARES Program Contingency \$ 18,650.00

This request is to appropriate \$18,650.00 from the Coalition Assisting Residents in Emergency Situations (CARES) Program Contingency to the Monticello Area Community Action Agency (MACAA). The CARES program, currently administered by MACAA, provides cash assistance and referral services to assist area residents in need of assistance with rent or mortgage payments, to avoid the disconnection of their utilities, or with other one-time emergencies. Funding from the City and the County has generally been used to cover administrative costs. The FY15 Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) recommended continued funding for this program at a reduced level pending the determination that MACAA is the appropriate administrator of the CARES funds. Staff recommends that MACAA continues to administer this program in FY15.

Appropriation #2015016 **\$784,456.61**

Sources: ECC Fund Balances \$ 784,456.61

The Emergency Communications Center (ECC) requests that the County, acting as fiscal agent for the ECC, appropriate the following re-appropriation requests:

- \$503,592.54 for the continuation of the work being done through the 800 MHz radio system Scottsville Augmentation project. The project will provide better coverage for radio system users for Southern Albemarle County.
- \$85,125.61 to complete the selection of the vendor for the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Technology project.
- \$177,387.46 to complete the ECC's Mobile Data Project.

Additionally, the Emergency Communications Center (ECC) requests that the County, acting as fiscal agent for the ECC, appropriate the following appropriation requests:

- \$2,500.00 from ECC fund balance to replace the batteries for eighty handheld 800MHz handheld radios.
- \$15,851.00 from ECC's Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) Local Emergency Grant for augmenting operating costs and supporting the ECC.

Appropriation #2015017 **\$0.00**

This appropriation will not increase the County budget.

Sources: Reserve for Contingencies \$ 10,000.00

As directed by the Board on March 4, 2014 during the discussion regarding the use of the Yancey Elementary School building for community programs, this request is to appropriate \$10,000.00 from the County's Reserve for Contingencies to the Parks & Recreation Department. This funding will be used to support the use of the Yancey Elementary School building for intergenerational activities. This one-time use of County funding demonstrates the County's commitment to support future grant applications for initiatives identified by the Yancey Work Group. Funding is anticipated to be used for expenses such as custodial costs associated with use of the school building for after hour community activities. This request will not increase the County Budget.

Appropriation #2015018 **\$0.00**

This appropriation will not increase the County budget.

Sources: State Revenue \$ 14,428.30
Use of School CIP Fund Bal. \$ (14,428.30)

This request is to appropriate revenue associated with the School Division Debt Service fund and to re-allocate the resulting available General Fund transfer balance to the Capital Program funds:

- **Virginia Public School Authority (VPSA) Refunding Credit:** This request is to appropriate \$14,428.30 in State revenue for Debt Service savings related to the bond refunding credit of the VPSA 2006B issue and to decrease the General Fund transfer to the School Debt Service fund by the equivalent amount of \$14,428.30. This results in no increase for the School Debt Service fund, leaving \$14,428.30 to be re-allocated to other debt and capital funds.

- **General Fund Transfer Reallocation to Capital Funds:** This request decreases the use of School CIP Fund balance in the amount of \$14,428.30 by increasing the General Fund transfer by \$14,428.30.

Appropriation #2015019		\$109,526.39
Sources:	General Fund fund balance	\$ 109,526.39

This request is to re-appropriate the remaining balance of \$109,526.39 for the FY 15 Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Service Contribution for the County's local support of the Ivy Material Utilization Center and the McIntire Recycling Center, which are managed by the RSWA. The total FY 15 payment is \$492,914.48, which includes \$383,426.50 for Ivy and \$109,487.98 for the Recycling Center. Any remaining funds will support any additional funds required after RSWA reconciles its fiscal year.

Appropriation #2015020		\$0.00
This appropriation will not increase the County budget.		
Source:	Volunteer Fire Rescue	\$ 706,442.00

This request is to appropriate \$706,442.00 in funding designated for fuel, insurance, Line of Duty Act, health services, turnout gear and other operating costs for Volunteer Fire Rescue operations from the Volunteer Fire Rescue appropriation category to the Fire Rescue Department appropriation category to improve administrative efficiencies and transparency.

Presently, the Fire Rescue Department manages expenditures in support of the volunteer stations in two appropriation categories: Volunteer Fire Rescue and the Fire Rescue Department.

- The Volunteer Fire Rescue category includes the County's direct annual contributions to the ten volunteer fire rescue stations, which staff recommends be maintained in this category, as well as \$706,442.00 in funding designated for the above expenditures, which are processed by the Fire Rescue Department, and which staff is requesting be reallocated to the Fire Rescue Department category.
- The Fire Rescue Department category includes support for volunteer stations by funding costs such as supplemental weekday daytime staffing, training, and recruitment and retention.

Consolidating the budgeting, accounting and processing of these support expenditures within the Fire Rescue Department category will more clearly reflect total Fire Rescue system costs and will provide administrative efficiencies by streamlining the processing of these expenditures. The FEMS Board is aware of these changes.

Appropriation #2015021		\$0.00
This appropriation will not increase the County budget.		
Source:	Reserve for Contingencies	\$ 32,951.00

This request is to appropriate \$32,951.00 from the Reserve for Contingencies to the Department of Fire Rescue for increased volunteer-related insurance costs. The County currently has an accident policy that provides volunteer firefighters and emergency medical technicians (EMTs) with medical coverage up to \$200,000.00 for injuries incurred as a result of their service. In addition, it includes benefits for income replacement and basic disability. The County's claims have grown over the last several years and its loss ratios have increased significantly, which has led to premium increases that were unknown at the time the FY 15 budget was being developed.

Appropriation #2015022		\$0.00
This appropriation will not increase the County budget.		
Source:	General Fund fund balance	\$ 20,000.00
	General Gov't CIP Fund balance	\$ (20,000.00)

This request is appropriate \$20,000.00 from the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) to the General Fund for Western Albemarle Rescue Squad's bay upgrade project. The FY15 Adopted CIP budget includes \$20,000.00 for WARS to upgrade the existing bay to meet the replacement apparatus needs. Subsequent to the adoption of the FY15 budget, staff further reviewed this expenditure based on the criteria for capital projects. Based on this review, staff recommends this item be budgeted and expended in the General Fund, where it is more appropriate.

Appropriation #2015023		\$54,402.49
Source:	General Gov't CIP Fund balance	\$ 54,402.49

This request is to re-appropriate FY 14 funds for the following Capital Program project:

Fire Department Contingency: This request is to re-appropriate the remaining balance of \$54,402.49 for unexpected apparatus maintenance expenses for the career fire and rescue departments.

Appropriation #2015024 \$0.00

This appropriation will not increase the County budget.

Source:	Public Defender Contingency	\$	74,049.00
---------	-----------------------------	----	-----------

The FY 15 County Budget includes a contingency of \$74,049.00 for Public Defenders salary supplements. Pursuant to the Board's direction on July 2, 2014, this appropriation request is to appropriate this funding from the contingency account to a Public Defender expenditure account in order for the County's Finance Department to access the funds to make monthly payments to the Public Defender staff pursuant to the County's Memorandum of Understanding with the Public Defender. Due to the timing of this appropriation, the July 2014 salary supplements will be included with the August 2014 salary supplement payments.

Appropriation #2015025 \$157,375.00

*The Church Road Capital Project funding component of this appropriation will not increase the County Budget.

Source:	Stormwater CIP Fund Balance	\$	157,375.00
	Church Road Stormwater Project*	\$	9,861.00

This request is to appropriate \$157,375.00 of the Stormwater Capital Program fund balance for the Carrsbrook Pipe Repair Project to fund the interim and long term repairs, and to appropriate \$9,861.00 from the Church Road Capital Project to the Carrsbrook Pipe Repair Project to fund the project management services related to the Carrsbrook Pipe Repair Project. This project management funding is available as a result of a portion of OFD's workload shifting from the Church Road Capital Project to the Carrsbrook Pipe Repair. The total project cost is \$167,236.

The corrugated metal pipe drainage pipes of the Carrsbrook Drive dam have corroded and a large eroded hole has formed on the downstream side of the dam as a result of the failing pipes. The pipes are located on two private properties and partially within the VDOT right-of-way of Carrsbrook Drive. The large eroded hole is located on private property and, if not repaired, could damage Carrsbrook Drive, and is a life-safety concern. Temporary/interim repairs will be quickly completed, followed by permanent repairs within an easement to be acquired by the County.

Appropriation #2015026 \$253,256.00

Source:	Federal Revenue	\$	253,256.00
---------	-----------------	----	------------

This request is to appropriate the remaining one year of grant funding in the amount of \$253,256.00 for August 2014 through May 31, 2015 to the Strategic Prevention Framework – State Incentive Grant (SPF-SIG) and BASICS Program. The total contract amount is \$273,550.00 which includes two earlier appropriations totalling \$20,294.00 approved by the Board in June and July of 2014. These grant funds have been received from the U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's Center for Substance Abuse Prevention through Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU). VCU, the Prime Awardee, will provide these funds to the County as its Subcontractor.

The purpose of the grant is to reduce the number of motor vehicle crashes involving alcohol-impaired drivers between the ages of 15 and 24 and to decrease the amount of binge drinking frequencies (4 or more drinks within a couple of hours) by 5% among college students. The County will contract with the University of Virginia to undertake the BASICS initiative associated with college students.

The County, in its previous capacity as fiscal agent for the Commission on Children and Families (CCF), received the first SPF-SIG Project grant for the time period of February 1, 2012 through January 31, 2013 in the fall of 2011. CCF was dissolved in December 2012, so the second SPF-SIG Project Grant was awarded directly to the County for the time period of February 1, 2013 through May 31, 2014.

Appropriation #2015027 \$0.00

This appropriation will not increase the County budget.

Source:	Grant Leveraging Fund	\$	17,500.00
---------	-----------------------	----	-----------

This request is to transfer funds from the Grants Leveraging Fund to the City of Charlottesville to provide matching funds for a co-sponsored grant awarded by the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs. The City is the recipient of the grant totaling \$70,000.00 on behalf of the City and the County. The City and the County will study the logistical and financial feasibility of building a flash freezing facility in the region with the goal of expanding the market for locally-sourced produce. This will help expand profit margins for local farmers, add value to seasonal production by expanding seasonal availability into the non-growing seasons, and better meet the needs of the major institutional buyers such as UVA and local restaurants.

Appropriation #2015028 \$301,269.00

Source:	State Revenue	\$	226,269.00
	Revenue from Central VA Regional Jail	\$	75,000.00

This request is to appropriate the following grants:

- **Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR) Grant 15-S6348CC15:** This request is to appropriate \$1,269.00 in State revenue based on the total amount awarded by the Department of Criminal Justice Services for the Criminal Justice Program grant administered by Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR). The FY15 Adopted Budget and associated Resolution of Appropriations had included \$723,815.00 in State revenue for this grant and the actual amount awarded by the Department of Criminal Justice Services will be \$725,084.00. This grant includes services under the Pretrial Services Act and Community Correction Act.
- **OAR Grant 15-C2636OT15:** This request is to appropriate \$225,000 in grant funding from the Department of Criminal Justice Services awarded to OAR with the County acting as fiscal agent, as well as the local match of \$75,000.00 being provided by the Central Virginia Regional Jail located in the Town of Orange for a total of \$300,000. Through this grant, OAR will continue to provide pretrial services in the rural counties serving the Central Virginia Regional Jail.

Appropriation #2015029 \$50,818.00

Source:	Federal Revenue	\$	50,818.00
	Grants Leveraging Fund*	\$	16,941.00

*The Grants Leveraging Fund component of this appropriation will not increase the County Budget.

This request is to appropriate \$50,818.00 in grant funding from the Department of Criminal Justice to the Albemarle County Police Department, as well as the local match of \$16,941.00, for a total of \$67,759.00. The purpose of this grant is to provide continuation funding for the Crime Analyst position that began in January 2014 based on the previous year's grant funding. To date, this position has provided a range of useful crime analytic services in support of operations, investigations, administration, planning, budgeting, and public education services. The grant project funding also provides for further professional training. The local match funds are being provided by the County's Grant Leveraging Fund.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved appropriations #2015014, #2015015, #2015016, #2015017, #2015018, #2015019, #2015020, #2015021, #2015022, #2015023, #2015024, #2015025, #2015026, #2015027, #2015028 and #2014129 for local government and school division programs and projects as described above:

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE			
APPROPRIATION SUMMARY			
APP#	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
2015014	3-1000-51000-351000-510100-9999	\$6,097.00	App Fund Balance
2015014	4-1000-12030-412030-130000-1001	\$5,664.00	PT wages
2015014	4-1000-12030-412030-210000-1001	\$433.00	FICA
2015015	4-1000-89000-489000-566300-1008	\$18,650.00	MACAA
2015015	4-1000-89000-489000-566305-1008	-\$18,650.00	CARES Program Contingency
2015016	3-4100-51000-351000-510100-9999	\$2,500.00	App Fund Balance
2015016	4-4100-31040-435600-800700-1003	2,500.00	Technology equipment
2015016	3-4110-51000-351000-510100-9999	503,592.54	App fund balance
2015016	4-4110-31060-435600-300204-1003	800.00	FCC Licenses
2015016	4-4110-31060-435600-312105-1003	3,546.43	Consultant Services
2015016	4-4110-31060-435600-312351-1003	10,000.00	Permit Fees
2015016	4-4110-31060-435600-331601-1003	9,791.00	R & M Equipment
2015016	4-4110-31060-435600-540000-1003	\$1,200.00	Leases & Rentals
2015016	4-4110-31060-435600-800150-1003	\$266,532.04	Labor and Installation
2015016	4-4110-31060-435600-800305-1003	\$201,852.50	Radio System Equipment
2015016	4-4110-31060-435600-999999-1003	\$9,870.57	Contingency
2015016	3-4115-51000-351000-510100-9999	\$177,387.46	App fund balance
2015016	4-4115-31065-435600-800316-1003	\$177,387.46	Mobile Data Project
2015016	3-4117-51000-351000-510100-9999	\$85,125.61	App Fund balance
2015016	4-4117-31061-435600-312700-1003	\$55,554.82	Professional Services Consultants
2015016	4-4117-31061-435600-550100-1003	\$11,231.39	Travel/Training/Education
2015016	4-4117-31061-435600-999999-1003	\$18,339.40	Contingency
2015016	3-4100-33000-333000-330223-9999	\$15,851.00	App fund balance
2015016	4-4100-31045-435600-310000-1003	\$4,500.00	Professional Services
2015016	4-4100-31045-435600-360000-1003	\$1,000.00	Advertising
2015016	4-4100-31045-435600-520300-1003	\$500.00	Telecommunications
2015016	4-4100-31045-435600-550100-1003	\$650.00	Travel/Training/Education
2015016	4-4100-31045-435600-600100-1003	\$750.00	Office Supplies
2015016	4-4100-31045-435600-600200-1003	\$500.00	Food Supplies
2015016	4-4100-31045-435600-601100-1003	\$1,200.00	Uniforms & Apparel
2015016	4-4100-31045-435600-800700-1003	\$5,815.00	Technology Equipment
2015016	4-4100-31045-435600-800712-1003	\$936.00	Software Upgrade
2015017	4-1000-99900-499000-999990-9999	-\$10,000.00	Reserve For Contingencies to Yancey

2015017	4-1000-71015-471010-392000-6113	\$10,000.00	Yancey from Reserve for Contingencies
2015018	3-9900-24000-324000-240404-9999	\$14,428.30	School Debt (Bond Credit - VPSA 2006B)
2015018	3-9900-51000-351000-512004-9999	-14,428.30	Gen. Fund Trsf. (School Debt Bond Credit)
2015018	4-1000-93010-493010-930003-9999	-14,428.30	Gen. Fund Trsf. To School Debt (School Debt Bond Credit)
2015018	4-1000-93010-493010-930004-9999	14,428.30	Gen. Fund Trsf. To School CIP (School Debt Bond Credit)
2015018	3-9000-69000-351000-510100-6599	-14,428.30	School CIP Use of Fund Balance (School Debt Bond Credit)
2015018	3-9000-69000-351000-512004-6599	14,428.30	Gen. Fund Trsf. To School CIP (School Debt Bond Credit)
2015019	3-1000-51000-351000-510100-9999	109,526.39	General Fund fund Balance
2015019	4-1000-42040-442040-999851-1004	109,526.39	IVY MUC (RSWA Contribution)
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-250200-1003	-\$29,250.00	250200-LINE OF DUTY - BENEFITS
2015020	4-1000-32016-432010-250200-1003	\$29,250.00	250200-LINE OF DUTY - BENEFITS
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-311000-1003	-\$40,000.00	311000-HEALTH SERVICES
2015020	4-1000-32016-432010-311000-1003	\$40,000.00	311000-HEALTH SERVICES
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-332104-1003	-\$6,295.00	332104-MAINT. CONT. - DP EQUIP.
2015020	4-1000-32011-432010-332104-1003	\$6,295.00	332104-MAINT. CONT. - DP EQUIP.
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-530950-1003	-\$205,357.00	530950-VEHICLE & BUILDING INSURA
2015020	4-1000-32016-432010-530950-1003	\$205,357.00	530950-VEHICLE & BUILDING INSURA
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-560700-1003	-\$12,500.00	560700-N. GARDEN VOL FIRE DEPT.
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-560800-1003	-\$18,000.00	560800-SCOTTSVILLE VOL FIRE DEPT
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-560900-1003	-\$26,698.00	560900-CROZET VOL.FIRE DEPT
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-561000-1003	-\$19,000.00	561000-EARLYSVILLE VOL.FIRE DEPT
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-561100-1003	-\$25,000.00	561100-E.RIVANNA VOL.FIRE DEPT
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-561200-1003	-\$14,000.00	561200-STONY POINT VOL.FIRE DEPT
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-561300-1003	-\$33,372.00	561300-SEMINOLE TR VOL FIRE DEPT
2015020	4-1000-32030-432030-565100-1003	-\$23,000.00	565100-W ALBEMARLE RESCUE SQUAD
2015020	4-1000-32030-432030-565200-1003	-\$24,480.00	565200-SCOTTSVILLE RESCUE SQUAD
2015020	4-1000-32015-432010-600800-1003	\$196,050.00	Fuel
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-561400-1003	-\$60,090.00	561400-J.C. FIREMAN ASSOCIATION
2015020	4-1000-32015-432010-250100-1003	-\$20,000.00	250100-VOLUNTEER-ACCIDENT & SICK
2015020	4-1000-32016-432010-250100-1003	\$80,090.00	250100-VOLUNTEER-ACCIDENT & SICK
2015020	4-1000-32020-432010-561495-1003	-\$3,000.00	561495-J.C.F.R.A. BENEFITS
2015020	4-1000-32016-432010-312000-1003	\$3,000.00	Other professional services
2015020	4-1000-32020-432010-601104-1003	-\$126,000.00	Turnout gear
2015020	4-1000-32015-432010-601104-1003	\$126,000.00	Turnout gear
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-601400-1003	-\$40,000.00	Other operating supplies
2015020	4-1000-32015-432010-601400-1003	\$40,000.00	Other operating supplies
2015020	4-1000-32020-432020-800135-1003	-\$250.00	800135-BACKFLOW PREVENTION DEVICES
2015020	4-1000-32030-432030-800135-1003	-\$150.00	800135-BACKFLOW PREVENTION DEVICES
2015020	4-1000-32016-432010-800135-1003	\$400.00	800135-BACKFLOW PREVENTION DEVICES
2015021	4-1000-32016-432010-250100-1003	32,951.00	250100-VOLUNTEER-ACCIDENT & SICK
2015021	4-1000-99900-499000-999990-9999	-32,951.00	Reserve for Contingencies
2015022	3-1000-51000-351000-510100-9999	20,000.00	App Fund Balance
2015022	4-1000-32030-432030-565100-1003	20,000.00	WARS
2015022	3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999	-20,000.00	App Fund Balance
2015022	4-9010-32020-432020-565100-3140	-20,000.00	WARS
2015023	3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999	54,402.49	Reappropriation-Fire Dept Contingency
2015023	4-9010-32010-432010-999999-3140	54,402.49	Reappropriation-Fire Dept Contingency
2015024	4-1000-21045-421045-999999-1002	-74,049.00	Move to contract services
2015024	4-1000-21045-421045-301210-1002	74,049.00	Move from contingency
2015025	4-9100-41038-482040-800975-9999	157,375.00	Carrsbrook Sinkhole Repair
2015025	4-9100-41038-482040-312366-9999	9,861.00	PM Services of Carrsbrook Sinkhole Repair
2015025	4-9100-82067-482040-312366-9999	-9,861.00	PM Services of Church Road
2015025	3-9100-51000-351000-510100-9999	157,375.00	Use of Stormwater CIP Fund balance
2015026	3-1591-33000-333000-330001-1005	253,256.00	federal revenue
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-110000-1005	73,735.18	Salaries
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-210000-1005	5,640.82	FICA
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-312210-1005	132,400.00	Contract Services
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-350000-1005	8,781.57	Print & Bind
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-360000-1005	10,000.00	Advertising
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-520100-1005	100.00	Postal Services
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-520300-1005	240.00	Telecommunications
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-550000-1005	1,729.93	Travel
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-600100-1005	3,074.00	Office Supplies
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-540200-1005	4,800.00	Lease/Rent Buildings
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-390030-1005	4,354.50	Indirect Costs
2015026	4-1591-53163-454101-390030-1005	8,400.00	Admin Fees to County
2015027	4-1000-93010-493010-930200-9999	17,500.00	Transfer from General Fund
2015027	4-1000-99900-499000-999974-9999	-17,500.00	Grants Leveraging Fund
2015027	3-1681-51000-351000-512004-9999	17,500.00	Transfer from Grants Leveraging Fund
2015027	4-1681-81502-481500-560050-1008	17,500.00	City of Charlottesville
2015028	3-1520-24000-324000-240440-1003	226,269.00	state revenue
2015028	3-1520-19000-319000-190216-1003	75,000.00	Central VA Regional Jail
2015028	4-1520-29406-421090-566120-1003	301,269.00	OAR
2015029	3-1505-33000-333000-330412-1003	50,818.00	Grant Revenue - Federal
2015029	3-1505-51000-351000-512004-9999	16,941.00	Transfer from Grant Leveraging Fund

2015029	4-1000-99900-499000-999974-9999	-16,941.00	Grants leveraging fund
2015029	4-1000-93010-493010-930200-9999	16,941.00	transfer to new fund
2015029	4-1505-31013-431010-110000-1003	46,040.00	Salary
2015029	4-1505-31013-431010-210000-1003	3,522.00	FICA
2015029	4-1505-31013-431010-221000-1003	6,211.00	VRS
2015029	4-1505-31013-431010-231000-1003	7,650.00	Health Insurance
2015029	4-1505-31013-431010-232000-1003	256.00	Dental Insurance
2015029	4-1505-31013-431010-241000-1003	608.00	VRS Life Insurance
2015029	4-1505-31013-431010-270000-1003	41.00	Worker's Compensation
2015029	4-1505-31013-431010-550100-1003	3,431.00	Training expenses
TOTAL		3,503,282.98	

Item No. 8.3. FY 2014 Budget Amendment and Appropriations.

The executive summary states that Virginia Code § 15.2-2507 provides that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget; provided, however, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The Code section applies to all County funds, i.e., General Fund, Capital Funds, E911, School Self-Sustaining, etc.

The total increase to the FY 14 budget due to the appropriation itemized below is \$496,653.00. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the amount of the cumulative appropriations does not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

This request involves the approval of three (3) appropriations as follows:

- One (1) appropriation (#2014112) to appropriate \$18,000.00 from the Reserve for Contingencies to the Volunteer Fire Rescue Tax Credit program. This appropriation will not increase the total County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2014113) totaling \$505,530.00 for Comprehensive Services Act expenditures; and
- One (1) appropriation (#2014114) for \$(8,877.00) to reconcile the debt service funds.

Staff recommends approval of appropriations #2014112, #2014113, and #2014114 for general government and school division programs as described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #2014112 \$0.00

This appropriation will not increase the County budget.

Source: Reserve for Contingencies \$ 18,000.00

This request is to appropriate \$18,000.00 from the Reserve for Contingencies to the Volunteer Fire Rescue Tax Credit program. The County has established a volunteer fire/rescue personal property tax credit that may be applied toward any vehicle owned by an eligible fire/rescue volunteer.

In FY14, the County implemented changes to automate the tax credit process to ensure all eligible volunteers received the credit and to streamline the process for both the Finance Department and volunteers. As a result of this change, a greater amount of tax credits for calendar year 2014 were processed in FY14 than anticipated in the budget, which was developed prior to implementation of this process change.

Appropriation #2014113 \$505,530.00

Sources: State Revenue \$ 490,758.00
 CSA Fund fund balance \$ 14,772.00

This request is to appropriate \$505,530.00 for Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) expenditures based on increasing trends and FY 14 expenditures for this fund. These expenditures will be funded through \$490,758.00 in State revenue and \$14,772.00 in CSA Fund fund balance. Because these expenditures can vary significantly year-to-year, the CSA fund maintains a fund balance for this circumstance.

Appropriation #2014114 \$(8,877.00)

This appropriation will not increase the County budget.

Sources: Bond Proceeds \$ 547,468.78
 Gen. Gov't Debt Service Fund fund balance \$ 144,944.21
 Gen. Gov't CIP Fund fund balance \$ (701,289.99)

This request is to reconcile the FY 14 Debt Service funds for a net decrease to the total County Budget of \$8,877.00:

- The General Government and School Division each has its own Debt Service Fund that provides funding for fees, costs of issuances, and the principal and interest expenses associated with debt issuances for capital projects. This appropriation reconciles the budget to the actual expenses per fund and actual receipt of revenues per fund. To reconcile the FY 14 Debt Service funds, this request is to:
 - A. Appropriate a total of \$547,468.78 in bond proceeds revenue received from the fall 2013 bond issuance to support the cost of issuance and underwriters discount already budgeted and expended: \$406,105.81 for the General Government Debt Service fund and 141,362.97 for the School Debt Service fund. The cost of issuance and underwriters discount were originally budgeted to be paid for with cash from the General Fund Transfer;
 - B. Decrease the School Debt Service fund expenditure budget \$23,097.81 and increase the General Government Debt Service fund expenditure budget \$23,097.81 where the costs were incurred for the fall 2013 bond issuance;
 - C. Appropriate \$144,944.21 in use of fund balance for the General Government Debt Service fund to maintain a \$0 fund balance;
 - D. Decrease the expenditure budget for costs for Professional Services by \$8,877.00 to reflect the actual costs incurred; and
 - E. As a result of A, B, C, and D reduce the use of General Fund Transfer to the Debt Service funds by \$701,289.99 and increase the General Fund Transfer equally \$701,289.99 to the General Fund Transfer Capital Funds.
- General Fund Transfer Reallocation to Capital Funds: This request decreases the use of General Government CIP Fund fund balance in the amount of \$701,289.99 by increasing the General Fund transfer by \$701,289.99. The funds are being appropriated to the General Government CIP Fund as a result of appropriation 2014056 whereby the General Government CIP fund balance was used to support the initial debt service payment required for the fall 2013 bond issuance.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved appropriations #2014112, #2014113, and #2014114 for general government and school division programs as described above:

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE			
APPROPRIATION SUMMARY			
APP#	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
2014112	4-1000-39000-439000-561405-1003	18,000.00	Volunteer FR Tax Credit
2014112	4-1000-99900-499000-999990-9999	-18,000.00	Reserve for Contingencies
2014113	3-1551-24000-324000-240109-1005	490,758.00	State revenue
2014113	3-1551-51000-351000-510100-9999	14,772.00	App fund balance
2014113	4-1551-53120-453010-581001-1005	505,530.00	CSA mandated services
2014114	3-9900-41400-341000-410530-9999	141,362.97	School Debt Service Bond Proceeds
2014114	3-9900-51000-351000-512004-9999	-173,337.78	Gen. Fund Trs. To School Debt Service
2014114	4-9900-95000-495000-310000-9999	-8,877.00	School Debt Service Professional Services
2014114	4-9900-95000-495000-312807-9999	-23,097.81	School Debt Service Bond Issuance Cost
2014114	3-9910-41400-341000-410530-9999	406,105.81	Gen. Gov't Debt Service Bond Proceeds
2014114	3-9910-51000-351000-510100-9999	144,944.21	Gen. Gov't Debt Service Use of Fund Balance
2014114	3-9910-51000-351000-512004-9999	-527,952.21	Gen. Fund Trs. To Gen. Gov't Debt Service
2014114	4-9910-95000-495000-900105-9999	23,097.81	Cost of Issuance
2014114	4-1000-93010-493010-930003-9999	-173,337.78	Gen. Fund Trs. To School Debt Service
2014114	4-1000-93010-493010-930011-9999	-527,952.21	Gen. Fund Trs. To Gen. Gov't Debt Service
2014114	4-1000-93010-493010-930010-9999	701,289.99	Gen. Fund Trs. To Gen. Gov't CIP
2014114	3-9010-51000-351000-512004-9999	701,289.99	Gen. Fund Trs. To Gen. Gov't CIP
2014114	3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999	-701,289.99	Gen. Gov't CIP Use of Fund Balance
TOTAL		993.306/00	

Item No. 8.4. Revised Community Use of County Facilities Policy.

The executive summary states that since first adopting a Community Use of County Facilities Policy on February 10, 1982, the Board has encouraged the use of County facilities by Local Government and the Schools Division for their activities, as well as by outside organizations and groups, as long as their activities do not interfere with County business. The Board reviewed and approved the most recent changes to the policy on May 2, 2012.

The policy requires that any group requesting to meet at the County Office Building complete a rental application and pay a nominal rental fee for use of the space. As currently written, that requirement also applies to the use of the lobby outside of the auditorium, which is often used by various groups to gather before a Board or Commission meeting to discuss issues to be addressed at that meeting, to hand out flyers, and to talk to the media. The current rental fee after 5 p.m. is \$40.00 per hour.

In order to ensure that all groups and individuals have reasonable access to the lobby area during Board and Commission meetings, staff is recommending a change to the Policy (Attachment A) that would identify the lobby as an extension of the auditorium during those meetings. This proposed change would allow citizens to use the lobby for the above mentioned purposes without charge. It would also require the same standard of conduct in the lobby during meetings as in the Auditorium itself.

Although the lobby has rarely been rented during Board and Commission meetings, there may be a minimal decrease in rental income resulting from the proposed change.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the revised Community Use of County Facilities Policy as presented in Attachment A.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved the revised Community Use of County Facilities Policy as set out below:

COMMUNITY USE OF COUNTY FACILITIES

A) Generally

1. The Board of Supervisors believes in the full and best possible utilization of the physical facilities belonging to the citizens of the County. To achieve this end, the use of County facilities for governmental, school and related activities, as well as by outside organizations and groups, shall be encouraged when these activities will not interfere with the routine business of the County.
2. Proper protection, safety and care of County property shall be primary considerations in the use of County facilities.

B) Eligible Organizations

1. The Board has classified various organizations and groups for the purposes of priority and the charging of fees.
 - I. Classification
 - II. County government and School-affiliated or related groups.
 - III. Youth agencies, educational, recreational, cultural, political, civic, charitable, social, veterans' or religious groups or organizations.
 - IV. Profit making or Private groups, organizations, or businesses.
2. Membership
The membership of any group or organization requesting the use of County facilities must be largely from the County of Albemarle. This restriction shall not exclude the use of certain facilities, as determined by the County Executive, by state and national organizations that have a local sponsoring division of such organization.
3. Commercial Activities
Commercial use of County property by any organization or individual is expressly prohibited.

C) Applications and Approval

1. Applications must be sponsored by reputable and established clubs, societies or organizations that can be held responsible for the payment of charges, compensation for damages to property and for use of the property in reasonable conformity with the regulations on the application.
2. The Board authorizes the County Executive or his designee to approve all applications for the use of County facilities that meet the requirements of the Board, that comply with implementing regulations the County Executive deems necessary to protect County property and that do not conflict with established business or commercial interests in the community. The County Executive shall design such application forms as are required. The completed and signed form shall be a binding agreement upon the applicant and the County.
3. No rental application will be considered more than six months prior to the desired rental date.
4. The County Executive or his designee reserves the right to cancel a rental contract up to ten calendar days prior to a scheduled rental.
5. The Lane Auditorium and COB – 5th Street Room A are available during business hours (8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday) only if the applicant provides shuttle bus

services or off-site parking for participants of the meeting. On-site parking is not available for large meetings during business hours.

6. All activities shall end, with County facilities vacated, no later than 10:00 p.m.
7. The Lane Auditorium and its adjacent Lobby are not available for exclusive rental or use on any day during which a local government board, commission, or other duly appointed entity is scheduled to use the facility. During any such public meetings, the adjacent Lobby shall be considered an extension of the Lane Auditorium and shall be subject to reasonable use restrictions. Such restrictions shall include, but not be limited to: (1) that ingress and egress are not obstructed; and (2) that use of the Lobby does not interfere with the conduct of County business.
8. Meeting rooms and Auditorium are not available on holidays, scheduled or declared, when the County Office Building is closed.
9. Reservations will automatically be cancelled when the County office buildings are closed due to inclement weather or emergency conditions.
10. County Office Buildings' Grounds and Parking Lots:
 - a. Unless otherwise specifically allowed in this policy, the Grounds of the County Office Buildings are not open for public use. For purposes of this restriction, the Grounds do not include parking lots that are open for public use or sidewalks, provided that ingress and egress are not obstructed and that use of those parking lots or sidewalks does not interfere with the conduct of County business.
 - b. Parking in County parking lots for purposes not related to business being conducted in or on County facilities shall not be permitted during the County's regular business hours, or during meetings of the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, or School Board. In addition, there shall be no public parking in such lots between the hours of 2:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. At such other times, unrestricted spaces in parking lots are open to the public for general parking purposes.
 - c. Veterans' Memorials. The County Executive or his designee may consider requests for the use of the area in proximity to the veterans' memorials on the Grounds by veterans' groups or organizations consistent with this policy. Such requests must be made and approved no less than 5 business days before the proposed activity.
 - d. At no time shall vehicles be parked on the lawns or pedestrian walkways.
 - e. Unauthorized users of County facilities or Grounds are subject to removal and/or prosecution for trespassing.

D) Fees (See Attachment)

1. The County Executive shall establish a minimum schedule of fees and may make additional adjustments in the fees. The minimum schedule and additional adjustments shall be based upon the classification of the group or organization, the facilities to be used, the size of the group, the objectives of the organization, the approximate cost to the County and the purpose for which the facility will be used.
2. In general, the County Office Building Rental Charges schedule (attached below) will apply.
3. A full rental fee shall be charged to all groups (except Classification I) when County facilities are to be used for fund raising and/or when an admission charge is levied.
4. All fees must be paid at least seven (7) calendar days in advance, and the sponsoring organization whose name appears on the application shall be held responsible for any and all damages to property and equipment.

E) Protection of County Property

1. An employee or agent of the County shall be on duty on the property at times when the facilities are in use. No equipment or furnishings may be used or moved without the consent of the employee in charge if such usage is not in conformity with the contracted agreement. The employee in charge may expel any group if said group, after ample warnings, fails to adhere to the provisions of their rental agreement.
2. The sponsoring organization shall be responsible for crowd control measures, including

the employment of police protection when required. Such control shall be arranged in advance when deemed necessary by the County Executive or his designee.

F) Safety

1. Organizations and individuals using the facility shall be responsible for familiarizing themselves with the nearest exits in case of emergency evacuation. Each conference room has a Fire Escape Plan posted at its entrance which shows the primary and secondary escape routes.

G) Deposits

1. A cash bond or deposit may be required at the discretion of the County Executive or his designee prior to use of the property.

Lane Auditorium and COB-5th Street Room A Rental Charges

Classification	Weekday-Business Hours	Weekday-Evening
I. County/Schools*	No Charge	No Charge
II. Youth agencies, educational, recreational, cultural, political, civic, charitable, social, veteran's or religious groups or organizations	\$18.00 flat fee	\$40.00 per hour
III. Profit Making or Private Groups, Organizations or Businesses	\$200.00 flat fee	\$200.00-flat fee

* Departments directly supervised or sponsored by the County Executive/Superintendent or sponsored by the local office of the Virginia Cooperative Extension

The Lane Auditorium and COB – 5th Street Room A are available during business hours (8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday) only if the Applicant provides shuttle bus services or off-site parking for participants of the meeting. On-site parking is not available for large meetings during business hours.

County Office Building Meeting Rooms Rental Charges (Other than for Lane Auditorium and COB-5th Street Room A)

Classification	Weekday-Business Hours	Weekday-Evening
I. County/Schools*	No Charge	No Charge
II. Youth agencies, educational, recreational, cultural, political, civic, charitable, social, veteran's or religious groups or organizations	\$18.00 flat fee	\$40.00 per hour
III. Profit Making or Private Groups, Organizations or Businesses	\$40.00 per hour	\$40.00 per hour

* Departments directly supervised or sponsored by the County Executive/Superintendent or sponsored by the local office of the Virginia Cooperative Extension

Additional Charges

1. Each additional room used shall incur an additional charge, pursuant to the above schedule.
2. Requests to set up additional chairs/tables shall incur a flat \$18.00 charge.
3. Any portion of a meeting scheduled past 5:00 p.m. will be subject to the applicable weekday evening rate.
4. For any event at which food is served, a \$150.00 security deposit will be charged, to be returned upon satisfactory inspection of facility.

Item No. 8.5. B.F. Yancey Coalition for Intergenerational Programming

The executive summary states that on April 2, 2014, staff provided the Board a status update of the community use and programs currently being offered at B.F. Yancey Elementary School, and recommendations of the Yancey Work Group for the Boards consideration. The first significant recommendation was for the County Executive and Superintendent of Schools to appoint the Yancey Work Group as the Yancey Advisory Panel for Intergenerational Programming for southern Albemarle, and to establish its continuing function by charter. The second recommendation was for funding support to keep Yancey open on weekends for community Intergeneration Programming for the remainder of FY14 and FY 15, and to authorize a letter of endorsement to be used in the solicitation of grant opportunities that encourage private and public partnerships. At the conclusion of that meeting, the Board appropriated one-time funding in the amount of \$10,000 from the Reserve for Contingencies Fund to keep Yancey open on weekends for Intergeneration Programming; authorized the Chair to sign the letter

of endorsement; and directed staff to bring back to the Board a draft charter that appoints the Yancey Work Group as the Yancey Advisory Panel for the Board's consideration.

Staff is recommending that the B.F. Yancey Work Group be appointed as the B.F. Yancey Coalition for Intergenerational Programming. A draft of the Coalition's Charter is attached (Attachment A) for the Board's consideration. The Charter includes primary objectives of the Coalition, as well as its structure and membership composition. The Coalition is empowered to develop its own timeline as it continues to expand on the Work Group's past accomplishments of identifying and responding to service needs of the southern Albemarle community, and to solicit financial support from foundations, corporations, non-profit organizations, government entities and individual donors who have an interest in the future of southern Albemarle. The Coalition shall provide a written Annual Report on its progress to the Board of Supervisors and the School Board, or more frequently if deemed appropriate.

There is no direct budget impact related to this matter; however, it is recognized that in April 2014 the Board allocated one-time funding in the amount of \$10,000 from the Reserve for Contingencies Fund for Intergenerational Programming at B.F. Yancey, and that dedicated County staff support is not available for this effort. It is assumed that the Yancey Coalition will be self-directed and self-supporting with the recognition that County government partners are and will remain engaged in the activities of the Yancey Coalition as a natural and normal part of services to the community.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the Yancey Coalition's Charter as set forth in Attachment A.

(Note: This item was pulled for discussion later in the meeting.)

Item No. 8.6. ZMA-2004-00024 Old Trail – Special Exception to Authorize Variations from the Code of Development.

The executive summary states that Old Trail Village was rezoned to Neighborhood Model District with an associated Application Plan and Code of Development (COD) on September 14, 2005. Fourteen (14) variations to the Plan and/or Code have previously been granted. The developer is currently proposing development within five different blocks that require five (5) additional variations from the COD before the final site plan and/or building permits can be approved by staff.

The following summarizes findings for each variation request. The attached staff report (Attachment A) provides details for each request.

Block 3D:

Variation #15: To change the minimum build-to line from 8 feet to 30 feet. *Change will better accommodate the landscaping necessary to transition from the urban center to the future County park on the other side of these lots.*

Block 14:

Variation #16: To allow roof overhangs and eaves to encroach the 5 foot building setback. *Change will enable larger buildable area for each lot and more flexibility in the design of each unit without impacting health, safety and welfare.*

Block 15:

Variation #17: To allow Lots 7-9 to be below the minimum lot size requirement for single-family units. *Change will have a de minimis impact on the development in this block.*

Variation #18: To reduce front, side and rear setbacks to 5 feet for single-family units. *Change will enable larger buildable area for each lot and more flexibility in the design of each unit.*

Blocks 28/29B:

Variation #19: To reduce front, side and rear setbacks to 5 feet for single-family units. *Change will enable larger buildable area for each lot and more flexibility in the design of each unit.*

No impact will result from this special exception authorizing multiple variations.

Staff recommends approval of this special exception authorizing multiple variations with the conditions outlined in the staff report. The basis for staff's recommendations is included in the staff report.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved ZMA 2004-00024 Old Trail Special Exception.

VARIATION REQUEST #15: Change the minimum build-to line from eight (8) feet to 30 feet in Lots 2-4 of Block 3D.

VARIATION REQUEST #16: Allow roof overhangs and eaves to encroach the five (5) foot building setback in Block 14.

1. Roof overhangs and eaves shall not be permitted to project further than one foot into the building setback.

VARIATION REQUEST #17: Allow Lots 7-9 to be below the minimum lot size requirement for single-family units in Block 15.

VARIATION REQUEST #18: To reduce front, side and rear setbacks to five (5) feet for single-family units in Block 15.

VARIATION REQUEST #19: To reduce front, side and rear setbacks to five (5) feet for single-family units in Blocks 28 and 29B.

Item. No. 8.7. Expansion of the Photosafe Program to the intersection of Greenbrier Drive and Seminole Trail.

The executive summary states that in 2007, the General Assembly enacted Virginia Code §15.2-968.1 enabling localities to establish, by ordinance, traffic light signal photo-monitoring systems. Virginia Code permits one traffic light photo enforcement location per 10,000 residents upon completion of the required traffic safety engineering studies. The County adopted an ordinance to authorize its Photosafe Program on August 5, 2009. Under this authority, the County Executive can approve the installation of photo-monitoring systems at up to ten intersections in the County.

On December 12, 2010, the Albemarle County Police Department activated the Photosafe Program at the intersection of Seminole Trail and Rio Road. Given the success of the Photosafe Program, staff has identified another suitable location where the Photosafe Program could be used for photo enforcement.

Following a traffic safety analysis of the County's top crash locations controlled by a traffic signal, as well as a survey of red light violations and an engineering analysis, the Police Department identified the intersection of Greenbrier Drive and Seminole Trail as the most suitable location. In selecting the Greenbrier Drive and Seminole Trail intersection for inclusion in the Photosafe Program, the Police Department considered the factors set forth in Virginia Code Section 15.2-968.1(J), including (i) the accident rate at the intersection, (ii) the rate of red light violations occurring at the intersection, (iii) the difficulty experienced by law enforcement officers in apprehending violators, and (iv) the ability to apprehend violators safely.

Prior to the activation of the Photosafe Program at the Greenbrier Drive and Seminole Trail intersection, the County must do the following:

1. Complete an engineering safety analysis.
2. If recommended by the analysis, make reasonable location-specific improvements, including signs and pavement markings.
3. Install conspicuous notification signs within 500 feet of the intersection.
4. Conduct a public awareness program advising the public that the Photosafe Program is being expanded to the intersection.

It is anticipated that the expansion could be operational by late this year.

No County funds have been required to support this program. Redflex assumes the preliminary costs associated with expansion of the Photosafe Program (cameras, signs, engineering safety analysis, signs, etc.). Net revenue to the County from the Photosafe Program has been as follows:

December 2010 – June 30, 2011: \$45,544.12
July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012: \$91,261.70
July 1, 2012- June 30, 2013: \$57,270.22

This revenue is designated solely for traffic safety programs. The expansion of the Photosafe Program will continue to be supported by revenue from civil penalties assessed for violations of the Photosafe Ordinance, and any additional net revenue would be designated solely for traffic safety programs.

Upon meeting all of the County Code requirements, the County Executive intends to authorize the expansion of the Photosafe Program to include a traffic light signal photo-monitoring system at the intersection of Greenbrier Drive and Seminole Trail. This Executive Summary is being provided for informational purposes.

(Note: This item was pulled for discussion later in the meeting.)

Item No. 8.8. FY 2014 4th Quarter Cash Proffer Report, **was received for information.**

The executive summary states that in 2007, the Board directed staff to provide a quarterly report on the status of cash proffers. Since that time, the report has been expanded to also include updates on non-cash proffers. The Board received the last quarterly proffer report on May 7, 2014, which included information on cash proffer revenue and expenditures and non-cash proffers for January through March, 2014. This report includes all proffer activity (both cash and non-cash) for the fourth quarter of Fiscal Year 2014 (April-June). The next quarterly report will be on the Board's November 5, 2014 agenda.

Proffer Activity for Fiscal Year 2014 Fourth Quarter (April-June)

- A. New Proffered Revenue:** There were no rezoning requests approved this quarter that provided new cash proffers.
- B. Total Proffered Revenue:** Total proffered revenue is \$46,136,985.90. This reflects 2013 annual adjustments to anticipated proffer revenue (not received yet obligated) from proffers in which annual adjustments were proffered and the increase in new proffered revenue described above.
- C. 4th Quarter Cash Revenue:** The County received a total of \$223,183.55 from existing cash proffers during this quarter from the following developments:

DEVELOPMENT	TOTAL	INTENDED PURPOSE
Glenmore	\$2,300.00	Schools/Transportation
Livengood (Glenmore S5)	\$64,049.02	CIP
Livengood (Glenmore S5)	\$5,330.00	Affordable Housing
Old Trail	\$4,000.00	Crozet Parks/Schools
Estes Park	\$83,264.00	CIP
Willow Glenn	\$41,740.53	CIP
Wickham Pond II	\$22,500.00	CIP-Crozet
TOTAL	\$223,183.55	

Although not proffer funds, the County received \$15,000 for affordable housing programs from a special use permit condition for Kenridge (SP 2012-13).

- D. 4th Quarter Expenditures and Appropriations:** At the Board's June 4, 2014 meeting, a total of \$493,832 in proffer funds (as set forth below) were appropriated as part of the FY 15 Appropriation Resolution for the FY15 Adopted Budget.

DEVELOPMENT	TOTAL AMOUNT	PURPOSE
Albemarle Place (Stonefield)	\$329,632.87	Agnor Hurt Elementary School Addition
Willow Glenn	\$54,129.19	Agnor Hurt Elementary School Addition
Old Trail	\$34,018.99	Henley Middle School Addition
Wickham Pond	\$9,294.01	Henley Middle School Addition
Wickham Pond II	\$66,756.84	Henley Middle School Addition
TOTAL	\$493,831.90	

Current Available Funds: As of June 30, 2014, the available proffered cash on-hand is \$4,479,364.91 (including interest earnings on proffer revenue received). Some of these funds were proffered for specific projects while others may be used for general projects within the CIP. Of the available proffered cash on-hand, \$2,466,156.12 (including interest earned), is currently appropriated (Attachment A). The net cash balance is \$2,013,208.79 and Attachment B provides information on how the net cash balance may be used for future appropriations to CIP projects.

Cash proffers are a source of revenue to address impacts from development and they support the funding of important County projects which would otherwise be funded through general tax revenue. Using cash proffer funding for current or planned FY14–FY17 CIP projects builds capacity in the CIP by freeing up funding for other projects. In addition, non-cash proffers provide improvements that might otherwise need to be funded by general tax revenue.

The Community Development Department and Office of Management and Budget staff monitor proffer funds on an ongoing basis to ensure that associated projects not currently in the CIP move forward and to ensure that funding is appropriated to projects before any proffer deadlines.

Item No. 8.9. Office of Facilities Development Capital Projects Status Report, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.10. County Grant Application/Award Report, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.11. Board-to-Board, August 2014, *a monthly report from the Albemarle County School Board to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, **was received for information.***

Item No. 8.12. Albemarle County Broadband Task Force Update, **was received for information.**

The executive summary states that on September 4, 2013, the Board directed staff to research grant funding and other strategies to advance the availability of high speed internet to underserved areas of the County. On October 23, 2013, staff presented its research results to the Board, and the Board directed staff to proceed with a round table with telecommunications providers to obtain information regarding plans, ideas and known funding sources to help facilitate additional service installation in the underserved areas of the County and to identify barriers to providing services in underserved rural areas. The round table was held on October 23, 2013, and the outcomes of that round table were presented to the Board on January 8, 2014. The Board directed staff to proceed with a Broadband Task Force.

The Broadband Task Force met several times and presented findings to the Board on April 2, 2014 (Attachment A). The Board directed staff to proceed with a Citizen Survey.

The survey was conducted throughout May and June of 2014. The results from the survey are provided for informational purposes in Attachment B. The Broadband Task Force is continuing its work to complete its analysis of the survey results data, examine the merits of creating a Wireless or Broadband Service Authority in Albemarle County or in the region, analyze the Rural Broadband Experiments Order intended to advance the deployment of voice and broadband-capable networks in rural areas with support from the federal Connect America Fund, and finalize the comprehensive Task Force report.

Staff is preparing for a September 3, 2014 work session with the Board, at which time staff will present the Task Force report to the Board and will comprehensively review the effort to extend broadband internet services to underserved areas of the County. The agenda for the work session will include: the findings and significance of the Citizen Survey; opportunities and potential benefits associated with the school network infrastructure project; opportunities and challenges associated with "fixed" (i.e., cable/wires) and "mobile" (i.e., wireless/satellite) modes of providing broadband service; impacts of the state and local regulatory environment; and funding strategies, to include partnerships, grants and the formation of an authority. Staff will conclude with several options for the Boards consideration.

The only direct budget impact of moving forward as proposed would be the utilization of existing staff time.

This executive summary is provided for the Board's information. Staff recommends that the Board review the Broadband Citizen Survey Results in preparation for the September 3 work session.

Discussion: 8a. Expansion of the Photosafe Program to the intersection of Greenbrier Drive and Seminole Trail.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he would like to further discuss the Photo-Safe cameras with more inclusion of the public in those conversations, because the programs are being developed in a whole new context compared to when the ordinance was passed. He said that when it was passed, the program was designed to address safety at intersections, but now there is money available from VDOT to make some physical infrastructure changes to these intersections – with parallel roads making an impact. Mr. Sheffield emphasized that the Board needs to reengage the public to ensure they are making the decisions within the context that the ordinance was created in. He said that the second part of his concern is a request to hold off on implementing another red light camera, because he feels that implementing the US 29 projects in the timeline proposed will see a substantial change in the safety along that corridor. Mr. Sheffield said that the Rio Road intersection red-light camera will be eliminated, because that intersection would be going from 10 signal movements down to possibly only four, and at that point people's desire to run the red light is greatly reduced. He stated that people are passing through the Greenbrier intersection because they are coming off of Hillsdale Drive or coming off of Greenbrier, and with Hillsdale Drive extended project there will be less traffic making the connection onto Route 29. Mr. Sheffield emphasized that he would like to wait and see how the corridor improves prior to spending money on another camera.

Ms. Mallek said that after the projects are finished would be an appropriate time to reevaluate it, but the difference in traffic management and driver behavior at Rio Road now compared to before is astonishing – and she sees very concerning situations at Greenbrier on a regular basis, because that is part of her main drive route in town and out. She said that there is a lot more research that needs to be done before any decision is made, and there will be a public decision process after all the engineering and information-gathering happens. She said that she would rather continue with the driver education than stop and get back to where they are now later.

Mr. Sheffield stated that they will probably shut down the red-light cameras at Rio Road during construction because they will no longer be positioned correctly, and the County needs to consider that in 2015. He said that he disagrees with Ms. Mallek's position, because they are putting this out to address

safety but they are also making a lot of other transportation improvements, and he would like to see those implemented first.

Ms. Dittmar asked if there is any kind of penalty for deciding to discontinue at a certain point. Confirming with Chief Steve Sellers, Mr. Foley said that there is not.

Ms. Dittmar stated that the Board could accommodate both viewpoints and stop it as soon as they add new traffic improvements on Route 29, without a financial penalty. Mr. Foley said there is work that needs to be done in preparation to set that up, so there would be some loss of funds if the Board proceeds. Staff can research the amount and bring it back to the Board. He suggested that Chief Sellers might be able to provide those details.

Ms. Mallek also asked where the money has been used in the last couple of years.

Chief of Police, Steve Sellers said that their contract with the vendor is due to expire next year, so it would be part of the negotiation and discussion process. He said that in the past, during construction at intersections, they have shut down the photo red-light cameras for a period of time, without any penalty. Chief Sellers stated that he would work further with staff to determine exactly what that would be.

Mr. Boyd asked what the lead time would be in order to install the new red-light camera. Chief Sellers said that the traffic analysis and engineering study is already done for Greenbrier, with the vendor needing about two months to install it. He said that if they repeat the practices done with the first intersection, they would have a month of not fining anyone and testing the system – getting people familiar with it, putting the signage up, etc. Chief Sellers stated that he is not exactly sure of the construction timeframe on Route 29, but Mr. Sheffield has connected the Police Department with the planning group responsible for it, so they are now engaged in that discussion.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the impact of light synchronization on the photo red-light project, because his understanding is that the synchronization will account for the volume of traffic coming through during that yellow cycle – so it is trying to accommodate enough traffic so people do not have the desire to run the red light. He said that they need to get some clarity from VDOT or the vendor as to how the technologies communicate with each other. Chief Sellers said that they checked with the vendor on that question, and there is no impact as they are used to operating systems with synchronization-type traffic signals. It does not change anything in terms of what they need, and they do communicate with one another.

Ms. Mallek said that she would hope there would be fewer people having infractions which is the overall goal, and if they have more people accommodated with synchronized lights and the processes decrease, that would be a huge success factor.

Mr. Boyd stated that their original hope was a decrease in the number of people running red lights, not a goal for increased revenue. He expressed concern that during the construction period, it would aggravate the problem more than help it, as people might feel the need to run the lights to get through faster. Mr. Boyd said that if there is no penalty for them to move forward, he is in favor of doing it.

Mr. Sheffield said that the problems related to construction would not be limited just to these intersections. The Board needs to have another discussion related to investment in expanding the police force – or at least the traffic unit – to address the impacts of the neighborhoods and businesses, etc. He stated that it is not limited to intersections, and putting cameras up will not solve the dysfunction coming out of these construction projects, so they should take a broader look at this.

Ms. Dittmar said that this deserves a much longer discussion, and suggested that it be included under Mr. Sheffield's report for the Route 29 Advisory Panel.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would like to hear from Chief Sellers on this.

Chief Sellers said that as they progress along the geo-policing philosophy and right-sizing of the agency, the patrol officers that patrol those communities are the ones who are supposed to be writing the tickets. He stated that doubling up officers in some of those sectors is probably the best strategy. Chief Sellers added that his department has submitted a grant for a police team that would be solely dedicated to responding to community concerns, including gangs, traffic issues or other imminent problems.

Ms. McKeel asked if he had a sense of what happens to traffic during construction, or whether it is too individualized based on certain sections. Chief Sellers said that Mr. Sheffield is correct in his assessment that it would impact not only the Route 29 corridor but the surrounding neighborhoods and streets, where people will try to avoid slowdowns and construction concerns – which they will just have to be prepared to mitigate. The Police Department has a role in that process.

Ms. Mallek asked how the department has used the funds for safety training, etc. Chief Seller said that the funds from the Photo-Safe program are reinvested back into traffic safety. A traffic officer has been funded out of that fund, along with purchase of variable message boards for traffic safety, radar

and lidar units for patrol officers so that more can be deployed, and traffic surveying equipment that can measure traffic patterns, speeds, etc. to determine problems in the community and implement evidence-based solutions. Chief Sellers said that they have had great success with these measures by reducing the number of serious crashes and fatalities in the County over the last 3.5 years.

Ms. Mallek commented that in problem areas like Earlysville, there has been compelling evidence about people ignoring the speed limit – so the police can invest time for enforcement officers in that particular spot, rather than just relying on anecdotal information. She said that the reason the red-light camera intersections were chosen is because they were so difficult for a standard operating officer in a car to be able to chase after someone who is barreling through a red light and proceeding at a high speed. One of the reasons the Board decided to go to this method is because the enforcement is safer as well as being a deterrent to dangerous behavior.

Ms. Palmer said that they are going to be doing a large number of things in this corridor, and at some level it seems confusing to add another layer with a red-light camera. She asked Chief Sellers if he sees any safety issues with having this running at the same time as construction. Chief Sellers stated that he does not advocate running the red light when the construction goes into full swing along that corridor, as it adds some confusion to the drivers. The reason the department put off the intersection of US 250 and Route 20 was for some near-term construction and development around that intersection. He added that they would not advocate for keeping it running while the construction is underway, so they would shut it down.

Ms. Palmer said that they would start it up in three months, and then shut it down when appropriate, which could be as early as next spring.

Ms. Mallek said that it would change at Greenbrier anyway because of the work being done there.

Chief Sellers said he would need to learn more of the planning as it develops.

Mr. Sheffield said that he would like to wait for the installation, but also enhance public awareness of these decisions – as he has heard more about the plan for a Greenbrier camera because it is located in his district. There have been comments about the Board trying to “sneak this by” the public on the Consent Agenda. He stated that he has spoken with Mr. Foley about enhancing the outreach for this, perhaps even amending the ordinance to better communicate the intentions and reasoning behind this. Mr. Sheffield said that he wants to make sure the community is well-engaged so they feel they have been given input.

Ms. Mallek said that there are also a lot of people who have moved here since the ordinance was implemented, so they were not part of the original process. She added that all people have to do is stop for the light, so it is not an issue other than that.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the Board needs to take any action on this item.

Mr. Foley stated that staff did not want to proceed without Board input. Staff can bring back information on the issues of enhancing public awareness. He said that the ordinance says that based on the safety data, it would proceed forward.

Mr. Davis clarified that the ordinance mirrors the state-enabling legislation and does it through a process whereby they must put up signs and give a time period for implementation. He explained that the ordinance states that the Board authorizes the County Executive to implement up to 10 traffic light signals in the County, so technically there is no action required by the Board. This was added as an informational item to solicit Board input and provide direction to the County Executive.

Mr. Foley said that it is a project funded in the CIP, so if there is a desire not to proceed he would need that direction.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he would like for it to be a regular agenda item so the public can provide input. He added that he does not like taking action without proper notice.

Ms. Dittmar said that they were not actually voting on this item.

Ms. Mallek said they would essentially be voting to stop doing something, not voting to do something.

Mr. Foley said the Board does not need to vote to proceed with the red-light camera, but if there is a motion to change what would typically happen, that is where the action would occur.

Ms. Palmer said that she would like to give Mr. Sheffield more time to speak with people individually.

Ms. Dittmar stated that she would like to see the light go up and see people change their behavior, and have it go away if what Mr. Sheffield purports is correct. She said that in her mind, the clock is ticking, but if they feel that the public should make comment, the Board should respect that.

Ms. Mallek said that people can come talk to the Board and they can address this further in the future, but she would urge the Board to continue with what they already have on the books at the moment.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the Board wants to open up a dialog about the ordinance itself, because they have a process in place through the ordinance, then it should open it up for public comment.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he would assume that the majority of the Board would want to explore the public outreach aspects of the ordinance, so the issue is whether or not to move forward now with the Greenbrier camera. He said that it took almost a year for people to change their driving habits at the Rio intersection before they started seeing a decline, which started in 2013 and was significant by 2014.

Ms. Mallek said that is why she does not want to stop the process now, because they will lose that year and perhaps more lives in that time period.

Mr. Sheffield stated that the question is whether they need to start over again. He added that he believes they need to create a transportation system that best moves traffic so people do not feel like they need to violate the law in order to achieve their driving goals. He said that there are some simple changes they can make in the community so that people would stop running red lights and stop cutting through neighborhoods, but instead they are attaching the penalties for those behaviors rather than changing them.

Ms. Dittmar said that she wants to make sure they do not get penalized for ending the red-light camera usage, and perhaps they could reevaluate the need for it after the construction is done. She said that the contract is currently in extension, based on her understanding.

Mr. Sheffield suggested adding this item to a future agenda to give Mr. Foley direction by a vote.

Ms. Mallek explained that they have an ordinance in place and an active contract, and what they are in the process of negotiating is for 2015 going forward.

Mr. Davis said that the way the contract is set up is a "no-cost" contract to the County. The vendor recovers their costs first with the County getting any revenue beyond their set amount – but the County does not have to pay any costs. He said that going forward, the vendor would install the equipment and operate it at its cost, on a cost-sharing basis with the County getting money above that amount. Mr. Davis stated that he does not think there was a requirement that the County agree to extend the intersection under the photo-red camera for a set amount of time, but he would need to verify how that works in the contract.

Ms. McKeel stated that part of what they would be doing with community outreach is notifying people that it is happening.

Mr. Davis said that there is obvious signage that needs to be put up, there was news coverage of it, a period of time where people were given warnings rather than summonses – and a whole process in place stemming from the ordinance.

Mr. Foley said that examining the ordinance is a separate topic, to see if it needs to change. The issue before them is whether the Board wants to vote on this at the next meeting.

Mr. Davis said that the action the Board needs to take is to instruct the County Executive to defer action on the red-light camera until the Board considers it as an action item.

Mr. Sheffield **moved** for the Board to give the County Executive direction to defer this as an action item, until they can have further discussion.

Ms. Dittmar asked how soon they can get it back on the agenda. Mr. Foley said they could do it next week.

Ms. Palmer **seconded** the motion.

Ms. Dittmar said that she would like the motion to include the provision that the item go back on their agenda the following week.

Ms. McKeel agreed.

Mr. Sheffield **modified** his motion to include the provision that the item go back on their agenda the following week. As seconder, Ms. Palmer **agreed** to the amended motion. Roll was then called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd
NAYS: Ms. Mallek.

Discussion: B.F. Yancey Coalition for Intergenerational Programming.

Mr. Boyd said that he does not understand why the Board is getting involved with this item as a County government and not just letting it evolve by itself. Mr. Foley stated that the reason is because the effort that had gone before it identified some things that needed to be done, and it seems as though there was a desire for a group to advise the Board and County.

Mr. Boyd said that based on what he is reading, they were going to make this a Superintendent and County Executive project, which would eliminate the Yancey group from some needs, but after that they would choose their own members. He said that he does not understand why the Board has its finger in this pie, as the private sector should be free to move forward with this, with the County providing the facilities and additional custodial services.

Mr. Doug Walker, Assistant County Executive, stated that this is being presented as a hybrid approach, and there could be either less or more involvement on the part of the County – and what is being proposed is to create the coalition but allow them to appoint their own members, with their charge defined and attached in the staff report. He said that the group would be very self-directed. There will be no direct staff support other than what is already being provided through the work being done with the schools, Parks & Rec, Department of Social Services, and affiliated agencies like JABA. Mr. Walker said that this proposal is an outcome from the report generated and presented to the Board in April to authorize a one-time contribution of the \$10,000 for extended programming, and this provides a structure by which the work of that group can continue with some accountability and an annual report. He noted that other structures might be more appropriate for the Board or School Board to consider, but this plan seeks to provide some balance in accountability and self-direction.

Ms. Palmer said that this is a pretty complicated endeavor for this citizens' group to have taken on – with a lot of moving parts. It is valuable to have the County staff and Supervisors to be involved to some degree. She stated that she will probably be asking for the same kind of support to keep the building open next year, and she would like to hear a few words about the initiative from the Yancey Principal, who is present at the meeting.

Yancey Elementary School Principal Craig Dommer reported that the committee has continued working since reporting to the Board in December and April. The committee is focusing on fall programming to include a computer class and a "Baby Steps" program to provide parent interaction and organized play opportunities. He said that in meeting with Mr. Walker and members of the committee in deciding how to move forward, they felt that this approach would be best – both in transitioning responsibility to the work group and the private citizens, and knowing that the overall mission of the workgroup initially was to figure out how to provide public and private services from the school building.

Ms. Palmer said that at its strategic planning session, the Board identified lifetime learning as an important initiative, and that is one of the many programs they're trying to start at Yancey – so it is important that the County stay involved at some level and help as possible.

Mr. Boyd stated that there are other groups that have been operating in that area for some time, such as the Yancey Club, and they are self-sustaining. He said that he is trying to understand why the County's involvement should be anything beyond just knowing what is going on. Mr. Boyd stated that he sees this as a future expense and program for the County and does not know why they need to be further involved.

Ms. Palmer said that she would like the County to be involved and see how they can help.

Mr. Boyd said that she can personally be involved, as it is located in her district, but he does not see why the government has to interject itself into this process.

Ms. Palmer said they might find that they need to be involved from time to time.

Mr. Boyd commented that that means there is going to be some future expense on the part of the County.

Ms. Palmer added that the director of Club Yancey is running that club and also spearheading this initiative.

Mr. Dommer said that the staff that is currently down there is taking on quite a bit. The committee has discussed the possibility of new programs such as public safety, senior programs, etc. Some of the programming could be public in nature, so having both the School Board and the Board of Supervisors involved as far as getting a yearly report is the way to go for the time being. He stated that it might be

appropriate at a later time to distance the group itself from government involvement, if it takes on a more private sector approach.

Ms. Mallek asked if the group will have a 501(c)3 in place for the Yancey group. Mr. Dommer explained that there is a 501(c)3 there that is active for an old organization, and they are also working with CACF and nonprofit management to explore their best financial options.

Ms. Palmer then **moved** to approve the Yancey Coalition's Charter as set forth. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer and Mr. Sheffield.

NAYS: Mr. Boyd.

Mr. Boyd clarified that this is a good quality program, but he does not think the government should be involved in it as it could be handled the way that JABA and other agencies are handled.

(The Charter is set out below:)

B. F. Yancey Coalition for Intergenerational Programming in Southern Albemarle County

Charter

Purpose:

The purposes of the B. F. Yancey Coalition for Intergenerational Programming in southern Albemarle County ("The Yancey Coalition") are to promote the development and delivery of intergenerational programming at the Yancey school and in the southern Albemarle region; further the work of the B. F. Yancey Work Group as chartered by the Board of Supervisors and School Board in December, 2012 (see Appendix 1); identify and introduce new programs; identify and develop partnerships for programs and services; and solicit financial support from foundations, corporations, individuals and government for the creation and on-going operating of an Intergenerational Learning Center.

Primary Objectives:

1. To provide programs and services identified in the B.F. Yancey Report dated December, 2013 and to expand those programs and other intergenerational programming as deemed appropriate for southern Albemarle based on input from the community and within available resources.
2. To solicit financial support from foundations, corporations, non-profit organizations, individuals and governments for programming and facility needs; and to identify and develop an appropriate structure for receiving and managing funds.
3. To advise the Board of Supervisors and the School Board regarding intergenerational programming and service needs in southern Albemarle.
4. To identify, develop and implement meaningful and productive partnerships with private, public and non-profit entities engaged in intergenerational programming in southern Albemarle.
5. To work collaboratively with the County Schools' Building Services to identify current facility needs, and to coordinate with the County Schools' Long Range Planning Committee to plan for future facilities.
6. To communicate effectively by any and all means available with residents in southern Albemarle regarding available intergenerational programming and community services and to continue active dialogue within the region about community needs.

Structure and Membership

The Yancey Coalition shall be considered a Type I Organization as outlined in Albemarle County School Board Policy KG-AP.

The Yancey Coalition shall be self-governing and shall not be a formal entity created by either the Board of Supervisors or the School Board. The members of The Yancey Coalition shall be appointed initially by the County Executive and School Superintendent jointly and at their discretion and shall be comprised primarily of individuals appointed previously to serve on the B. F. Yancey Work Group. The Yancey Coalition may appoint other Albemarle County residents to serve as members as it sees fit.

Timeline

The Yancey Coalition is expected to develop its own timeline as it proceeds with its work.

Communication with the Boards

The Yancey Coalition shall provide a written Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors and School Board. The Coalition may report to the Board more frequently as deemed necessary or appropriate.

Expectations for on-going Support

Dedicated County staff support is not available for this effort. Rather, The Yancey Coalition is empowered to be self-directed and self-supporting with the recognition that County government partners are and will remain engaged in the activities of The Yancey Coalition as a natural and normal part of service to the community. Specific County partners providing relevant programs and services in the community include the B. F. Yancey Elementary School administration, Club Yancey, School Administration, County Department of Parks and Recreation, County Department of Social Services, County Executive's Office.

Other active partners include but may not be limited to the Jefferson Area Board on Aging (JABA).

Appendix 1

Background

In December 2012, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors and the School Board approved a charter for a work group to address the decline in student enrollment at the B.F. Yancey Elementary School and the desire to maximize use of the building beyond traditional classroom use and to improve services to the citizens of southern Albemarle County within the capacity of this school building.

The Albemarle School Board and Board of Supervisors charged the Yancey Work Group with five primary objectives:

1. Identify service needs of the southern Albemarle community including review of existing needs assessments and other data compiled by the County and other community partners over the past 5 -10 years.
2. Develop recommendations for enhanced use of the school building. Ideas for strategies might include first identifying how much and what kind of space may be available, identifying any restrictions on the use within the building and identifying activities/programs that are aligned with continuing the building as an elementary school.
3. Identify other individuals, entities, and/or organizations already engaged in or interested in enhanced service delivery, and to determine feasibility for public/private partnerships to support program development.
4. Conduct research into best practice models where successful programs or uses have been identified and implemented.
5. Research avenues of possible funding support for model programs, including foundations with interest in enhanced service delivery in settings such as the Yancey Elementary School.

On December 12, 2013, the Yancey Work Group presented their final report to the Board of Supervisors and the School Board that identified these needs for the southern Albemarle Community.

- After School Programs for Youth
- Workforce Skills
- Childcare for infants/toddlers
- Esmont and Scottsville Senior Centers and Support
- Access to Technology
- Mental and Physical Health Programming

To meet these needs the B. F. Yancey Work Group made these five recommendations in the final report:

1. That the negotiations on land purchase and septic upgrades required for current and future use be completed by the beginning of the 2014-15 school year.
2. That Albemarle pursue the creation of an intergenerational learning center to be housed at B.F. Yancey Elementary School that would provide space for local agencies to deliver needed services for the southern Albemarle community.
3. That the pursuit of the center be implemented in three phases to consist of the following time frames and actions:
 - a. Phase I – January 1, 2014- August 1, 2014; Athletic programs sponsored by Yancey Tennis Boosters, a recreation basketball program, parenting classes,

- health information sessions, and an open technology lab will be held during normal operating hours when class is not in session using current facilities. The school principal, the director of Club Yancey, the Office of Community Engagement, the Department of Parks and Recreation and the Department of Social Services will help to coordinate these efforts using current staffing.
- b. Phase II – August 1, 2014 – August 1, 2015; Programs from Phase I will continue. In addition, adult classes involving technological and workforce skills will be conducted. Additional health programs will be offered as well as additional classes for toddlers and early learning. Mental health services and programs for the aging population will be sought from community partners. The school principal, the Office of Community Engagement, and the Department of Social Services will help to coordinate these efforts. The Club Yancey Director position should be made the Director of these programs for Phase II. This position's salary should be moved into the County Budget.
 - c. Phase III August 1, 2015, The addition to the current building in the Capital Improvement Plan is expanded to create more space, as outlined in Chapter 5 of this report for community agencies to run and coordinate their own programs throughout the school day in addition to after school, evenings, and weekends. The Director of Intergenerational Programming of Albemarle position is created. The new Director collaborates with the school principal, the Office of Community Engagement, and outside agencies to run programs including Club Yancey.
4. That an ongoing fundraising committee be appointed to work with County staff in the implementation of this plan and to solicit foundation, corporate, government and individual donors who have an interest in the future of southern Albemarle in order to raise money for building, programming, and the establishment of a foundation to provide future funding.
 5. That the Long Range Planning Committee meet with the Leadership Team of the workgroup, Building Services Staff, and a representative from the County Executive's office and the School Superintendent's office to design and attain a cost estimate of increasing the project currently in the Capital Improvement

Since the submission of the final report, a wide variety of programs has been established or expanded that provide the foundation for the intergenerational programming including:

- *Social Services Day* – provides resource and benefit information to the community in partnership with Albemarle County Department of Social Services.
- *Open Doors Learning Catalog* - An informational publication of ongoing activities at Yancey and community events throughout southern Albemarle in partnerships with Community Education.
- *Veggie Village* – Grant awarded to Club Yancey by Quick Start Tennis and Piedmont Master Gardens that provides Club Yancey participants opportunities to enhance gardening skills and grow vegetables.
- *Thomas Jefferson Gardening Club* works with Club Yancey participants to plant flowers and make landscape improvements to the school.
- *Weekly reading and one-on-one tutoring* in partnership with Jefferson Area Board for Aging (JABA) and the Scottsville JABA Senior Center.
- *Quick Start Tennis* –Basic tennis for adults and children of all ages sponsored by a QuickStart Tennis Grant.
- *Introduction to Computers* – Beginner class for adults to learn and/or improve computer skills in partnership with Adult Education.
- *Baby Steps* – Drop-in playgroup for infants to school-age children in partnerships with Club Yancey, southern Albemarle Intergenerational Community, organized community volunteers and the Southern Albemarle Family Practice.
- *Open Gym* – Open on weekends to all ages in partnership with the Albemarle County Parks and Recreation Department.
- *Cyber Sundays* – Community Internet access in the school in partnership with the Southern Albemarle Intergenerational Community Committee and Club Yancey.

Non-Agenda Item. The Board recessed at 10:50 a.m. and reconvened at 11:01 a.m.

Agenda Item No. 9. PUBLIC HEARING: **14-03(1) – Agricultural and Forestal Districts** – Ordinance to amend Division 2, Districts, of Article II, Districts of Statewide Significance, of Chapter 3, Agricultural and Forestal Districts, of the Albemarle County Code, as specified below:

- a) **AFD-2014-1 Eastham AFD – District Review.** The proposed ordinance would amend Section 3-212, Eastham Agricultural and Forestal District, to continue the district for all parcels identified in the ordinance, to set the next district review deadline date of August

6, 2024, and to remove any parcels for which a request for withdrawal is received before the Board acts on the proposed ordinance.

- b) **AFD-2014-2 Pasture Fence Mountain AFD – District Review.** The proposed ordinance would amend Section 3-225, Pasture Fence Mountain Agricultural and Forestal District, to continue the district for all parcels identified in the ordinance, to set the next district review deadline date of August 6, 2024, and to remove any parcels for which a request for withdrawal is received before the Board acts on the proposed ordinance.
- c) **AFD02014-3 North Fork Moorman’s River AFD – District Review.** The proposed ordinance would amend Section 3-223, North Fork Moorman’s River Agricultural and Forestal District, to continue the district for all parcels identified in the ordinance, to set the next district review deadline date of August 6, 2024, and to remove any parcels for which a request for withdrawal is received before the Board acts on the proposed ordinance.
(Advertised in the Daily Progress on July 21 and July 28, 2014.)

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that localities are enabled to establish agricultural and forestal districts (“AFD’s”) under the Agricultural and Forestal Districts Act (Virginia Code § 15.2-4300). AFD’s serve two primary purposes: (1) to conserve and protect agricultural and forestal lands; and (2) to develop and improve agricultural and forestal lands. Land within an AFD is prohibited from being developed to a more intensive use, other than a use resulting in more intensive agricultural or forestal production, without prior approval of the Board. The trade-off is that the County is prohibited from exercising its zoning power in a way that would unreasonably restrict or regulate farm structures or farming and forestry practices in contravention of the Agricultural and Forestal Districts Act unless those restrictions or regulations bear a direct relationship to public health and safety (Virginia Code § 15.2-4312).

Localities may establish districts of statewide significance (Virginia Code § 15.2-4300 *et seq.*) and districts of local significance (Virginia Code § 15.2-4400). The County has a robust AFD program, with 26 districts of statewide significance and one district of local significance. (County Code § 3-100 *et seq.*). These AFDs comprise a total of 71, 237 acres.

AFD’s are established by an ordinance adopted by the Board on the petition of participating landowners. A new AFD must have a minimum core of 200 acres in a single parcel or in contiguous parcels. (Virginia Code § 15.2-4305). A parcel not part of the core may be included in an AFD under certain circumstances prescribed by State law. A landowner may petition to add its land to an AFD at any time (Virginia Code § 15.2-4310). AFD’s are periodically reviewed by the locality, and the Board has set a 10-year review period for all AFD’s in the County. During the review period, any landowner may request to withdraw his lands from an AFD until the Board acts on the AFD review. (Virginia Code § 15.2-4311). At any time other than during an AFD’s review, land may be withdrawn from the district only for good and reasonable cause (Virginia Code § 15.2-4314).

There are possible tax advantages for having land within an AFD. Land within an AFD and used in agricultural or forestal production *automatically qualifies* for use-value assessment if the requirements for that assessment are satisfied. Also, land within an AFD that is devoted to open-space is *eligible* for use-value assessment for open space if the requirements for that assessment are satisfied. Otherwise, to qualify for open space use value, such land must be in a permanent open space easement or under an open space use agreement.

District Reviews

Virginia Code § 15.2-4311 requires the periodic review of agricultural and forestal districts (AFD) to determine whether they should continue, be modified, or be terminated unless the Board determines that review is unnecessary. During the review process, land within the District may be withdrawn at the owner’s request by filing a written notice with the Board any time before the Board acts on the review. In addition, Virginia Code § 15.2-4311 requires that the Board conduct a public hearing on AFD reviews, and that they also be reviewed by both the Agricultural and Forestal District Advisory Committee and the Planning Commission for their recommendations.

Eastham AFD

The Eastham AFD, which was created in 1985 and currently includes 21 parcels and 1,001 acres, is undergoing its periodic ten-year review. This AFD is located along Route 20, just south of its intersection with Proffit Road. No 4-03(1) Agricultural and Forestal Districts; the periodic review of the Eastham AF District, the North Fork Moorman’s River AF District, and the Pasture Fence Mountain AF District requests for withdrawal have been received to-date. The Advisory Committee and the Planning Commission reviewed the Eastham AFD and recommend the continuation of the AFD. The Eastham AFD staff report to the Planning Commission is attached (Attachment B).

North Fork Moorman’s River AFD

The North Fork Moorman’s River AFD, which was created in 1993 and currently includes 4 parcels and 270.5 acres, is undergoing its periodic ten-year review. This AFD is located at the headwaters of the North Fork Moorman’s River, adjacent to the Shenandoah National Park. No requests for withdrawal have been received to-date. The Advisory Committee and the Planning Commission reviewed the North Fork Moorman’s River AFD and recommend the continuation of the AFD. The North Fork Moorman’s River AFD staff report to the Planning Commission is attached (Attachment B).

Pasture Fence Mountain

The Pasture Fence Mountain AFD, which was created in 1993 and currently includes 7 parcels and 1,247 acres, is undergoing its periodic ten-year review. This AFD is located in the northwestern portion of the County, just to the east of the North Fork Moorman's River. No requests for withdrawal have been received to-date. The Advisory Committee and the Planning Commission reviewed the Pasture Fence Mountain AFD and recommend the continuation of the AFD. The Pasture Fence Mountain AFD staff report to the Planning Commission is attached (Attachment B).

Eastham AFD

The Eastham AFD primarily consists of forest and open pasture. Of the 1,001 acres in the District, there are currently 587 acres under conservation easement. There are also 524.30 acres in Agricultural Land Use and 414.54 acres in Forestry Land Use. In addition to agriculture and forestry, there are approximately 26 dwellings in the District (this includes secondary dwellings). Conservation of this area will help maintain the environmental integrity of the County and aid in the protection of ground and surface water, agricultural soils, mountain resources, critical slopes, and wildlife habitat.

North Fork Moorman's River AFD

The North Fork Moorman's River AFD primarily consists of forest on slopes of twenty-five (25) percent or greater, with a few small open areas. There are currently no parcels in the District under conservation easement. The entire 270.5 acres in the District are in Forestry Land Use. There are no dwellings in the District. Conservation of this area will help maintain the environmental integrity of the County and aid in the protection of ground and surface water, agricultural soils, mountain resources, critical slopes, and wildlife habitat. The District lies partly in the watershed of the Sugar Hollow Reservoir and partly in the watershed of the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir.

Pasture Fence Mountain AFD

The Pasture Fence Mountain AFD primarily consists of forest. There are currently no parcels in the District under conservation easement. Of the 1,247 acres in the District, there are 1,131 acres in Forestry Land Use. In addition to forestry, there is one dwelling in the District. Conservation of this area will help maintain the environmental integrity of the County and aid in the protection of ground and surface water, agricultural soils, mountain resources, critical slopes, and wildlife habitat. The District lies partly in the watershed of the Sugar Hollow Reservoir and partly in the watershed of the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir.

There is no budget impact.

After conducting public hearings on the proposed AFD reviews, which may be held together as one public hearing, staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached ordinance to continue the Eastham, the Pasture Fence Mountain, and the North Fork Moorman's River AFDs.

Mr. Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning, addressed the Board, stating that there are three districts for the Board's review, all for renewals. The Eastern District is located along Route 20 and to the south of Proffit Road, totaling about 1,000 acres, with no withdrawal requests. The North Fork Moorman's District is located next to the Shenandoah National Park and at the headwaters of the North Fork Moorman's River, at just over 270 acres and no withdrawal requests. The Pasture Fence Mountain District is located next to Shenandoah National Park, and the Pasture Fence Mountain is located in the northwestern part of the County, at approximately 1,250 acres and no withdrawal requests. Mr. Cilimberg said that the recommendations from staff, the Ag/Forestry Advisory Committee, and the Planning Commission are for renewal of each of the districts for a period of 10 years. The Board has been provided with an ordinance in their packets requiring their action.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Neil Williamson, President of the Free Enterprise Forum, said he has no opinion about these amendments but finds it interesting that when these items come up they have a public hearing, yet when conservation easements are granted there is no such public hearing. He said that they consider it a flaw in state law that should be considered as to whether public hearings should be held, as conservation easements do impact their neighbors, both positively and negatively.

There being no further public comment, the Chair closed the public hearing and asked for Board discussion.

Ms. Mallek noted that the essence of the action is to extend the time period for 10 years. She thanked the landowners who have been involved in the districts – many of whom have been engaged for more than 20 years, especially the properties in the watershed where they are forested properties as they provide great ecological services to the community.

Ms. Mallek then **moved** to adopt the proposed ordinance as presented. Ms. Palmer **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

(The adopted ordinance is set out in full below:)

ORDINANCE NO. 14-3(1)

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN CHAPTER 3, AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICTS, ARTICLE II, DISTRICTS OF STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE, DIVISION 2, DISTRICTS, OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE, VIRGINIA.

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, that Chapter 3, Agricultural and Forestal Districts, Article II, Districts of Statewide Significance, Division 2, Districts, of the Code of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, is hereby amended and reordained as follows:

By Amending:

Sec. 3-212 Eastham Agricultural and Forestal District
Sec. 3-223 North Fork Moorman's River Agricultural and Forestal District
Sec. 3-225 Pasture Fence Mountain Agricultural and Forestal District

**CHAPTER 3. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICTS
ARTICLE II. DISTRICTS OF STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE
DIVISION 2. DISTRICTS**

Sec. 3-212 Eastham Agricultural and Forestal District.

The district known as the "Eastham Agricultural and Forestal District" consists of the following described properties: Tax map 46, parcels 91B, 91C, 91E; tax map 63, parcels 1, 1A, 1A1, 2, 4, 14G, 14H, 14I, 26, 26A, 27, 28, 28A, 30F, 30G, 41A, 41A1, 41A2. This district, created on October 2, 1985 for not more than 10 years and last reviewed on August 6, 2014, shall next be reviewed prior to August 6, 2024.

(12-8-93; 5-11-94; Code 1988, § 2.1-4(c); Ord. 98-A(1), 8-5-98; Ord. 04-3(2), 4-14-04; Ord. 09-3(4), 12-2-09)

Sec. 3-223 North Fork Moorman's River Agricultural and Forestal District.

The district known as the "North Fork Moorman's River Agricultural and Forestal District" consists of the following described properties: Tax map 4, parcels 1, 2, 3, 4. This district, created on November 17, 1993 for not more than 10 years and last reviewed on August 6, 2014, shall next be reviewed prior to August 6, 2024.

(11-17-93; Code 1988, § 2.1-4(v); Ord. 98-A(1), 8-5-98; Ord. 04-3(2), 4-14-04)

Sec. 3-225 Pasture Fence Mountain Agricultural and Forestal District.

The district known as the "Pasture Fence Mountain Agricultural and Forestal District" consists of the following described properties: Tax map 13, parcels 1, 5, 8, 10, 12. This district, created on November 17, 1993 for not more than 10 years and last reviewed on August 6, 2014, shall next be reviewed prior to August 6, 2024.

(11-17-93; 7-13-94; Code 1988, § 2.1-4(u); Ord. 98-A(1), 8-5-98; Ord. 04-3(2), 4-14-04)

Agenda Item No. 10. **Appeal of ARB Decision:** ARB-2014-024. New Hope Church (*deferred from July 9, 2014*).

Ms. Margaret Maliszewski, Principal Planner, addressed the Board, stating that this item was deferred from the Board's July 9 meeting, at which time they considered a landscape plan that was revised to address the concerns expressed at the June meeting. She said that the plan meets the conditions of the previous ARB approval, and is consistent with the Entrance Corridor design guidelines. Ms. Maliszewski said that what is before the Board is a resolution in support of the landscape plan. Staff recommends adoption of the resolution.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was further information on precedent to provide. Mr. Davis said that staff has provided that information to the Board, and he does not feel that there needs to be further discussion.

Ms. Mallek stated that there has been a very successful meeting with the applicants and a discussion with neighbors as to the future site plan – which was purely voluntary and not linked to the ARB decision – and she was very pleased at this level of engagement. She said that they are beginning to build a good atmosphere of trust on the project. The applicants are also investigating doing something

on the VDOT property to enhance the buffering – which would be even more beneficial to the Route 29 view.

The Chair opened the meeting for public comments.

Mr. Chuck Boldt addressed the Board, stating that he lives at 5260 Piney Mountain Road. On Monday, he emailed each Board member an analysis of the proposed resolution. Mr. Boldt said that they have made some progress, but have not confirmed what was agreed upon the previous week. He asked the Board to defer action until they have a set of plans that represents a consensus. He stated that another week will also allow the Board to get an independent opinion as to whether the process and guidelines were followed with regard to disturbance of critical slopes. Mr. Boldt said that staff told the Board at its last meeting that it had reviewed the matter for general accord and made proper administrative decisions, but he disagrees that a 2:1 is in general accord with a 3:1 slope. The motion before the Board is to confirm the original staff recommendation. He stated that Mr. Graham is asking that the Board trust Community Development's determination with the knowledge that once they act on the ARB appeal, Mr. Boldt's status as an aggrieved party expires and the Board has no further input. He said that his appeal is nothing more than a request for an independent certification that the required processes were followed, and he hopes that the Board will consider changing them in the long term. Mr. Boldt stated that after the last Board meeting, he attempted to review the County Attorney's opinion, but Mr. Davis was unable to share it with him because it is considered a confidential document. He said that while the Board does not need to insert itself into every land dispute, this is one of those times when they do need to be involved because it is so important. He again asked the Board to defer action on this request.

Mr. Mike Henderson, Pastor of New Hope Church, addressed the Board and stated that they have done everything they can – exceeding requirements – and are hoping to begin planting in the fall. Mr. Henderson said that the site is just sitting, which has prompted people to ask them if the church has run out of money. He stated that they are trying to get the entrance looking as good as possible, but they need to move ahead with their site plan in order to do so.

Ms. Dittmar said that she visited the site with Mr. Boldt and Mr. Henderson, and feels that the Board needs to narrowly focus on what they are looking at with regard to the ARB's actions. She said that she wants to underscore her hope that discussions will continue and that trust will be built as the applicant and appellant will be neighbors for a very long time.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to adopt the resolution as presented. Ms. Palmer **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.

NAYS: None.

(Note: The resolution as adopted is set out in full below:)

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Albemarle County Architectural Review Board ("ARB") approved a certificate of appropriateness for New Hope Church (the "Church") for the site improvements on the portion of Tax Map and Parcel Number 02100-00-00-012C1 within the Entrance Corridor Overlay District ("ARB 2014-024") on April 7, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the ARB's decision was appealed to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors pursuant to Albemarle County Code § 18-30.6.8 by Charles M. Boldt (the "Appellant") and the Board considered his appeal on June 11, 2014, July 9, 2014 and August 6, 2014; and

WHEREAS, after the June 11, 2014 Board meeting, the Church submitted a revised landscape plan for the Board's consideration at its July 9, 2014 meeting, and the revised landscape plan is identified as Sheets L1.1 Landscape Plan New Hope Church and L2.1 Landscape Details New Hope Church, both prepared by Albiston Associates, last revised 6-25-2014, (the "Revised Landscape Plan"); and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered the issues raised by the Appellant and County staff's analysis of those issues, County staff's analysis of the landscape plan approved by the ARB and the Revised Landscape Plan and their consistency with the applicable design guidelines, and has given due consideration to the decision of the ARB.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that upon consideration of the foregoing, and because the Revised Landscape Plan is consistent with the applicable design guidelines, in particular Design Guidelines 7, 8 and 33, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves a certificate of appropriateness for ARB 2014-024, subject to the condition that the landscaping installed shall be as it is illustrated on the Revised Landscape Plan.

Agenda Item No. 11. Follow-up to Board of Supervisors' Retreat Priorities Discussion. (Due to agenda schedule this item was moved to follow Agenda Item 22).

Agenda Item No. 12. Reuse of the Old Jail.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that Albemarle County's historic Old Jail was originally constructed in 1876, with the jailor's house and wall added in 1886. The two buildings total 5,527 square feet. The jail closed in 1974, and the jailer's house was last used as a construction office during the renovation of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court building from 2009 to 2010. Recent maintenance of the structures has focused on preventing their further deterioration, at an average annual cost of \$10,541. The maintenance has included exterior painting, vegetation and pest control, and lead paint abatement. An Engineering study of the facilities, including a general condition assessment, was completed in 2006. Since May 2011, there has been ongoing monitoring of the jail wall.

Steven Meeks, the President of the Albemarle Charlottesville Historical Society, has submitted a proposal (Attachment A) for the reuse of the historic Albemarle County jail. The Historical Society proposes to lease the Old Jail from the County with the intention of rehabilitating the facility for use as a museum. Mr. Meeks has prepared a presentation addressing the programming, rehabilitation, and funding aspects of the proposal for presentation to the Board on August 6.

If the Board agrees to consider leasing the Old Jail to the Historical Society, staff will provide a budget analysis at a future Board meeting, once a proposed lease has been provided to the County for consideration.

Staff recommends that the Board direct staff to collaborate with the Historical Society to develop an acceptable lease for consideration by the Board at a future meeting.

Mr. George Shadman, Director of General Services, said that the old jail facility was built in 1876 and served as a jail until 1974. Except for a few minor temporary uses it has for the most part sat idle. Mr. Shadman said that General Services invests about \$10,500 per year to keep the facility from further deteriorating; they do pest control, lime care, painting of exterior and minor repairs to both interior and exterior. He stated that they have an ongoing project with a local engineering firm to monitor and regularly report on the stability of the exterior wall and sally-port. For several years there has been a desire to find a use for the facility that would benefit the community and Mr. Steven Meeks recently submitted a proposal to the County Executive's office for potential reuse of the jail and the jailer's house, and that submittal is an attachment to the executive summary.

Ms. Mallek asked if the engineering supervision would continue as far as the structural integrity. Mr. Shadman said that he would recommend that and has been budgeting for it.

Mr. Steven Meeks, President of the Albemarle-Charlottesville Historical Society addressed the Board. He said that their efforts are not only to preserve the jail, but to give it a reuse. He said that most of the old jails around the state have been repurposed as a museum of some kind – highlighting the history of the community. Charlottesville/Albemarle is the only community in Virginia that does not have a museum devoted to telling the story of the area. Mr. Meeks said that they have some smaller exhibits in the old McIntire Library, but using the jail would fulfill the museum need while providing the County with a reuse for the facility. He stated that in giving jail tours in the past, there has always been an excitement to see the inside of the building. When they give walking tours around Court Square, the guests are very excited to see the inside of the courthouse and also excited to see the front of the jail. Mr. Meeks said that visitors would like to see more than just Monticello, the Downtown Mall and wineries, and there are not that many places that are readily open and available for guests to see, so the jail could be a very vital part of interpretation and history of Court Square. The jail has the potential to be a major attraction to the community. He stated that the Historical Society's proposal is to utilize the entire complex – the jailer's house, the jail, the courtyard. Albemarle is unique in that it has a jailer's house and is the only jail in the state that has a wall around the building.

Mr. Meeks said that they have communicated with the Virginia Tourism and the Charlottesville-Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau, and they are all supportive of having another attraction in the community. He stated that this needs to be a public-private partnership, and he hopes that the County will also work to help fulfill these goals. He said that the Historical Society has demonstrated an ability to work with the County on other projects, such as the Hatton Ferry, now in their fifth year of running it. The Ferry was costing taxpayers and now is being run without any burden to taxpayers of the County or the state. Mr. Meeks noted that the Society has installed an interpretive exhibit at the ferry site, and one at Rio Hill to highlight the Civil War skirmish that took place there. The Historical Society would like to continue developing its relationship with the County.

Ms. Palmer said that she appreciates the tour of the jail and thinks it is wonderful that they are taking on the project as it's an important place to preserve, but it seems a bit peculiar to her to tell the story of the community in a jail. She stated that they have a wonderful facility available already in the old library, and she would prefer that the story be told there rather than the jail – and wondered if the Historical Society had considered using both spaces.

Mr. Meeks said that they have a major research library at the McIntire building, which is considered a branch of the Jefferson-Madison Regional Library. They also house a large museum collection in that building but they do not have a place to display it. He stated that they will continue to rotate the smaller exhibits in that building, but their envision for the jail complex is a more permanent static display. Mr. Meeks said that unlike other communities, they would not tell the story of the County in the jail itself; it would be reserved to the jailer's house, so it is more of a house museum. He stated that Palmyra has a jail museum and another house next to it that they utilize, so the idea is to repurpose the jailer's house here. Mr. Meeks said that he has been to nearly one-half the counties in the state to see what they are doing, and having that separate facility will help the Society flesh out the mission to help present and preserve the history of the community – so the jail and the library will complement each other.

Ms. Dittmar said that there are site-specific museums at Monticello and Ash Lawn, and in the Rotunda, but this would be a general one to honor the County's heritage. This is a building that needs some attention and it would be terrific if the County could get buy-in from citizens as the Historical Society fundraises.

Mr. Boyd stated that it takes special guided tours now to see the museum because of structural issues, and he recalls from past discussions that this is going to be an expensive undertaking just to make it safe. He asked what kind of money they thought would be needed to make those improvements. Mr. Meeks said that there are a few estimates that would cover everything to bring the building up to the desired standards as a finished product, including exhibits and displays. The cost would total around \$1.0 million – with a 50/50 split between building renovation costs and exhibits.

Mr. Boyd asked if he felt they could raise that kind of money. Mr. Meeks stated that it will not happen overnight. They are looking at it as a multi-year project that they can phase in, and they hope to work with County staff moving forward.

Mr. Boyd noted that discussion of the jail also came up in their discussion of the courts project, and several people in the legal community mentioned that location for a parking garage – but he would prefer that the jail be maintained. Mr. Meeks said that discussion like that tends to come up when a property is not being utilized, and hopefully the attitude will change when people see the property getting a new lease on life.

Ms. Dittmar stated that staff's recommendation is to direct them to collaborate with the Historical Society to develop an acceptable lease.

Mr. Boyd said that he is in favor of it as long as it is not requiring County funds. Given other CIP priorities – including the courts – he does not think the Board could help out much with the \$1.0 million. Mr. Meeks said that he would like for the County to continue to set aside the small allocation as it is now for incidentals.

Board members agreed. Ms. McKeel noted that the amount was \$10,000.

Ms. Dittmar agreed and said that is the landlord's responsibility.

Mr. Foley said staff could bring that back in the lease. The issue of any capital costs would be a future discussion separate from any action the Board takes today.

Ms. Mallek stated that one thing that makes this agency appropriate is that it has expertise working with historic properties and know how to do it right.

Ms. Palmer **moved** to direct staff to work with the Historical Society to develop an acceptable lease for consideration by the Board at a future meeting. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 13. 2015 Legislative Priorities and Meeting with State Legislators. *(Due to agenda schedule this item was moved to follow Agenda Item 20).*

Agenda Item No. 14. VDOT Monthly Report.

Mr. Joel DeNunzio, VDOT Residency Administrator, addressed the Board, stating that Ms. Teresa Gardner from the Traffic Operations Center and Mr. Grant Sanders of the Staunton office were also present and would talk about the adaptive signal process.

Mr. DeNunzio reported that due to the Route 29 Solutions project, VDOT has moved some people around – and permitting and land use are now located out of the Charlottesville residency for Albemarle and Greene counties. He said that from 2009 until last week, people had to go to Zion Crossroads to get a permit, but now they can go to Charlottesville to get a permit for driveways and entrances, and all land review will be done out of that office too. Mr. DeNunzio stated that they have hired a program manager for the Route 29 Solutions project, who is also based in the Charlottesville residency, and several Culpeper residency personnel are also assigned to focus on this project. The staff will include the project manager for the Rio Road grade separation and the program manager who oversees everything. He noted that there will also be two assistants to the project manager who will be doing various tasks. Most of the items related to the project were being managed out of the Charlottesville residency.

Mr. DeNunzio reported that there is lots of work underway on the medians on Route 29 to address five failing culverts resulting from the rains in May. They have already completed two culvert replacements on Route 29 South near the I-64 interchange and the Hunt Country Lane culvert. He said that as of September, they will finish the Lewis & Clark culvert and will move onto a project near Ashwood Boulevard, with all of the replacements being “jack and bore” projects that are fairly straightforward and are done with an effort to minimize traffic disruptions.

Mr. DeNunzio stated that with the Route 29 widening projects, the plan is to make these urban typical sections with curb and gutter, similar to what is found at Hollymead and south of the River up to Polo Grounds Road. He said that in the RFP, on which the contract will be based for the whole package of projects, VDOT plans to put the requirement that sidewalks will be on both sides of Route 29 for the entire project – but it is critical that they stay on time and under budget. He stated that if the sidewalk concrete takes them over budget, since the most critical section is the eastern side of the road in the developed areas, they will put the request in for the entire sidewalk, and will start by removing sections on the western side first – with the minimum being to keep the section from Ashwood Boulevard to Hollymead. Mr. DeNunzio said that he believes they can get all of them in, but want to have a contingency plan.

Ms. Mallek said that it is perfectly appropriate not to do the west side in the section between the lights at Hollymead and Polo Grounds. Mr. DeNunzio said the plan is to do them all in order to get a better price, but they will remove sections if the project starts going over budget.

Mr. David Benish, Chief of Planning, noted that there is a section on the west side from the Kohl's development to the Hollymead intersection for which they have received some proffers and design commitments, but that priority is the east side up to the town center. He said that as this goes to bid, the contractors will work with VDOT and the County to set priorities in order to ensure that the most important sections are built first.

Ms. Mallek asked if the developer has already provided a proffer to cover the County's construction of the sidewalk from Kohl's heading south. Mr. Benish said that they provided a cash proffer towards the improvements. He said he is not sure if it has been provided yet or is there for the County to ask for – and there are also greenway design concepts that went out to that road to make a connection.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the proffer money then goes over to VDOT to satisfy their contractor. Mr. Benish said that it goes to the County and then could be conveyed to VDOT, but he is not sure of the details beyond the fact they have the commitment for the developer to participate in sidewalk improvements along the Route 29 corridor.

Ms. Palmer asked if there is any landscape money involved with this. Mr. DeNunzio said that landscaping will be included as part of the RFP, but where they fit in the typical sections is hard to determine.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification of the sidewalk locations on both sides of the Route 29 project. Mr. DeNunzio stated that the sidewalk would go from Polo Grounds Road to just south of Hollymead, and even if the sidewalks are removed the platforms would still be there because of the urban section design – so proffers might easily get those completed in the future.

Ms. Mallek commented that there is not a sidewalk now on the east side between the cemetery and Hollymead, so that would be the most important side all the way up. She added that she hopes they will put some trees in the medians as it is safer to have them in place if cars cross over the lanes of traffic.

Mr. DeNunzio said that the northbound lanes will be widened to the inside as much as possible. The areas that have guard rails currently that will still have steep slopes are the areas in which it is easiest to keep the existing trees in place. He stated that VDOT will need to see the plans, as there will be a lot of vertical changes out there also. He explained that Berkmar is a four-lane right of way. They are going to build two lanes of it. As part of the ultimate section of the four lanes, they will be building the two northbound lanes as two way traffic. The eastern side of those lanes will not be affected by any future construction. Mr. DeNunzio said they are planning on putting a shared-use path there, and on the other side will be a sidewalk that will ultimately be the median of the four-lane typical section – and that section will also have bike lanes on it.

Ms. Dittmar asked about the timing of the projects. Mr. DeNunzio said that all three projects that will be in the design build package – the Route 29 widening, the Berkmar and the Rio grade separation – have a completion date of September 2017, with incentives on the Rio Road interchange to be earlier. He stated that the incentives provide September 2016 for early completion on the Rio grade separation, and July 1, 2016 for accelerated early completion. Mr. DeNunzio said that VDOT expects to have the contract in place in February 2015. He stated that VDOT is planning to have public location hearings and a design location hearing as a two-hearing process for this.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the Rio grade separation is planned at the same time as the Route 29 widening. Mr. DeNunzio emphasized that Rio has been given the incentives to have an early completion, and the smallest window of construction that impacts the traffic, which is critical to the businesses out there.

Ms. Dittmar said that she is trying to determine whether they will have two construction projects going on at the same time. Mr. DeNunzio stated that it is possible.

Mr. Boyd asked if VDOT is going to publish a timeline for construction. Mr. DeNunzio said that those are the dates in the RFQ that went out two weeks earlier.

Mr. Boyd asked if that is published somewhere where the public can see it. Mr. Sheffield responded that the information is on the US 29 Solutions website, and the information forwarded from the panel includes that as well. He said that perhaps the Board needs to direct staff to mirror the information VDOT is putting out.

Mr. Foley stated that the staff has created links on the County's site to that so people can have that access, but staff can double-check and be sure they are doing everything possible.

Mr. Sheffield said that as Supervisors they should be listening to see if the public is not aware of this information so they can make sure to get it out there.

Ms. McKeel said that in some of the public comments made this morning, it was clear that some of the questions has been answered several times.

Mr. Sheffield stated that despite all of the coverage and publicity, he recently encountered a constituent who had no idea this was moving forward.

Mr. Boyd said that the majority of people in the community really do not understand what is going on with this.

Mr. DeNunzio said that Mr. Lou Hatter of VDOT's communications is now based in the Charlottesville residency. Mr. Hatter has been working with the County, City and MPO communications staff to ensure that all available information is disseminated.

Mr. Foley commented that there is a considerable partnership underway now to ensure the best possible dissemination of information.

Mr. DeNunzio noted that part of the communications plan will be presented at the VDOT meeting the following day.

Mr. Boyd said that no matter what, there will be people who have no idea what is going on until they start digging up the road.

Mr. Sheffield suggested that they have a packet that explains what is going on, for Supervisors and anyone coming in contact with the public.

Mr. DeNunzio said they are developing a one-sheet summary for each project.

Ms. McKeel asked if it is possible to put a link from the County's website.

Mr. Sheffield said that the problem is you have to go down into the layers of the website to find that.

Ms. Dittmar suggested putting electronic message boards out on Route 29.

Mr. Foley said that they will be compiling all of the ideas as part of the overall communications strategy.

Ms. Mallek said that having some notices much further north and south will be helpful for travelers, so that they have the option of taking I-81 and other routes.

Mr. Benish asked if they will be able to bid a sidewalk at a wider width than five feet, perhaps an eight-foot width. Mr. DeNunzio said they will have to see what the requirements of the urban platform

are. As they put the RFP together they are open to a lot of those things in order to achieve what the County wants.

Mr. Benish said that the County's cross section calls for a multi-use facility along this corridor, and said that what VDOT is doing with the sidewalks is a step in the right direction – but if one of them could be wider, it would address some of the expectations along the corridor. Mr. DeNunzio responded that they must stay within their footprint on the Route 29 corridor, so they will consider anything that can fit in that platform.

Mr. Benish said that the County is trying to get a sidewalk that meets a multi-use function if at all possible within this existing right of way width, and that standard is eight feet. The County will endeavor to get that facility in given right of way and funding.

Ms. Palmer said if that is not possible now, perhaps the design can accommodate some later expansion.

Mr. DeNunzio said that as long as it is within the footprint and they decide it is going to better serve the area to have a 10-foot sidewalk on one side and nothing on the other side, and it does not increase the footprint of the road, they can do that instead. He added that these are ongoing discussions they can have as they are developing the RFP.

Mr. DeNunzio reported that VDOT has received the resolution of approval for Midway Road to increase rural rustic for the whole length and got environmental clearance the previous week, so construction should begin in the next few weeks to finish the road.

Ms. Mallek said that she would like to know the status of the crossings at Cale Elementary School and Putt-Putt on Rio Road. Mr. DeNunzio said that VDOT sent someone to Cale and found there was very little pedestrian activity, but Mr. Jack Kelsey of County Engineering had said the school was supportive of more pedestrian activity. The challenge currently is that the school would have to have the receiving facility on their side prior to VDOT moving forward with the crosswalk. Mr. DeNunzio said that the school has a plan for people to use the crosswalk, and what VDOT does not want to do is put up a crossing that is not used, because drivers will not pay attention to it.

Ms. Mallek asked if the surface treatment they will be using is slurry. Mr. DeNunzio responded "no". He said that the surface treatment will be chip and tar, and the stone in the topcoat will be a little finer than what is used on rural rustic – and within a few months it cures fairly well. He stated that they are not currently doing that in subdivisions that have curb and gutter and are instead using a new material, which they have had about 80% success with so far. Mr. DeNunzio added that they are trying a one-inch asphalt substance overlay in Forest Lakes, and it has been an effective surface treatment to seal up a road.

Ms. Dittmar said that she received very positive feedback from the Citizens Advisory Committee on the meeting that he and Mr. John Lynch had held on Rivanna Village. She added that she and Mr. DeNunzio will be hosting a roundtable on August 18 to discuss road issues in southern Albemarle.

Mr. DeNunzio said that he met with the advisory council in that area a few weeks earlier to talk about Porters Road, Route 20, and other problematic roads – and VDOT is following up with those items.

Ms. McKeel thanked Mr. DeNunzio for his help with the speed study for Garth Road.

Ms. Dittmar asked what VDOT does with the animals that are hit on the side of the road. Mr. DeNunzio reported that the contractor who picks them up is required to take them to "an approved site of disposal."

Ms. Palmer said that she learned from Mr. Mark Brownley of RSWA that VDOT contracts with people to go around and pick up deer and other animals, then take them to the nearest approved site. She said that many may be going to Greene County because their transfer station is approved, and Rivanna's is approved; the one at Zion Crossroads is not approved. Ms. Palmer stated that there are only a few sites, and Ivy is used by Rivanna, the City of Charlottesville, and individuals from the County.

Agenda Item No. 15. Seminole Trail - Signal/Traffic Services (Adaptive Signal Project) Update.

Ms. Teresa Gardner, VDOT's Regional Traffic Engineer for the Staunton and Culpeper districts, addressed the Board. She stated that she became the project manager last August, 2013. She added that she is managing the synchronized signalization on Route 29 – a project that is now fully funded. Ms. Gardner reported that what is on Route 29 today is an actuated control system with time of day plans, so a driver getting into the green band will have a fairly nice ride through – but if they are shopping or coming in off of a side street, it is possible they could not be in the green band. She stated that the system relies on regular re-timings, which means VDOT staff has to physically go out and re-time them, with time of day plans assuming some type of traffic flow – and no ability to adjust to exceptional events in real time. They do not have the ability to talk to the signals from their TOC or from Mr. Grant Sanders, VDOT's Signal

Operations Engineer. Ms. Gardner said that one of the features of adaptive control and any type of real-time system is the ability to optimize on the fly, so it can be responsive to anything happening along the corridor.

Mr. Sheffield asked how often VDOT goes out to re-time the signals and how much staff effort it takes. Ms. Gardner stated that re-timing the corridor is very extensive internally, and they often rely on consultants at costs ranging from \$100,000-\$200,000 with that number of intersections. She said that they do keep an eye on changes in the corridor, but any operational issues require dispatching a technician – whereas the adaptive signal system will allow that to be done remotely.

Ms. Gardner presented information on the adaptive signal system at Pantops, which is provided by Rhythm Engineering, and is the In-synch product that is being used throughout Virginia today as chosen by VDOT. She reported that they have been using adaptive signals at VDOT for several years now and have different project throughout the state, and have lessons learned not only as a state but as the adaptive industry. Ms. Gardner said that one of the key elements is the expectation of the drivers. Over-saturated periods such as peak hours and football games mean the adaptive system can struggle sometimes in accommodating – so there are still some limitations to this product. She stated that a major factor in the success of any adaptive or real-time program is communications, and those communications to signals must be reliable. Ms. Gardner said that when you go along Route 29 there are some line of sight issues, and there is fiber along the entire corridor so VDOT has been working with its Central Office to get permission to tie in, and that is the most reliable source available for communications. She stated that there have been some issues with these systems and Pantops has failed several times – and sometimes that can create serious safety problems. Ms. Gardner said that they are seeing much more failure on the adaptive side of things than they are on the typical intersection controllers, and she stated that it has been on an incident basis rather than a percentage of failure.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there are liquidated damages for failures. Ms. Gardner said that there are not. She added that on a system like that on Route 29 there is a warranty period with an additional level of service that is no added cost, and when the system goes out of warranty they will go into a new maintenance warranty with Rhythm or with DTS – a vendor that helps with repairs.

Mr. Sheffield emphasized that the vendors should be held accountable to the productivity or reliability of their products. Ms. Gardner said she will share that information with Central Office.

Ms. Mallek said that if the seller is going cheap on the stuff they are buying, it is going to fail – so the vendor needs to know that accountability is important so they will buy something that will last. Ms. Gardner agreed, and said that VDOT has their ear because the vendor wants to place their product on Route 29, and there may be some other things that come up with the contracting mechanism.

Ms. Mallek said they want to avoid the kind of bugs that were present in the first computers that were still in beta.

Ms. McKeel asked if the failures are happening when the systems are being put on old equipment, or are they changed out. Ms. Gardner said that it is typically the equipment processor that fails, and the problems tend to be glitches in the system because they are using video – and the industry is starting to address that by choosing better cameras that process the data.

Mr. Grant Sanders, VDOT Northwest Region Signal Operations Engineer, said that for the Route 29 project, VDOT will be using a package called “fusion” where it will tie into the traditional loops they have in the road, which are better at detecting vehicles, so they will be able to confirm that there are vehicles there.

Ms. Gardner stated that the infrastructure upgrades really drove the project costs up.

Ms. Dittmar said that if there is a situation on Route 29 where all lights were red except side streets, the County would end up having to mobilize the police force to deal with it – so they would like to send the bill to somebody, and she asked Ms. Gardner to take that point back to those at VDOT who are negotiating the issue. Ms. Gardner responded that she thinks VDOT has a good short term solution to that issue.

Ms. Gardner then presented information on the original 21 intersections that were in the adaptive project. She said that there are three side streets chosen – with 18 of the intersections along Route 29 – running from Hydraulic Road up to Airport Road. She said that they chose the side streets based on the intersections that dump a lot of left turns from Route 29. She provided a highlight of the areas impacted by the Rio interchange project and the third-lane widening. Ms. Gardner said they will also keep an eye on what happens at the un-signalized intersection of Berkmar and Route 29 south of Rio, and VDOT is noting this information as part of the design-build process.

Ms. Gardner said that when she began working on the project in August, they went through the preliminary engineering, developing a communications plan and a cost estimate – with all of this prior to the mega-projects. At that time, they identified a funding shortfall, having started out with revenue-sharing money totaling \$722,000 and costs escalating to around \$3.2 million. She stated that they have

three projects currently in design-build, including the adaptive project and the Best Buy ramps. VDOT has also secured a contract to purchase the adaptive equipment but that was originally assuming state funds. She explained that now they have the money, but the mega-projects will impact the original plan and VDOT's ability to be cost-effective with their choices. They are going to go back and redesign signal-to-signal communications – such as the signal south of Rio Road, which was originally going to be fiber but may now be wireless radio. Ms. Gardner said that VDOT recently met with DTS, the vendor that helped design the original communications plan, so they are now on board to do a new plan. She stated that as a result of the communications plan change they will also revise the cost estimate. The other piece to succeed with a real-time or adaptive system is the loops present in the road – which supplement the video to provide a much more accurate picture of what is going on in the intersection. As part of the infrastructure costs, they did not have to go in and do new signal poles, but did have to do five new cabinets because of space limits. Ms. Gardner said that because they are now getting federal monies for the project, they have to do a systems engineering report, so VDOT's Central Office is leading that effort and they are hoping to have it in place by early October – at which point they will be able to go into their construction phase. She stated that they will also have to federalize the contract to be able to purchase the adaptive equipment.

Ms. Gardner said that from VDOT's perspective, they will need to manage the entire corridor during the multiple construction projects and after those are complete. She stated that their proposal is to create a two-phased project. Phase 1 is to create a real-time traffic management corridor – not for the adaptive system, but for updated controllers along the corridor that can take data and put communications in place so that the signals talk to each other in real time. Ms. Gardner noted that they will no longer have to dispatch a technician to go out and make changes, and it also helps in case there is a traffic incident, weather or other events. She stated that their goal is to move forward with creating a real-time corridor, and also to prioritize the 21 intersections plus two additional ones. Ms. Gardner said they anticipate Best Buy to be under construction in spring, so their goal is to address those from Hydraulic Road south, and then get the remainder on with the goal of having all 21 online in real time by summer 2015. She stated that they will work with the design-build schedule to keep an eye on what their dates are to ensure everything is in place in anticipation of construction changes. The contracting mechanisms are already federalized and in place regionally. She reported that Phase 2 will occur when these projects are complete and traffic is stabilized, probably in 2016 or 2017. Prior to that VDOT will be making the decision as to whether the adaptive industry has addressed concerns with equipment issues. At this time VDOT feels that the industry will continue to make positive change with the adaptive systems, and they will then purchase and install the equipment. That also helps with the warranty which starts from that date. When they federalize the equipment contract, it may allow some incentives and penalties for failures and response issues. VDOT does believe that this is the best option to deal with construction.

Ms. Gardner reported that key remaining items are to finalize the preliminary engineering and provide preliminary cost estimates by early September. As mentioned earlier, they would like to add two additional signals – one at Hydraulic and Commonwealth, and one at Hydraulic and District Ave./Cedar Hill Road. She said that they are not sure if they should be added to the adaptive system, but the lights will be real time so they can be monitored and adjusted as needed. Ms. Gardner said that VDOT will also continue its discussions with the City, which also has an adaptive program, and will try to encourage them to move forward with at least Angus and Morton as part of the Best Buy project, as well as Whole Foods/Route 250 bypass intersection improvements.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the funding that came from the Route 29 Solutions package approved by the CTB included the City portions. Ms. Gardner said that her understanding is that they were not included, but VDOT continues to work with the City and may be able to develop something positive in the future – such as phasing projects that are key to the Route 29 corridor.

Ms. McKeel said that originally the project was explained to her as starting in the City at Ivy Road and then proceeding northward. Ms. Mallek said that one person had suggested that, but the City did not agree to it.

Ms. Gardner said that VDOT has been providing the City with technical support but they are currently having some staffing issues. With Barracks Road there are some tough decisions as far as getting adaptive signals to work – so the City is pulling their data together now in an effort to establish what makes sense for the 13 intersections in their part of the area. She stated that VDOT has a meeting scheduled with the City's engineer the following week. VDOT would like to get the City to move forward on Morton, Angus, Whole Foods and the Route 250 bypass. Ms. Gardner said that this would create a communications link between the County and the City, and would also benefit the traffic management plan for the corridor during construction.

Ms. Mallek said she is very impressed with the plan that Ms. Gardner has laid out. She then asked about the status of revenue-sharing dollars, and asked if it would be put back into other projects. Ms. Gardner said that the \$722,000 includes that revenue-sharing monies, and that is what is currently keeping this moving forward. She said that she cannot touch federal funds until some things are in place. Ms. Gardner added that if VDOT does not need the money for preliminary engineering work, they can start to do some work on things like loop detectors. They are going to look at critical path items in terms of equipment, cabinets, etc.

Ms. Mallek said that Greenbrier Drive and Commonwealth Drive are also on her radar. Ms. Gardner said that they are in the technical development for the design build project right now. They have identified 15 other signals that need to be considered at places like Greenbrier Drive and Commonwealth Drive, and they will look at the feasibility of including those if financing allows.

Agenda Item No. 16. Closed Meeting.

At 12:26 p.m., Mr. Sheffield **moved** that the Board go into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia under subsection (1) to consider appointments to boards, committees, and commissions in which there are pending vacancies or requests for reappointments; under subsection (3) to discuss the possible disposition of seven acres of vacant County held real property because discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position of the County; under subsection (7) to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice relating to the negotiation of easements on the County Office Building property; and under subsection (19) to discuss a report relating to the security of County facilities and the safety of persons using such facilities. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 17. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 1:51 p.m., Mr. Sheffield **moved** that the Board certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each Board member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 18. Boards and Commissions: Vacancies/Appointments.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to make the following appointments/reappointments:

- **reappoint** Mr. E.N. Garnett, Mr. Bruce Dotson and Mr. Stephen McLean to the Acquisition of Conservation Easements (ACE) Committee with said terms to expire August 1, 2015.
- **appoint** Mr. Joseph Chambers to the Architectural Review Board to fill an unexpired term ending November 16, 2016.
- **appoint** Mr. Matt Harris to the Charlottesville-Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB) Management Board with said term to expire June 30, 2017.
- **reappoint** Ms. Cyndra Van Clief to the Jail Authority Board with said term to expire August 6, 2017.
- **appoint** Mr. Jeffrey Sitler to the Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee with said term to expire November 30, 2015.

Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 19. Discussion: Charlottesville Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB) Governance and Funding. *Due to agenda schedule, this item was moved to later in the meeting.*

Agenda Item No. 20. Virginia Secretary of Transportation Aubrey Layne, Discussion on Regional Transportation Issues.

Ms. Dittmar introduced Virginia Secretary of Transportation, Aubrey Layne.

Secretary Layne introduced Charlie Kilpatrick, Commissioner of Highways; Alison DeTuncq, Commonwealth Transportation Board member; John Lynch, VDOT District Administrator; and Lou Hatter, VDOT Communications Director.

Secretary Layne stated that he had served as a member of the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) for six years prior to Governor McAuliffe asking him to consider the cabinet position but, before that, he was a businessman – commercial enterprise shoe business and commercial real estate. He said his undergraduate degree was in Accounting, and his graduate program was in International Business with a concentration in Finance. Secretary Layne said he looks at things through the lens of getting the best bang for the dollar and doing what is practical to get a solution resolved, adding that both government and the private sector deal with limited resources. He stated that there are seven agencies reporting to him with just over 10,000 employees, and those are all “operating agencies” which are run like businesses and fits well with his background. Secretary Layne said Governor McAuliffe has been adamant that VDOT will be good stewards of taxpayer money and will also pick the right projects, and he believes that his department should be accountable for its actions.

Secretary Layne reported that, in June, the state announced a \$13.2 billion six-year plan which was one of the largest in the state’s history, and was made possible by the passage of HB 2313, which put new revenues in transportation for the first time in over 25 years. He said several things have already impacted the use of those monies. He stated that the centerpiece of the legislation was to change the cents-per-gallon to a wholesale percentage on the price of gasoline and, since that time, the price of gasoline at the wholesale level was about 60% below where it was when the legislation was enacted. Secretary Layne stated that the revenues anticipated a year ago are not anticipated now for the next six years, adding that there will be an \$800 million reduction from last year’s six-year plan as far as what the CTB has to work with. He said there is a floor in the law which will not allow it to go below a certain level; however, large reductions have already been addressed. Secretary Layne said areas like Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads raised real estate and other taxes for transportation, but the statewide budget for transportation would remain what it was before the passage of the law and it is expected to grow as economic activity picks up.

Secretary Layne said the \$13.2 billion amounts to about \$2.5 billion a year for the next six years, but two things would significantly impact it – House Bill 2, which is legislation to address choosing the right project. He explained that this bill requires the CTB, by July 1, 2016, to allocate dollars not based on population or formula, but based on prioritization of projects across the Commonwealth. He stated that this would be a significant change in the way money is allocated across the state, and the intent of the legislation is to make sure that the dollars spent on transportation will offer the best bang for the buck for taxpayers. Secretary Layne said this is comprised of five criteria: urban areas, congestion mitigation; rural areas, economic development; safety; mobility which would include return on investment; and environmental concerns. He stated that this will not eviscerate the current six-year plan or any projects currently under construction or advertised, however, certain federal programs may not be subject to this. Secretary Layne said there would likely be several iterations of this process as they go forward, and it would likely be a very loud process because every region wants its project to be done without having to go through a group prioritization. He said state officials started this process with a very high-level screen, and would be coming back in the fall to make adjustments.

Secretary Layne stated that the second factor impacting the plan is the solvency of the Federal Highway Trust Fund, which Congress had just patched by putting general appropriations in the shortfall. He said the Commonwealth gets about 50% of every construction dollar from the Federal Highway Trust Fund and, to the extent those monies are curtailed or replenishments are set back, that will impact construction in the state. He stated that he has testified in front of Congress and the Senate Finance Committee, and at least got a patch, but transportation projects take a long time to develop so putting bonds or monies into long-term projects is going to be difficult until a fix is determined. Secretary Layne said Governor McAuliffe continues to work on this threat, and has spoken with the President and others to advocate for a long-term solution which is sustainable, multi-modal, and also looks at growth in the system. He stated that the federal gas tax has not been raised since 1993, and the current projections, if the state gets reimbursed for actual receipts, show a 20-25% hit to the state or \$250 million per year.

Secretary Layne said, as a CTB member, he voted for the bypass and he would have voted for the Route 29 Solutions package, had it been before the CTB. He said, given the history over the last 25 years and in every report he saw, whether from VDOT, the Joint Legislative Audit Review Committee (JLARC), or any other third party, showed that the solution would need to be a combination of projects. He said the last year he was on the CTB, the question was asked when could construction begin, but the answer was always the same which was the lack of federal approval. Secretary Layne stated that, when he received the letter in February, the only thing he asked of Secretary Fox at the federal level was to make a decision so another four years would not be spent trying to determine what to do. He said the decision that came down was that the FHWA had ruled that this no longer fit what it was trying to accomplish, did not meet the need that it was originally scoped for and was not because of environmental concerns or historical information returns. Secretary Layne stated that they never got beyond the first threshold that this project did not meet the “purpose and need” for the project, so they had to make a decision as to whether to fight for it or get done what they could on Route 29 with the knowledge that every report had stressed the need for a multiple-project solution. He said that was the genesis for the approach they took, but he did not feel it was the end-all solution, nor did he feel the bypass was the end-all solution, however, it has been over 25 years and they have not taken any real steps to address traffic through and around the corridor. He said there was feedback that these projects had been sprung on people very quickly, but VDOT has been looking at the corridor for 30 years and all of these projects have been looked at so none of them were particularly new. Secretary Layne said there was a myriad of

information going between reports and studies and, because he wanted an independent opinion, the state hired Philip Shucet, former CTB Commissioner, to lead the process.

Secretary Layne stated that he firmly believes this is the best way to start addressing the situation, even though everyone does not agree with the solution. He said a question has been raised as to how the projects fit into House Bill 2 and, because many of the projects have been considered previously, he feels comfortable those will score very high. He said Governor McAuliffe has recognized the need to do something in the corridor; therefore, a decision was made to move forward before monies were put into HB2. Secretary Layne said he is aware of the projects at Berkmar and Hillsdale and the extension of train service on Route 29 South but wanted to emphasize that these are not the end of the solutions, but are a good start in an incremental approach. He stated that community and political buy-in works better when people see what you do, and then take the next step so this approach takes into consideration the 20 years of history in the corridor when determining the plan. Secretary Layne said he has made himself available to community groups, editorial boards, chambers of commerce, etc. to answer questions as to what projects are being done and why. He said how those projects are scaled and scheduled is a concern to the business community in the area, and that is why the contract will have safeguards to keep level of service at all times and to not begin another part of construction until the other parts can handle the traffic. Secretary Layne said, as construction begins, VDOT will adjust as necessary and, while there will be difficulties associated with the construction, VDOT knows how to do these projects and he will give his word that his staff will stay involved with the project from start to finish.

Secretary Layne reported that he had toured the neighborhoods in which VDOT owns right of way for the now-defunct bypass, adding that VDOT has come in and cleaned up those neighborhoods where the houses are located. He said the decision on how to dispose of the right of way is based on three factors: the federal process, which the state is working on in order to minimize impact on property owners; some of the right of way may be needed for other projects such as Berkmar or other transportation needs; and how well they proceed with the construction projects. Secretary Layne said VDOT will make sure the properties are always kept clean, and would assure the neighbors in those areas that they would not be impacted.

The Chair invited the Board to provide the Secretary its comments and questions.

Mr. Boyd said one of the biggest concerns with this has to do with the sequencing, and it seemed to some that the VDOT was pushing through with the Rio interchange as the first piece. He asked why VDOT would not be doing Berkmar, Hillsdale and the Best Buy ramp first. Secretary Layne said the Rio interchange would be an urban interchange, not the sprawling rural interchanges that people are probably used to seeing and are going to try to fit this into the existing right of way. He stated that this is a design-build contract, and VDOT would work with the awarded bidder from the private sector as to what it thinks the sequencing should be. Secretary Layne said level of service is one of the top performance measures in the contract, and hiring multiple contractors affects timing and accountability. He stated that hiring one contractor with a schedule and a bifurcated contract would allow for flexibility yet control of the contractor, and the appropriate sequencing would be a question as part of their considerations. Secretary Layne said there are no federal requirements to meet level of service standards, but VDOT is going to require it. He stated that John Lynch and Philip Shucet's group had focused significantly on times of operation and when the construction would be allowed, and that would depend on what is going on in that particular area with businesses, neighborhoods, UVA events, etc. Secretary Layne emphasized that this project has the attention of the Governor and others around the state, and he assured the Board that, if things were not going as desired, VDOT would make adjustments in the plans.

Mr. Boyd stated that, in addition to businesses, this is the highest concentration of residences in the County and his concern is that the highly congested use of Proffit Road and Route 20 would be exacerbated even further when this project gets underway. Secretary Layne said he has ridden the entire length of the project, and does not see anything which would cause the project to be unsuccessful but he assured Mr. Boyd that he understands his concerns.

Ms. Mallek said doing something specific similar to what was done at Tyson's Corner, with the designation of the same number of lanes available through the intersection, would reassure people that they were not going from four lanes to one.

Secretary Layne said, next week, the correspondence with the bidders would begin; meetings would begin, and that level of service on this project is as important as anything and, if adjustment need to be made, they will be made. He said he firmly believes that private industry does have a role to play in the design of these roads, and is very concerned about the impact on industry. He pointed out that, if people do not have a good transportation system, then people will not have good industry. Secretary Layne said transportation supports many of the freedoms people enjoy today, and is a core function of government.

Mr. Sheffield said moving forward with Rio is important because of the John Warner Parkway opening up and the City's work on Hillsdale. He noted that Rio is at a critical point whereby it cannot handle too many turning movements before it will fail. He said, if this problem is not resolved now, all of the other projects would just exacerbate the problem at the Rio intersection. Mr. Sheffield said he has expressed a desire to use as many local vendors as possible. He stated that, with the cost of this project

at \$230 million, there is an opportunity to provide an economic benefit here. Secretary Layne said he views transportation as a means to an end and, hopefully, all of that will be bettered with these improvements; adding that he thinks these projects will increase traffic once these are completed, which will actually benefit businesses.

Mr. Sheffield commented that the community is tired of waiting, and is eager to see this project, among others, moving forward. He said, as Supervisors, its job is to connect with residents, convey information, and he wants to be sure Board members have the most up-to-date material to share with the community. Secretary Layne said both Mr. Hatter and Mr. Lynch are working with the communications plan and will stay involved with Mr. Shucet's panel adding that, without community buy-in, this would not be successful.

Ms. Palmer asked if there was any ability to use local vendors. Secretary Layne said Governor McAuliffe had just issued an executive directive in terms of prioritizing use of local, minority and small business owners and VDOT is covered by that. He said the competing factor is getting the best return for the taxpayers, so both are considered to the extent that the state does not necessarily have to take the lowest bid. Secretary Layne added that the contracts would come before the CTB for review.

Ms. McKeel said the community has been talking about this project using up all of the transportation money for the next 20 years, and she wanted people to understand how the prioritization process works. Secretary Layne stated that House Bill 2 would help smaller and more rural projects, because each would be evaluated on its merits, adding that Governor McAuliffe has campaigned on the platform of picking the right projects. He said the state does not have anywhere near the money needed to do all of the projects in the state and, currently, most of the monies are already obligated to previous projects before HB2 takes effect. Secretary Layne said there is no guarantee Albemarle County will or will not have additional transportation money, because it is based solely on the merits of projects going forward.

Ms. McKeel said, for many residents in several of the districts, the most important thing is the sell-back of that right of way and she urged him to move forward on that as quickly as possible.

Ms. Dittmar said she was on the original Route 29 Solutions panel and, although it was not discussed at the time, her understanding was that the final sequencing of projects has not yet been determined, therefore, she was unsure how to answer sequencing questions for constituents. Secretary Layne said the sequencing had not been finalized, and would be part of the process with the contract bidders which will include considerations of political factors, cost, engineering considerations, etc. He said the panel will try to make it as open a process as possible and will, at a minimum, reveal the rationale behind its decisions.

Ms. Dittmar said a recent VDOT report indicated that the widening and the Rio projects may be happening at the same time, and should be considered as part of the sequencing. Secretary Layne stated that VDOT would be evaluating that as part of the process and, because nothing has been done in the corridor for so long, people are fearful of what may happen but he is also confident that VDOT can make this work.

Ms. Dittmar said it is important for people to know why things are proceeding the way they are. She also asked, if there was a cost overrun on Rio, would it take money away from the Hillsdale or Berkmar projects. Secretary Layne said the state is committed to getting the solutions project implemented, but typically have fixed-price contracts so the state would share that risk with the private sector. He said the intent is that all of the solutions must be implemented in order to reap the benefits.

Ms. Dittmar thanked him and the CTB for keeping the money here for another transportation priority once the bypass option was not selected.

Mr. Boyd said he knows several people who serve on Mr. Shucet's committee who have said they feel it is a waste of their time because they are not being listened to, and feel there is a pattern and a plan which is already in place. Mr. Boyd stated that he does not feel the committee should continue if the people are not going to be heard, as it would be just a show. Secretary Layne said he did not feel it was just a show. He said he read a recent newspaper article which indicated the plan was being dictated by the state and what he has found is - if the state is doing things that everybody likes, then they are great listeners and, if they do not like the plans, then they are not great listeners. He emphasized that the panel is not simply checking off the boxes and that is not what Mr. Shucet's committee is about.

Mr. Sheffield stated that the committees and panels are only as effective as the people who serve on those. He said he expects substantive suggestions to be taken seriously, adding that any obstructive or irrelevant suggestions are treated as such. He said there is another responsibility for panel members, and that is to take the information from the discussions and disseminate it back to the public.

Secretary Layne said doing nothing would be more costly than not doing this, and everyone involved must find a way to move forward. He stated that he would take Mr. Boyd's concerns to Mr. Shucet and follow up to ensure panel members were being heard, which is something he takes very

seriously. He addressed panel members who were present at the meeting and encouraged them to contact his office as necessary.

Agenda Item No. 13. 2015 Legislative Priorities and Meeting with State Legislators.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that each year the Board considers and approves its legislative priorities and submits them to the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC), the Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) and the Virginia Municipal League (VML). Generally, the TJPDC's legislative program incorporates the County's legislative priorities. Other initiatives are sometimes added prior to the General Assembly session. This executive summary will provide a review of the Board's 2014 Legislative Priorities (Attachment B) and request the Board to review and approve its initial 2015 Legislative Priorities (Attachment A).

The Board has requested that a meeting with area legislators be held in advance of the normal process. Staff has been working with David Blount at the TJPDC to assist in organizing this meeting, taking into consideration the importance of getting regional support to advance any top legislative priorities. In addition, conversations are continuing regarding the school system's involvement in this effort. David Blount will be in attendance at Wednesday's meeting to further discuss gaining regional support and planning for a meeting with legislators.

A review of the County's 2014 Legislative Priorities is provided in the attached "2014 Legislative Priorities Report" (Attachment B). The report includes details regarding previous action taken on the priorities, an assessment of what priorities should be continued in the future, and links to the final legislative reports of the TJPDC, VACo and VML.

Many of the proposed 2015 Legislative Priorities (Attachment A) are carried forward from 2014. Four new or expanded priorities, and the continuing Composite Index priority, are set forth below:

Local Government Administration and Finance

Taxation

Option 1:

The County supports legislation granting counties taxing powers equal to those granted to cities and towns, without decreasing, limiting or changing city and town taxing authority. The existing local tax structure for counties is overly dependent upon general property taxes, especially real estate taxes. Unfunded and inadequately funded state mandates and commitments strain local government budgets and place additional pressure on the real estate tax.

Option 2:

If the Board believes that general taxing authority equal to cities and towns is not attainable or another approach is preferred, then the County could request specific legislation for additional taxing authority related to the food and beverage tax, the transient occupancy tax, or a cigarette tax.

Other considerations regarding taxation:

These items have been discussed by individual Board members recently and are presented here to determine if the Board is interested in further consideration for the legislative program:

- Establishment of a sustainable funding source for public schools
- Establishment of a local option sales and use tax
- Study of independent taxing authority by school boards
- Study of a local option income tax

It is proposed that any legislative priority regarding taxation be coordinated as a regional initiative. David Blount is beginning the discussion with TJPDC localities. Mr. Blount has prepared a working draft background paper detailing prior legislative studies since the 1980's for the Board's information (Attachment C). Additional information on the potential revenue generated by increases in the above sources will be provided at Wednesday's meeting.

Composite Index

The Composite Index determines a school division's ability to pay education costs fundamental to the Commonwealth's Standards of Quality (SOQ). A locality with a low Composite Index receives proportionally more funding from the Commonwealth to pay the costs of the SOQ than a locality with a higher Composite Index. An informational summary of the Composite Index, its formula and a history of bills introduced in recent General Assembly sessions are included for information (Attachment D).

Prior Boards have supported two specific amendments to the Composite Index Formula:

1. Legislation to amend the Composite Index Funding Formula by re-defining the local true value of real property component of the formula to include the land use taxation value of real property rather than the fair market assessed value for those properties that have qualified and are being taxed under a land use value taxation program.
2. Legislation to amend the Composite Index Funding Formula to adjust the funding formula for Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville to account for the annual transfer of funds from the County to the City required by their annexation and revenue sharing

agreement. This adjustment would more equitably reflect the County's and City's "ability to pay."

Growth Management, Land Use and Transportation

Transportation funding

In 2009, the County requested enabling authority to establish a new dedicated funding source for a Charlottesville-Albemarle Regional Transit Authority. That request was not successful. Funding for transit will be important to a successful regional transit authority. This initiative may be timelier in 2016 based on the need for additional work on the local approvals needed to establish the Authority.

State Obligations and Services

Community College funding

Request the state to fund 100% of public funding required for community college costs. Currently, localities are required to fund operating and capital costs proportionally based on student enrollment.

Public Defender Funding

Request the state to adequately fund compensation for public defenders. The Board approved salary supplements for the Public Defender's Office in FY 15 as requested by the Albemarle-Charlottesville Public Defender's Office to address inadequate funding provided by the state for public defender salaries.

After the Board's review, input and approval of the proposed 2015 Legislative Priorities, staff will submit the Board's 2015 Legislative Priorities to the TJPDC, VACo and VML for their consideration to be included in their respective legislative programs. This will also be the starting point for the agenda for the proposed meeting with area legislators in October. The 2015 TJPDC Legislative Program will be presented to the Board in September for the Board's input and review.

The County's legislative priorities seek to ensure that the state adequately funds its mandated responsibilities and does not jeopardize the County's ability to effectively and efficiently implement the policies (including fiscal) and programs that it deems necessary. There are no specific, identifiable budget impacts.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the proposed initial 2015 Legislative Priorities (Attachment A), and any additions or deletions it finds are appropriate, for submission to the TJPDC, VACo and VML.

Mr. Foley stated that the Board and staff have been talking for the last several months about various legislative positions, particularly about the difficult budget process and the need for more sustainable funding. He said, beyond the typical things, there has been discussion related to pursuing some positions in a different way than has been done in the past and it was felt that the most effective way to deal with that is to team up with the School Board and also with regional partners. Mr. Foley said Mr. Davis would provide an overview of how the Boards' objectives may fit into the legislative program and see how comfortable it is with that. Mr. Blount would follow up with a discussion on how to make this process effective with legislators.

Mr. Davis said staff works closely with David Blount on the legislative program, and the process which is typically followed is to put together County priorities on an annual basis and coordinate those with the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission's (TJPDC) legislative priorities, and then with VACO and VML so there is a coordinated legislative program which goes forward to legislators in the General Assembly. He said what is being presented today is the beginning point for establishing a legislative program and, even though it is a bit earlier this year, they are trying to anticipate an earlier meeting with legislators which the Board wants to have in October. He said it is also timely for coordination with VACO's legislative committees. Mr. Davis stated that the draft legislative priorities look a lot like prior legislative priorities due to the fact that there are a lot of standing concerns from localities which are addressed in the County's priorities – and they try to set out a framework as to how to vote on what could be thousands of bills that come before the legislators. He said the County usually stakes out its positions in a general form so legislators will know what the sense of the community is when they have to vote on specific bills that have not been identified in advance of the legislative session. Mr. Davis added that it is also an opportunity for the County to focus on very specific items if there are concerns about a specific legislative need. He said, this year, staff is aware of a few areas the Board wants to address, particularly the issue of revenue.

Mr. Davis said when he reviewed with his staff and Mr. Blount the legislative positions regarding revenue, it became apparent that this has been an issue of longstanding concern to localities. He said Mr. Blount prepared a white paper which provides perspective on how the General Assembly has studied taxing issues over the years, and the lack of initiatives generated from those studies going back to the 1980s. Mr. Davis said, in looking at VACO's legislative platform for the last three years, VACO in 2012 supported equal taxing authority for counties with that of cities and towns, and also supported a local sales tax option of a half-cent for counties and other localities to offset reductions in state revenues, and that obviously did not happen. He said, in 2013 and 2014, VACO also supported granting counties the

equal taxing authority given to cities and towns, and the VACO draft report for 2015 for the Finance Committee is again recommending that position. Mr. Davis said the TJPDC, since 2012, has supported taxing equity and changes to the state code which would not reduce localities' abilities to tax. He said that has been coincident with the County's legislative priorities going back to at least 2012, where it has requested not to have taxing authority taken away such as BPOL, real estate assessments, and other bills.

Mr. Davis stated that the County's position for a number of years has been to try to maintain what it has and, going forward, a potential option is to establish a legislative priority which seeks enhanced taxing authority so the tax base in Albemarle County would not be centered primarily upon real property taxes. He said option 1 is to mirror VACO's position, which is to ask for counties to have equal taxing authority as cities and towns have, and that would primarily provide unrestricted ability of a locality to tax primarily the excise tax areas, which are the food and beverage tax, the transient occupancy tax, the cigarette tax and, in some circumstances, an admissions tax. Mr. Davis said if the County cannot obtain that, a separate option would be to ask for specific authority to deal with those taxes on an individual basis, rather than having the same taxing authority as a City. He stated that he has set forth in the Board's materials the revenue projections which would be based upon some of these potential revenue sources, such as the one-cent local sales tax received from the state, budgeted in the FY15 budget, which equates to about \$14.7 million. Mr. Davis said that is the most significant revenue-generator which the County could tap into and, implementing a half-cent local option sales tax would generate over \$7 million. He stated that the County is now at the maximum for food & beverage tax at 4%, which generates \$1.6 million per year and getting additional authority to raise that tax, would be an option. Mr. Davis said the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) generates about \$476,000 per penny, and he included in the Board's packet a recent fiscal impact statement from the 2012 request by Roanoke County for increased TOT taxes along with a history of about a dozen other localities' requests. He stated that, unfortunately, all of those legislative amendments have tied such a tax increase to funding tourism or convention centers or advertising for tourism, so none of those bills have given localities additional general fund unrestricted revenue, and that has been a political hurdle for counties that have tried to increase the TOT.

Ms. Mallek said, in the past and when revenues were better, the County put some of the TOT money toward the Acquisition of Conservation Easements (ACE) program because it was enhancing the scenic value for tourism, and asked if that could now be excluded if Albemarle tried to participate as other counties are.

Mr. Davis said, under existing enabling legislation, two cents of the five-cent tax may be spent on any purpose; three cents of the five cents has to be spent on tourism and/or tourism-related travel expenditures. He stated that the County has been able to fund the ACE program in the past out of the three cents which is designated for tourism. He explained that, if the acquisition of the property met carefully-crafted criteria to demonstrate that it did have an impact on the tourism industry, it would be permitted and could include certain parks and recreation programs and expenses.

Mr. Foley said cities have no restriction on how TOT funds are used. He said Charlottesville has a six-cent rate and, by agreement with the Charlottesville/Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB), a portion of that funds it but only applies to the first five cents, so the one cent over that goes to whatever the City wants it to.

Ms. McKeel asked what the pushback was as to why the legislature does not want to allow counties to have the same taxing authority as cities.

Ms. Mallek said a citizen asked that question of Delegate Steve Landes some years ago, and his response was that counties were created by the General Assembly, so it has control over counties, whereas cities have its own charters, so it is in a different category.

Mr. Foley stated that cities originally provided more urban services, and the General Assembly has failed to recognize that many counties also offer those urban services.

Mr. Boyd said the Board may have more success if this legislation is tied to other urban counties.

Ms. McKeel agreed, stating that making a case for urbanization could yield more success.

Ms. Dittmar said Ms. Mallek's point about Delegate Landes underscores that the counties are basically the state and are designated by the state to deliver state services, whereas cities deliver their own services; so it is the mindset of an entire constitutional framework along with the Dillon Rule.

Mr. David Blount, Legislative Liaison with the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, addressed the Board and said this has been a very tough political fight. He said, even with equal taxing power, there has been no recognition of counties being full-service providers. Mr. Blount said, going back to the 1980s, there are numerous reports which suggest or recommend that taxing power of counties be equalized with cities.

Mr. Foley added that there is also logic presented as to why that should be.

Mr. Davis said the argument about levels of service has been advanced time and time again, and it has not been effective. He added that the political reality is that it is difficult, particularly in the house, to be supportive of tax increases. He stated that the perception among delegates has been that voting for enabling authority so localities can increase taxes is equivalent to voting for a tax increase, of which delegates can be held accountable.

Ms. Dittmar said what is missing is an explanation on what a penny on the property tax does for the localities.

Ms. Palmer stated that she has been told by the City that it has a different lobbyist which represents its issues, and she wanted to know what the City's issues are.

Mr. Blount said, over the past seven years, the City has utilized a lobbyist to focus on one particular issue, but the City does have different issues and also adopts a legislative program to advance specific initiatives. He stated that the City coordinates through him and he, in turn, works with legislators on those as well. He mentioned that his first meeting with the City for this coming year's legislative program would be the following week.

Ms. Palmer asked if there was anything that cities and counties had in common which could be worked on together.

Ms. Mallek said that is what the TJPDC process has been all about, with a minimum of six jurisdictions represented and all working together.

Ms. McKeel commented that it seems like Albemarle County has been doing the same thing for a while, and getting the same results. She suggested working on a different approach.

Mr. Foley said what is before the Board are some new ways to approach this, but there may be other ideas as well.

Ms. Mallek stated that many of the counties looking to impose a higher TOT rate are very small and do not provide urban services.

Mr. Davis pointed out that those tax revenues are not going for schools, public safety, etc., but are going to a very specific tourism-related project or purpose.

Ms. Mallek said if that money could go for ACE and/or Parks & Recreation, it could free up operating money for other areas.

Mr. Blount stated that, in the last seven to nine years, there has been legislation introduced which would have restricted localities' ability to use the tourism part of TOT tax for the ACE program, but TJPDC was able to get it defeated. He said the County is often in a defensive position, however, with some recent momentum on things such as cost-shifting and unfunded mandates, he liked the idea of trying to initiate and move forward. Mr. Blount stated that, from a regional perspective, Board concerns are very consistent with the positions and the priorities which have been in the program over the years.

Mr. Davis said one tax that cities and two counties have is a cigarette tax, which was increased last year in Charlottesville from 35 to 55 cents per pack. He stated that, if a cigarette tax were implemented in the County, a rough estimate using the same per-capita figure as the City's and the same 55-cent tax rate, it would generate approximately \$1.6 million annually. Mr. Davis said the City provides a five-cent per pack offset for vendors to process the tax, but it is still a significant amount of money. He stated that if the County was able to use the tax authorized to Arlington and Fairfax at 30 cents per pack, it would still generate approximately \$900,000.

Mr. Davis said the other item for consideration, as discussed by the Board and School Board, has been a sustainable funding source for schools which does not exist now under Virginia law, as there are no funding revenues other than state funds which are designated solely to schools. He stated that the establishment of a local option sales and use tax was advanced by VACO in 2012, but there is no instance where a locality has the authority for a local sales and use tax for County or City purposes. He said, other than the 1% now set forth in general law by the state, no one has ever gotten legislation through to get a local option sales tax. Mr. Davis said a concept currently being discussed by the Virginia School Board Association and at least one Northern Virginia local school board is to begin a discussion about independent taxing authority for school boards, which has been implemented in almost every other state, and could provide a dedicated source of funding.

Ms. McKeel said the Virginia School Board Association has, for years, asked for a study on what this would look like and the impact. She stated that there are some real experts at Virginia Tech who have presented on this, but it did not even make it to the study phase.

Mr. Davis said it may be introduced again this fall, but the complicating factor is that it would likely require a constitutional amendment in order to grant taxing authority to a school board because it is currently limited to local government bodies and that process can be three years or longer.

Mr. Davis stated that the last idea, which dates back to Senator Emily Couric's time, is the possibility of a local option income tax with the structure including equalization through reduction of real property tax rate in the first year, and unrestricted taxes going forward. Mr. Davis said there would be some percentage of income tax collected by the state and returned to the locality to fund local government services, but he was not sure if a formal study had ever been done.

Mr. Blount reported that there is some current authorization for Northern Virginia localities to enact a 1% income tax, but no one has ever taken advantage of it because the process is so cumbersome.

Ms. Dittmar asked what the Board's next step should be.

Mr. Foley said the question is whether the Board wants to amend the current County legislation program to make a statement about the things it supports.

Mr. Davis said a starting point would be to support equal taxing authority for counties with cities and towns and, after the Board has further discussions with legislators, Supervisors may want to adjust that priority. He added that this package can be somewhat dynamic until December but, at that point, the Board would need to focus its discussion platform.

Ms. Palmer asked if there was any reason the Board would not want to add the cigarette tax.

Mr. Davis said the cigarette tax would be included under the equal taxing provisions.

Ms. Palmer stated that perhaps the cigarette tax, as a stand-alone item, would be more realistic.

Mr. Blount said the challenge with individual legislation that pertains to just one County is that it requires a higher vote percentage, i.e., a 2/3 majority of both Houses rather than a simple majority.

Ms. McKeel asked if Board members had a sense of what legislators might be willing to get on board and advocate for the County.

Ms. Dittmar said the Board needs to know what it wants, and that is what the meeting with legislators is all about. She said the meeting with legislators will be earlier this year, however, Supervisors need to get its concerns streamlined first. She said she has been told it would be important to have bipartisan support of the bill in each House, and today's discussion is a step in that direction, in addition to meeting with the School Board.

Mr. Boyd asked if other communities involved with TJPDC have talked about narrowing the scope of requests, because legislators have suggested having one, two or three initiatives would be more effective than bringing 10 or 15 forward.

Mr. Blount said this would probably sit very well with some of the other localities. He stated that he had only met with Louisa so far so it would probably be effective to focus on the top issues and getting those out sooner.

Board members expressed support for limiting the legislative agenda.

Ms. Mallek suggested listing a few as the highest priorities but leaving the rest on the back of the page, because things will pop up at the last minute and it is helpful for Mr. Blount to have some background so he can answer for those issues.

Mr. Blount agreed, stating that the key is to identify the region's top priority as an action item.

Mr. Davis said, last year, the Board and School Board agreed to write a joint letter expressing the top three priorities – the Standards of Quality, the composite index, and the Virginia Retirement System funding issues. He stated that, under the signatures of the chair of the School Board and the Board of Supervisors, a letter was sent to legislators requesting it focus on those priority issues for the boards. Mr. Davis said something like a tax option could be done on a regional basis, and may have more impact than pursuing it individually.

Mr. Foley said a good legislative program is important, but Albemarle County needs to develop a regional strategy and the program, as it stands, does not list equal taxing authority for counties, so the Board may want to take that under consideration with the idea that a strategy will be developed over the next few months as Mr. Blount coordinates with regional partners.

Mr. Boyd asked when the next Mayors & Chairs meeting would take place, as that would be a good place to tackle that issue.

Mr. Blount said the next meeting was scheduled for August 27.

Mr. Foley noted that the County Administrator's meeting is held every month, and the plan is to talk about it there also. He said the Board would need to put forth some very strong specifics for legislators which could be tackled at the regional level; however, there are other issues such as the composite index which are already firmly on the County's agenda.

Mr. Davis explained that the composite index determines a school division's ability to pay and, based on that number, the composite index determines how much state funding is received by a local school system to fund the Standards of Quality (SOQ) requirements. He stated that several factors impact the composite index: the true value of real property, adjusted gross income in the locality, and taxable retail sales. Mr. Davis said the two issues the County has been concerned about in the past are related to land use value taxation. He explained that Albemarle County has a large land use program including ag/forestral districts which receive tax breaks for the next ten years. He stated the County Assessor has told him that the reduction in taxable property last year by properties in the land use program was reduced by about \$1.9 billion, which equates to about 10 cents on the tax rate. Mr. Davis said that number gets plugged into Albemarle's composite index based on the 100% fair market value rather than the land use value, and would equate to the \$2-\$2.5 million range of additional funding if that reduced land value was used in the composite index rather than the fair market value.

Mr. Davis stated that legislation to change the composite index has always been difficult politically, because every time the index is changed, there are winners and losers – probably more losers since few localities have land use tax – but, as an issue of ability to pay, it seems to be a reasonable position to take. He explained that land use taxation is a statewide initiative which encourages the preservation of natural resources and should be a state priority which the County should not have to pay for locally. Mr. Davis said Senator Emmett Hanger introduced a bill in 2013 which did not make it out of committee, but that has been the only recent effort, so it is a tough political proposition, but one the County should continue to think about. He said the other composite index factor arises from the revenue-sharing agreement with the City. He stated that the School Board, as well as the County, has pushed this on several legislative agendas in the past. Mr. Davis said bills have been introduced in 2011, 2012 and 2014 which tried to take the amount of revenue being provided to the City into account in the composite index formula. He said this was added to the County's program late in the year as a priority of the School Board, with the bill introduced by Delegate Rob Bell last year. He stated that it is an issue the Board needs to decide as to whether it wants to include it this year, perhaps after meeting with the School Board.

Ms. Dittmar said it was added at the last minute last year at the request of the School Board, and she would like to have it removed because this is the Board's legislative agenda.

Ms. Palmer agreed, stating that the City has someone fighting it and the County has someone promoting it.

Ms. McKeel noted that it makes relationships very difficult, adding that she has voted against it at the School Board level and supports taking it out.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that the letter came after the School Board had initiated the issue without consulting or advising the Board at all.

Ms. McKeel said there have been some years where Delegate Bell was not willing to take it forward, and some years where he was, so that is another issue.

Mr. Boyd disagreed, adding that Delegate Bell has always felt it was a fairness issue.

Ms. Mallek clarified that she agrees with Part A, but not Part B, and it is just a jab at the City to leave it in.

Mr. Boyd said he did not view it that way, and felt it was simply a fairness issue.

Ms. Palmer said she was a bit confused about the discussion of school consolidation and, along with that, there had been a discussion of revenue sharing, and felt it should be on the table for Part B.

Mr. Boyd asked what she was referring to.

Ms. Palmer explained that, if both entities consolidated schools, the state would look at the revenue sharing arrangement between the City and the County. She stated that there was a report done on this topic which is available online at *Charlottesville Tomorrow*.

Mr. Foley suggested that the Board revisit that issue at some point but, for the time being, asked the Board to clarify what should be put into this legislative agenda. He said Attachment A is a proposal for the program which the Board could approve and, perhaps, remove Item B under composite index, however, staff's recommendation is to approve the rest of the items as those are good additions to the County's overall legislative program. Mr. Foley stated that, if there is consensus on this, the County would continue its efforts with Mr. Blount and the other localities to determine the broader picture of equal taxing authority and whether a few sources would come out which everyone could support. He said staff

could then work with the TJPDC to get legislators to an early meeting in October, and see if there is a push for those items. He said option 2, as presented, is still on the table and perhaps Supervisors would go with a specific source of revenue which the Board would put on the priority list for legislators. He added that the equal taxing authority is a good one to have on the list, as it is consistent with VACO and does not restrict the County from going with separate individual taxing sources as it drafts a regional position on that.

Mr. Foley summarized that staff's recommendation would be adoption of the revised program with the exception of Item B under the composite index item.

Ms. McKeel said the Board should include something in its legislative packet which conveys to legislators the tight timeframe in advertising as it is problematic to get the County's work sessions and meetings done within that window.

Mr. Davis said it was originally seven days, and then went to 30, with the compromise being 14; however, that has failed on at least two occasions over the last five years. He said the 1% is a pretty low threshold and, before the recession, it was not uncommon for the County to have double digit effective increases. He said the other item highlighted in the packet is the transportation funding issue, and staff suggests that it would not hurt to include it in the program. He indicated that it may not be pushed until the study group gets together and figures out more specifically what it wants the funding source to look like.

Mr. Foley stated that adoption of the proposed amendments to the legislative program, with the exception of Item B under the composite index, would reflect what staff has heard over the last several months.

Mr. Davis said the Board could refer to it as the "preliminary legislative priorities."

Ms. Mallek **moved** to approve the preliminary legislative priorities with Item B under composite index deleted. Ms. Palmer **seconded** the motion.

Ms. McKeel said the cost to compete pay differential has not been on the School Division's agenda for the last several years, so there is no need to keep it in.

Mr. Davis said it was on the School's agenda two years ago, but it might have dropped off last year.

Mr. Sheffield said he would vote in favor of the motion, but agreed with Mr. Boyd about removing Item B.

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer and Mr. Sheffield.

NAYS: Mr. Boyd.

Mr. Foley pointed out that this item may be on the School Board's legislative agenda. Mr. Davis said staff would try to better coordinate the priorities going forward.

DRAFT ALBEMARLE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS 3-YEAR PRIORITIES

June 10, 2014

Items **highlighted in green** are proposed 1st Year priorities.

Educational Opportunities: Provide lifelong learning opportunities for all our citizens

1	In partnership with the school system, identify a process to identify potential improvements in funding strategies for K-12 and school readiness <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider a blue ribbon committee to explore funding methods• Examine the funding relationship between the Board and School Board
2	Research and determine the successful components and outcome measurements for a lifelong educational system <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Determine who does what (respective responsibilities) and where opportunities may lie; consider what piece each partner may play• Determine continuing education needs by using the Economic Development Office to work with businesses to define those needs
3	Support the CATEC Strategic Plan in order to improve workforce development that is aligned with our local economy <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Incorporate CATEC Strategic Plan into County plans (i.e. economic development)• Expand the role of CATEC• Improve vocational/workforce/employer links• Increase internships and apprenticeships
4	Change process for oversight of the CIP to ensure that the Board and School Board get better input earlier on and that we achieve greater citizen awareness

Economic Prosperity: Foster an environment that stimulates diversified job creation, capital investments, and tax revenues that support community goals

1	Establish a successful Economic Development Office that achieves the County's economic development goals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine focus and direction of efforts; create appropriate role and structure • Determine reasonable measurements for success • Leverage career ladder jobs within our target industries (multiplier jobs) • Educate the community about the importance of economic development, what it would look like, and how the Economic Development Office is a resource for the County
2	Evaluate the Orange Dot program in the County
3	Define policies and incentives for redevelopment
4	Review our assets and economic engines within the community and enhance and protect our relationships so that we are able to utilize more partnerships when appropriate

Operational Capacity: Ensure County government's ability to provide high quality service that achieves community priorities

1	Attract and retain high performing professionals and managers
2	Bring staffing capacity up to a level required to implement the Board's strategic priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider/evaluate a Transportation Planning position • Consider/evaluate a Water Resource Manager position • Consider/evaluate a Rural Areas Planning position
3	Continue with our long term plan to fund the Police Department's core services and geo-policing
4	Continually evaluate others' best practices and encourage an organizational culture that innovates and is a model for others <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help staff with furthering "One Organization Committed to Excellence"
5	Obtain and maintain infrastructure of sufficient quality to support government operations (i.e. IT, buildings, vehicles)
6	Strengthen regional collaboration efforts

Citizen Engagement: Successfully engage citizens so that local government reflects their values and aspirations

1	Improve citizen communication and participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an interactive mapping approach that enhances geographic information that is available to citizens • Support elected officials meeting with and coordinating ombudsman activities with citizens • Continue to establish protocols, resources, and technologies that reach and respond to citizens from diverse circumstances <p>[Note: Consider whether any of these bulleted items should be separate priorities]</p>
---	--

Critical Infrastructure: Prioritize, plan and invest in critical infrastructure that responds to past and future changes and improves the capacity to serve community needs

1	Establish and implement a solid waste management plan with emphasis on reducing, reusing, and recycling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and execute short term solutions/actions and begin the implementation of a long range strategy to address solid waste issues
2	Consider the formation of a regional transit authority and consider creating a service district for funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update previous study • Identify partners • Look at funding alternatives
3	Explore the basis for calculating school capacity to insure alignment with our development plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process is underway to produce a long range plan that will inform the CIP process • Address Pre-K space needs; consider whether schools can support Pre-K education
4	Revisit our capital investments and prioritize those that are needed, particularly as they relate to Master Plan implementation
5	Examine/revisit the possibility of financing our CIP projects through a local bond issue
6	Begin design for court expansion and renovation
7	Revisit the process for the CIP across schools [Note: This Priority may be combined with Educational Opportunities #4 into one priority regarding the CIP and will be addressed under the appropriate Aspiration]

Development Areas: Attract quality employment, commercial, and high density residential uses into development areas by providing services and infrastructure that encourage redevelopment and private investment while protecting the quality of neighborhoods

1	Perform transportation impact planning to determine how growth is affecting existing neighborhoods, businesses, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include safety improvements in master plan areas
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance transit service, routes, and bus stops
2	Define new small area plans with related improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand and sensibly place light industrial areas
3	Develop and implement policies and/or performance measurements to protect existing neighborhoods
4	Explore redevelopment policies and incentives

Natural Resources: Thoughtfully protect and manage Albemarle County's ecosystems and natural resources in both the rural and development areas to safeguard the quality of life of current and future generations

1	Set up a program to improve water quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine the level of service and funding Revisit the funding mechanism for storm water management
2	Successfully implement the County's stormwater management programs
3	Identify important biodiversity areas and provide information to landowners on the importance of those areas
4	Consider steps suggested in the LCAPP to ease/mitigate climate change [Note: Revise this Priority after Comprehensive Planning presentation to the Board]

Rural Areas: Preserve the character of rural life with thriving farms and forests, traditional crossroad communities, and protected scenic areas, historic sites, and biodiversity

1	Optimize management of the County's parks and open spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine the optimum relationship between tourism and preservation and ensure that tourism (overuse) is not having a negative impact Consider how we may better develop our park system Review park/open space usage to determine what parks may be overused; how to open new parks to spread usage, and how to get people to our parks Consider how funding for the ACE program may contribute Include volunteer system for trail maintenance
2	Carefully address agri-tourism mandates to assess rural impact
3	Develop a rural transportation plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify entrance corridor roads (i.e. Barracks Road) Address connectivity including trails, bikeways, greenways, rural rustic road, etc.
4	Ascertain the core services expectations in rural areas and examine the "social contract" that the County has with rural residents in the delivery of services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community facilities plan addresses this and will lead to Board policy Develop common theme and messages that Board Members can communicate
5	Establish a minimum acceptable level of broadband service and pursue opportunities to bring that level of service to all citizens
6	Encourage rehabilitation of crossroads communities

Agenda Item No. 19. Discussion: Charlottesville Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB) Governance and Funding.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that Board members expressed an interest in understanding the background related to the membership composition and the funding formula for the Charlottesville Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB) as established in the 2004 joint exercise of powers agreement between the County and the City (Attachment A). Information regarding the CACVB, including a copy of the joint agreement, the CACVB's 2014 annual report and a long-range funding assessment, were provided to the Board in their Dropbox in June, and are attached as part of this executive summary. Strategic plan Goal 3 is to encourage a diverse and vibrant local economy

Establishment of the CACVB

- From 1989 until 2004, the CACVB operated under a joint exercise of powers agreement between the County and the City and was jointly funded on an annual basis in accordance with a formula based on local sales and lodging tax revenues.
- During that time, the CACVB was supervised by a Management Committee consisting of the County Executive, the City Manager and the President of the Chamber of Commerce. A Regional Tourism Council, consisting of 15 people appointed by the Management Committee, served in an advisory role to the CACVB's Executive Director.
- In 2004 a new joint exercise of powers agreement (Agreement) for CACVB was approved by the County and the City by ordinance. The most substantive changes were:
 - the elimination of the Charlottesville Regional Tourism Council;
 - an increase in the size of the CACVB's governing board from three to eleven to include representatives from the tourism industry;
 - a change in the funding formula to be based on 30% of the first 5% of County and City annual transient occupancy tax revenues; and

- (4) the inclusion of specific performance measures by which the CACVB is held accountable.

The Agreement is in effect until terminated by mutual agreement of both Parties or either Party may terminate the Agreement by giving written notice to the other Party and to the CACVB Management Board at least six months prior to July 1st of any year in which the Agreement remains in effect. The effective date of any such termination shall be no sooner than June 30th of the year following the six months notice.

Governing Board Composition:

As outlined in the Agreement, the powers and authority of CACVB are vested in a Management Board, consisting of eleven members, as follows:

- Seat 1:** Charlottesville City Manager, or his designee
- Seat 2:** Albemarle County Executive, or his designee
- Seat 3:** President of the Charlottesville Regional Chamber of Commerce, or his designee
- Seat 4:** Executive Vice President of the University of Virginia, or his designee
- Seat 5:** President/CEO of the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, or his designee
- Seat 6:** Representative of the Local General Business Community, appointed by the City
- Seat 7:** Representative of the Local General Business Community, appointed by the County
- Seat 8:** Representative of the Local Accommodations/Hotel Business appointed by the City
- Seat 9:** Representative of the Local Accommodations/Hotel Business appointed by the County
- Seat 10:** Representative of the Local Tourism Industry appointed by the City
- Seat 11:** Representative of the Local Tourism Industry appointed by the County

Currently, the County's appointees are:

- Seat 2 – Lee Catlin
- Seat 7 – Jason Burch (Charlottesville Albemarle Regional Airport)
- Seat 9 – currently vacant
- Seat 11 – Cynthia Chiles (Carters Mountain Orchard)

Pursuant to the Agreement, when any of these seats becomes vacant, the CACVB Management Board shall submit a list of eligible nominees to the appointing jurisdiction and such jurisdiction may, but shall not be required to, appoint a person from the nomination list to fill the vacant seat.

Funding Formula:

Both the County and the City provide funding to the CACVB in each fiscal year in an amount equal to thirty percent (30%) of the first five percent (5%) of the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenues collected by the jurisdiction in the most recent fiscal year for which a full year of data is available. Virginia counties, by general law, are enabled to levy a maximum TOT of two percent (2%). In 1996, the General Assembly enacted legislation that enabled Albemarle County and several other counties to levy a maximum TOT of five percent (5%). The legislation required that the revenue from the additional three (3%) be used only for projects and expenditures that promote tourism, travel, or businesses that generate tourism or travel in the locality.

In the FY15 Adopted Budget, the additional three percent (3%) generates \$1,453,305 and funds the following:

- CACVB – \$725,098 (30% of FY13 TOT revenues pursuant to Agreement)
- Parks and Recreation Maintenance (CIP) - \$25,000
- Parks and Recreation Maintenance (operating) - \$671,707
- African American Cultural Arts Festival / Chihamba - \$2,700
- Ash-Lawn Opera - \$3,800
- Piedmont Council for the Arts - \$5,000
- Virginia Festival of the Book - \$10,000
- Virginia Film Festival - \$10,000

As noted in the attached Long Range Funding Assessment (Attachment C), additional TOT revenues are expected be generated as new lodging establishments are constructed in the County and the City, with a percentage of those increased revenues going to the CACVB pursuant to the Agreement. The Assessment identifies future expenditure drivers anticipated by the CACVB, the most significant of which is the transition of funding to support an expanded marketing effort from fund balance to the operating budget. The CACVB's expanded marketing effort was funded initially through a very significant fund balance that had accumulated over several years. Now that the fund balance is being spent down, the CACVB's marketing plan will need to shift to an operationally financed marketing program, which means that the CACVB operating budget will need to cover major cost items, such as those outlined in the Assessment.

Performance Measures and Indicators:

CACVB is required to provide an annual report that includes Return on Investment (ROI) information for the fiscal year based on a formula that is outlined in Schedule B of the Agreement. The ROI is the ratio of the total direct visitor expenditures for every dollar of funding provided to CACVB by the Parties. The target ROI is 7:1. The ROI formula includes visitor expenditures related to meetings, group tours and leisure travel. The FY 2013 Annual Report demonstrated an ROI of 6.83:1, which is very close to the goal of the 7:1 ROI established in the Agreement and which translates to \$8,482,902 direct

expenditures generated by the CACVB compared to \$1,241,885 invested by the County and the City. Full details on the most recent performance measures are provided in the FY 2014 Annual Report (Attachment B).

Additional Information:

Since this issue was discussed by the Board, several Board members expressed an interest in some additional information regarding tourism-related revenues. The majority of that information is provided in Attachment D, the remainder of the information will be made available at the August 6 meeting.

There is no budget impact associated with this item.

This information is being provided in response to Board inquiry.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant to the County Executive for Community and Business Partnerships, addressed the Board and stated that she would provide a brief summary on the Charlottesville/Albemarle Convention & Visitors Bureau (CACVB) items. She explained that, from 1989 until 2004, CACVB operated under a joint exercise of power agreement between the City and the County and was funded by the two localities [along with the Chamber of Commerce] based on a formula of local sales and lodging tax revenues. During that time, she said the CACVB was supervised by a management committee consisting of the County Executive, the City Manager and the President of the Chamber of Commerce. Ms. Catlin said there was also a regional tourism council consisting of 15 people appointed by the management committee that served in an advisory role to the CACVB's Executive Director. She stated that, in 2004, a new joint exercise of power agreement was adopted by ordinance, and there were several substantive changes: it eliminated the Charlottesville Regional Tourism Council and increased the size of the CACVB's governing board; it changed the funding formula to be based on the TOT revenues; and it included some specific performance measures for accountability by CACVB. Ms. Catlin said the agreement is in effect until it is terminated by mutual agreement of both parties, or either party can terminate the agreement by giving written notice to the other party and to the CACVB management board within a specified time period.

Ms. Catlin said the power and authority of CACVB is vested in a management board, and that management board consists of the three parties which comprised the management board prior to this change, plus the addition of a number of other seats which brought the total to 11. She explained that those seats reflect City and County businesses, accommodations/lodging entities, and tourism industry representatives. She stated that the seats the County can influence include the County Executive position, which she currently holds; the County business representative, which is Jason Burch of the Charlottesville/Albemarle Airport; County accommodations/lodging, which has been vacant; and the County tourism industry, which is Cynthia Chiles from Carter's Mountain. Ms. Catlin said, by agreement, whenever a seat becomes vacant, the CACVB management board submits a list of eligible nominations – which the Board may or may not listen to. She stated that the funding formula is for the City and County to each provide annual funding equal to 30% of the first 5% of the TOT revenues; for the County, that amount is 5%. Ms. Catlin said the amount is calculated on the most recent fiscal year for which a full year of data is available, so there is a bit of a lag in how the funding is allocated.

Ms. Catlin said all counties in Virginia were enabled to levy a maximum TOT of 2%, which goes to the General Fund to support general expenses of the County. In 1996, the General Assembly enacted legislation which gave Albemarle and several other counties the ability to levy 5% with the stipulation that the additional revenue of 3% be used only for projects and expenditures that promote tourism, travel, or businesses which generate tourism and travel. She said this is where the County gets the funding for CACVB, Parks & Recreation maintenance and operating, and a number of cultural festivals. Ms. Catlin said the return on the investment (ROI) agreement requires performance measures, and the target return on investment, which is the ratio of total direct visitor expenditures for every dollar of funding provided, is 7 to 1, with a formula established in the agreement that shows how that is supposed to be calculated. She said this is reported to the County by the CACVB, and the ROI for 2013 was 6.83 to 1, which translates into \$1.2 million invested by the County and City and \$8.5 million in direct expenditures realized, according to the formula put out for them.

Ms. Mallek asked if that was shared between the City and County. Ms. Catlin said it is shared but she would have that broken out by locality for the Board.

Ms. Catlin said the Board had requested TOT information for the last five years, which was provided in the executive summary. She explained that a 1% increase in the TOT rate would equate to about \$426,000 based on what is projected for the budget next year. She stated that TOT is the only revenue supported by tourism, however, food and beverage and sales tax revenues are also impacted. Ms. Catlin said the Virginia Tourism Corporation indicates that visitors account for about one-half of table service sales, and 90% of TOT. She stated that she also provided the Board with five years of CACVB funding information. She said some other counties like Roanoke have been given the authority to increase its TOT for specific things such as tourism advertising. Ms. Catlin said James City County and York County have a 5% TOT rate, and were allowed to charge an additional \$2 per room in those jurisdictions, but those funds were required to go to tourism advertising. She stated that the recent

transportation bill imposes a state TOT to help fund the transportation authorities which are forming in Northern Virginia.

Mr. Davis said that was repealed last year after it was ruled unconstitutional, so the transportation authorities do not have the ability to impose the TOT.

Mr. Boyd said that was based on the fact the authorities were unelected.

Mr. Davis said the transportation authorities were not a governing body.

Ms. Catlin stated that 13 counties have been granted permission to levy an admissions tax not to exceed 10%, but only three of them are using that authority. She said some of the more upscale properties around the state charge a "resort fee," but that stays with the property and does not get passed onto localities.

Ms. Palmer asked how one could tell if advertising dollars are increasing tourism. Ms. Catlin said there are some website-driven things such as online booking sites for reservations, and also some pretty well-established conversion formulas which the State Department of Tourism and other sources use as well as multiplier factors for things like meals.

Mr. Foley said there is an industry standard which is being used.

Ms. Palmer said just because someone books online does not necessarily mean they did so because of an advertisement.

Ms. Dittmar said the tourism director used to survey individual properties about what has generated business. Ms. Catlin said that is still being done and, at some point, she can bring back Payne Ross marketing staff because they are able to track a fairly direct link between specific ads and a spike in that particular solicitation coming in. She said there is an assumption that more marketing is better, but there is also some hard data which shows how exposure to different efforts really relates to increased usage.

Mr. Foley asked if there was any direction the Board wanted to provide and also what staff should follow up on. Ms. Dittmar said this stems from general interest in what all of the authorities are doing for the County and, because this is a significant piece of economic development, it should be well understood as the new economic development director comes on board.

Ms. Mallek said, given the new hotels in the area, there would likely be a big increase in this category of revenue and wondered if the County should continue to put all of its money in this direction. She stated that she was not wedded to the current arrangement. Ms. Mallek said, from an influence perspective, what the County had in terms of structure with the CACVB previously was more appealing in her opinion.

Mr. Boyd said he has been on that board since the agreement was changed, and what the County has now is a better situation than what was in place before, mainly because there was no accountability.

Ms. Mallek expressed surprise, given that the County Executive was on that board.

Ms. Dittmar said she was also on the board and felt that there was a lot of accountability, adding that the board consisted of Leonard Sandridge from the University of Virginia, Bob Tucker of the County, Cole Hendrix and then Gary O'Connell from the City. She stated that they spent a lot of their meetings going over numbers.

Mr. Boyd asked if the board was keeping track of this kind of information.

Ms. Dittmar said they were, although it was less sophisticated with more standard advertising absent social media, and was critical for revenues for the region. She stated that it was a good model, and now Supervisors are just looking at a different model.

Mr. Foley said staff would look for any other direction the Board wanted to provide in the future.

Mr. Boyd said the reason he likes this model is because there are people now on the CACVB Board who have a vested interest in seeing success and, while there was some institutional interest before, it was not as important as it is to those who sit now. He also commented on stores that requested a zip code, and wondered if that could be a method to help track tourism dollars for sales tax information.

Agenda Item No. 22. Solid Waste Service Options.

The executive summary states that on April 2, 2014, the Board considered solid waste options and provided three directions:

- **Consensus** that staff prepare and provide at a future meeting additional information and options regarding costs for construction and operation at Ivy, as well as services to be provided, to assist the Board in determining which approach is the most desirable.
- **Consensus** that staff bring back to the Board for further consideration viable alternatives for providing increased recycling opportunities for County residents in the near term, to include cooperation with public, private and regional entities.
- **APPOINTED**, by a vote of 5:0:1 (Boyd-abstained), the County appointees to the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Citizens Committee to a separate advisory committee to the Board to do initial work on long-term solutions for solid waste.

This executive summary is presented to address the first two directions.

Solid Waste Services at Ivy MUC

Staff has focused on providing near-term solid waste options that assure a continuation of important solid waste services while enhancing current recycling efforts. The expectation is that the Board will adopt more permanent solid waste solutions following recommendations from the Albemarle Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee. Staff estimates that the near-term services will be needed for a period of three to five years, beginning on July 1, 2015, which is the anticipated closure date of the Materials Utilization Center's (MUC) transfer station. Staff has focused on continuing to use the MUC site as directed by the Board, recognizing time.

Staff has determined that two levels of service can be provided at the MUC site through the following operations: 1) a transfer station, which would largely continue current services; or 2) a convenience center, which would reduce the current service level primarily to commercial haulers, but would provide as much service as possible without triggering the need for a DEQ transfer station permit. The distinction between these two operations is key and is described in detail as part of a report from Draper Aden Associates (DAA) in Attachment A. It is important to note that as part of this report, DEQ addressed the distinction between a transfer station and a convenience center specifically in the context of the Ivy MUC site. This DAA report further provides three options regarding the utilization of the site as a convenience center including advantages and disadvantages with each option. This report provides for better evaluation overall of the service opportunities and challenges related to the Ivy site. In addition, staff has identified two possible management structures for the operation of the facility: 1) RSWA operation or 2) County operation by overseeing the management itself or by contract with a third party. Note that the County operation of the existing transfer station is deemed non-viable at this time, due in part to the fact that the DEQ permit is currently held by the RSWA and any material change would require DEQ permit modification, modification of internal agreements, and additional environmental liability.

Consequently, staff has identified three scenarios for consideration to determine a preference for the continued operation of a transfer station or the conversion of the transfer station to a convenience center to be operated by either the RSWA or the County in Attachment B, which provides a comparison of these three scenarios, including assumed favorable and unfavorable factors, cost comparisons and qualitative aspects of each.

Enhanced Recycling

Staff has identified some specific areas in which the County's overall recycling efforts may be enhanced in the near term. First and foremost, with any of the three scenarios above, additional or enhanced recycling services can be incorporated. Second, the County's current program with the RSWA, in which the County pays for the collection of paper at three different locations in the County, can be modified in order to implement a pilot project intended to expand materials collected at a reduced cost. However, the Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee has requested more time and opportunity to consider and evaluate "enhanced" recycling options, including any pilot programs, so that any proposed changes can best inform their work in advising the Board next Spring/Summer.

Budget impacts depend on the selection of a preferred option as described in Attachment A and Attachment B.

Staff recommends that the Board direct staff to pursue the conversion of the existing Ivy transfer station to a convenience center operated by the RSWA as summarized in Scenario 2 above for the following primary reasons:

- 1) Maximizes levels of service for residences and businesses with an emphasis on re-use and recycling without the need for a transfer station permit (note that under this scenario the transfer station permit is terminated).
- 2) Maintains operational efficiency associated with the compaction of bulky material using the existing hopper/conveyor/compactor system, thereby reducing cost. Alternatives for any required replacement equipment for this type of convenience center would be less expensive due to the type of equipment needed to handle such a small amount of municipal solid waste (MSW).

- 3) Reduces up-front capital investment and specifically eliminates the need to upgrade the current transfer station to meet DEQ requirements while taking advantage of existing leachate/stormwater facilities on site.
- 4) Avoids additional liability/risk tied to control (ownership/lease) of a portion of the former Ivy landfill property.
- 5) Continues high quality service with a proven partner in the RSWA.

Mr. Doug Walker, Assistant County Executive, addressed the Board, stating that this has been a team approach over the last several weeks, adding that Lynn Klappich of Draper Aden has been working together with Tom Frederick of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) to bring together the information that is before the Board at this time. Mr. Walker said what he has presented to the Board includes an outline of Board direction, scenarios considered for the Ivy Materials Utilization Center (MUC), a recommended near-term solution, and next steps.

Mr. Walker said the direction from the Board stipulated that staff should look at options related to the Ivy MUC, bring back information on the costs and operation at Ivy as well as the services to be provided. He stated that, in looking at that direction, staff identified a few different questions to be answered which will help form the basis of the consideration in the presentation scenarios: either it is a transfer station, or it is a convenience center but it cannot be both; and either it is operated by the RSWA, or it is operated by the County but it cannot be both. He noted that the County operation could include contracting out to a private third-party vendor. Mr. Walker said recycling enhancements were also identified by the Board in April and, most recently in meeting with the Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee, the Committee had asked for some time to consider those enhancements prior to bringing them forward, so enhancements include any number of different improvements which could be made at Ivy to make recycling more accessible to the general public.

Mr. Walker stated that the entrance to the Ivy site on Dick Woods Road has the facility concentrated at the front of the entire site, with the vegetative waste and clean-fill areas at the rear of the site which becomes relevant with regard to service options and opportunities. He said the three scenarios would be: (1) the transfer station operated by RSWA which is primarily a status quo arrangement but could also include some enhancements to recycling; (2) a convenience center operated by RSWA with one option using existing equipment and the lay-out would be utilized and another using new equipment, but, in either case, there would be no need for additional development at the site; and (3) a convenience center operated by the County or through some other means but under County control. Mr. Walker said each scenario has both favorable and unfavorable factors. He said scenario one enables Rivanna to keep its Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) permit to operate a transfer station but it would require an amendment to the permit in order to meet requirements, and also would allow waste from commercial haulers, multiple properties and dead animals. He stated that unfavorable factors include the need for a public process in order to get the permit considered and approved, which would make the project more complex. He said another unfavorable factor would be that commercial waste proportion is declining. Mr. Walker said one-time development costs include an estimated \$600,000, which comes from the 2012 Draper Aden report and has not been significantly modified, and does not include any additional costs associated with enhancements for a separate area for household recycling. He said the annual operating cost of this site is estimated at \$400,000. He said, from 2010-2014, the total tonnage at Ivy has gone from over 52,000 tons to less than 20,000 tons, with a significant increase in recyclable materials over non-recyclable materials. Mr. Walker noted that this was a point Draper Aden made about the operation being more of a convenience center and less of a transfer center due to the reduction in commercial waste.

Mr. Walker said scenario two would not require a DEQ permit, would continue most services, and the RSWA would continue to receive waste from individual residential and commercial properties as well as waste received from recyclable goods, white goods, clean fill, and vegetative waste. He stated that what would be excluded would be commercial haulers' waste, waste from multiple properties and dead animals. Mr. Walker explained that, if it comes from Goodwill or Salvation Army, it is considered a single property, however, the waste itself is coming from multiple properties. He said the Board has previously asked if a contractor doing work at someone's home could bring their waste to the convenience center, and the answer under this scenario is yes. He stated that there are some enforcement mechanisms under this scenario so Rivanna can assure DEQ that the County is adhering to the provisions, but this is a significant part of the switch from transfer to convenience center and it does terminate the transfer station center permit. Mr. Walker said one-time estimated development costs, with a separate enhanced recycling area, range from \$200,000-\$400,000 and, without the recycling area, the cost to make this conversion would be much less. He stated that the estimated annual operating costs would be approximately \$325,000.

Mr. Walker said scenario three would be a convenience center operated by the County, and a DEQ permit would not be required. He said this scenario would allow waste from individual residential properties but eliminates other services being provided such as vegetative waste and clean fill because onsite access would be terminated. He stated that it would require County control of the property via lease or purchase from RSWA, which brings up a number of issues including the additional liability and risk assumed by taking over a property which was once a landfill and would be a significant negotiating point. Mr. Walker said the estimated one-time development cost would be \$600,000. He said that cost assumes there is a template as to what that facility would look like with bagged trash put into compactors,

bulk trash into open containers, and recycling into open containers. He said there is a certain footprint to accommodate that along with traffic, and would require additional development, including grade separation to facilitate disposal of those materials. He stated that there is no estimated annual operating cost because the County would need to solicit competitive proposals from a third-party provider.

Mr. Walker stated that staff's recommendation is to transition from a transfer station to a convenience center and that it be operated by the RSWA, with the primary factors being the clearer definition from DEQ as to what can be accepted at the convenience center which would enable the continuation of most services. He said continued use of the hopper/conveyor/compactor system is significant in that, as long as it continues to work, people can put their waste in the hopper so it is compacted, which reduces hauling costs and is more efficient. Mr. Walker said, because of the lower volume of material, a replacement compactor unit is going to be much less expensive than fixing or replacing the existing compactor unit. He stated that this does reflect the trend of materials currently being handled at Ivy MUC, with much less volume; it does not require major capital investment to achieve DEQ compliance; the operating costs are similar to the transfer station, somewhat less; it does not require the County to assume additional risk; and it enables the County to continue a successful partnership with the RSWA, ensures continuity of current operations and takes advantage of its good relationship with neighbors and customers.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the Board needed to focus on two out of the three options. Mr. Foley said the big question is whether option three is viable to the Board, which would mean putting it out to bid and obtaining a lease from Rivanna. He pointed out that this scenario has the longest timeframe. He stated that, if the Board decides not to pursue that option, the convenience center versus transfer station operated by Rivanna becomes the issue, and is not as critical in terms of time and final decision.

Ms. Mallek asked if there had been any discussion with RSWA about the improvements coming out of the capital reserve which the County has already paid into, because it is an improvement to the facility. She also asked what the breakdown is for annual operating costs in scenario three since these would be hourly wage employees, noting that neighboring counties pay a whole lot less for that. Mr. Walker said scenario three operating costs were not determined as those were to be bid out for competitive procurement to determine if it would be cheaper for the County to run it, or to contract it out to a private vendor.

Ms. Mallek said the \$325,000 cost is if Rivanna ran it using its current staff and current operation mode. She stated that the only way to have a more modern facility is for the County to do it itself and hire someone to run it because Rivanna has been clear that it does not want to change the way it operates it. Mr. Walker said there may be some other variables and factors which might influence her thinking as to whether that is a viable option to pursue further and, if it is, then the timing becomes much more critical because of the need to get an RFP out as soon as possible. He stated that the cost estimate of redevelopment of the site was considered without a determination as to where that money would come from, and whether there was County money which could be used to pay for the equipment in option one because it is comingled with City money, and is a different discussion that leads to other questions.

Mr. Foley noted that there is an assumption that some money set aside could offset that cost; however, staff does not know what that amount would be in total.

Ms. Palmer pointed out that option three does not mean it is not going to be modernized in some ways, as there are different options outlined in the Draper Aden report, adding that the County could modify those depending on what Supervisors decide to do. She said one of the things that makes it important to have Rivanna involved is the fact that it has this expertise. She stated that, at the last committee meeting, she was very impressed at the composition of the group and the status of the RSWA. Ms. Palmer said she did not want to preempt the committee's work, would like to keep Rivanna in the loop of running this because the Authority is a critical partner and it has the expertise in addition to the fact that the County will lose services otherwise.

Ms. Dittmar asked what Ms. Palmer's preference would be in ranking order. Ms. Palmer stated that her preference is the staff recommendation, adding that she was very impressed at how they brought everything together because there are a lot of moving parts, so that would be scenario two, i.e., a convenience center run by RSWA. She said she would like to add the nuance that, if the transfer station is closed, there would still be some public health issues. She said this option would allow the Board to say 'yes' to a convenience center along with the option to put together a plan for the wholesale level of the solid waste policy and to also put a letter forward to the DEQ by April 1 which would outline the County's next steps with a timeline. This would also allow the County to keep the transfer station open a bit longer in order to handle the dead animals, depending on what DEQ says. Ms. Palmer said, in talking to Mark Brownley at RSWA, the site receives as many as 300 deer during the fall. She stated that she does not like scenario three.

Mr. Foley clarified that the concern is the provision of handling of dead animals.

Ms. Palmer said Board members have been told over and over again that the site is not economically ideal for a transfer station, so the question is how to handle the other things.

Ms. Dittmar said that is a longer term solution and what the Board is trying to determine now is a way to bridge from now to that point.

Mr. Boyd said he agreed with option two, but has some of the same concerns as Ms. Palmer about the dead animals. He said he wants to make sure the County can still accommodate the bulky waste and hazardous materials collections at that location. He stated that the City has also indicated it wants to address that, however, he would like to resolve the issue of Rivanna's reserves and how those will be appropriated as that needs to be dealt with regardless of which option.

Ms. Palmer said she also agreed with John Martin's proposal to equalize the cost for City and County residents to use the facility.

Ms. Mallek expressed concern about that arrangement, because the County is paying 100% of the cost.

Mr. Foley said that is a topic for another discussion, as there are several issues there.

Ms. Dittmar said scenario two is fine with her, but she would hate to give up the DEQ permit and would like to see what the committee recommends first.

Ms. Mallek said she does not think the County can afford the transfer station requirements which the County is going to have regardless.

Ms. Dittmar stated that \$300,000 is a lot to pay for improvements if DEQ is not going to let the County keep the permit. She said she would also like to take scenario three off the table because of the liability issue. She said she did not want a short-term solution which would open up long-term problems for the County.

Mr. Foley said eliminating scenario three is good direction for staff, adding that the committee is not scheduled to come back to the Board under the current schedule, however, this matter could be put on hold until staff sees what comes out of those meetings.

Ms. Palmer stated that the committee is currently going to be working through their timeline, discussing the wholesale/retail issue, and she would like to give that process a bit more time.

Ms. Mallek said there was something in the DEQ letter which alluded to having a holding period, not to be construed as approval. She stated that, since 2008, the County has been extending this another year while the Board figures out what to do, and it seems Supervisors are there again.

Mr. Foley said it is a significant decision to have RSWA stay involved in this, which would eliminate option three, however, the transfer station and dead animals question still remains.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that somehow the County needs to get a better handle on costs and have those verified by an outside source, because that is a real cost and not just a default as to what Rivanna has always done.

Mr. Boyd said he was not in favor of leveling the cost for City and County residents.

Ms. Dittmar said she was not sure that a lot of City residents were using this anyway, given the distance, and asked if it was a volume consideration.

Ms. Mallek said municipal solid waste was being eliminated anyway, so volume becomes a non-issue.

Mr. Foley said the volume is insignificant, adding that it would be more of a factor if the whole region was collaborating.

Ms. Palmer pointed out that the City is bringing its dead deer there currently.

Mr. Sheffield said his thoughts lean toward having the RSWA operate the facility.

Mr. Foley stated that the elimination of scenario three gives staff some very good direction as to how to proceed, including the comments from the Board as to things it needs to consider.

Agenda Item No. 21a. Budget Planning for FY 16 - Budget Process: Budget Development Calendar. *(Due to agenda schedule, the Board moved this item to later in the meeting).*

Recess. At 4:44 p.m., the Board recessed their meeting, and reconvened at 5:13 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 23. CPA-2013-01. Comprehensive Plan Update/Amendment, to begin with public comments and possible Board direction.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that at the July 9, 2014 Comprehensive Plan work session, the Board of Supervisors discussed the goal and introductory statements to the Rural Area Chapter and associated criteria for review of new uses, statements related to residential development, and expectations for crossroads communities. The Action Memo for that meeting, found here, http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Board_of_Supervisors/Forms/Action_Letters/2014_Actions/07092014actions.pdf provide direction to staff.

The staff report for the Rural Area work session that began on July 9, 2014 may be found here: http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Board_of_Supervisors/Forms/Agenda/2014Files/0709/05.0_CompPlanES.pdf

Staff has updated the July 9, 2014 Executive Summary for the August 6, 2014 meeting. Changes in this Executive Summary are underlined.

At this work session, the Board will continue its review of **Chapter 7: The Rural Area**. This Chapter may be found here: http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/07_Chapter_Rural_Area_Final_%201-23-14.pdf

The Goals, Objectives, Strategies, Implementation Priorities, Measures of Success, and list of Reference Documents for the Rural Area are found in Attachment A. There are no appendices, but the Reference Documents include maps of important agricultural and forestry soils.

A table comparing the existing and recommended Comprehensive Plan recommendations for the Rural Area is provided as Attachment B. Links to staff reports and relevant portions of the Planning Commission's minutes are provided in Attachment C.

On August 6, the Board will review the following topics:

- **Recommendations for lodging and restaurants** (pages 7.31 and 7.33)
These topics generated the most discussion at Commission meetings and are brought to the Board because of the Commission's recommended change in policy.

Staff comment: In light of the strong emphasis on tourism in the Economic Vitality Action Plan, the Planning Commission explored whether additional provision should be made for lodging and restaurants in the Rural Area. The Commission was keen to find ways to preserve existing historic resources and help prevent large farms and estates from being subdivided for residential development. Although they tried to find appropriate parameters to recommend in the Comprehensive Plan for such facilities, they were unable to agree on any thresholds. As a result, they recommended that lodging, possibly by-right, be considered in the Rural Area zoning district, provided that necessary parameters, such as minimum acreage, maximum number of rooms, etc., could be identified. They also recommended consideration of zoning text amendments to allow for restaurants, by-right, in crossroad communities only. Attachment D provides additional background and discusses the Commission's deliberation and recommendations.
- **Events in the Rural Area** (pages 7.31 – 7.32)
This topic is brought to the Board's attention because of state code changes. It is also highlighted because of the Commission's recommendations for a potential change in policy. (Please note changes in Attachment E.)

Staff comment: The preserved scenic beauty of the rural area has provided an economic boon for farm wineries that host events. The General Assembly of Virginia approved legislation earlier this year to extend those benefits to farm breweries. The Planning Commission made four recommendations related to events; however, one of those recommendations is not consistent with the recent legislation. Attachment E explains the Commission's recommendations and changes needed for consistency with the State Code.
- **Commercial Recreational facilities** (pages 7.33 and 7.34)
This topic is brought to the Board because of the Commission's recommended consideration for a change in policy.

Staff comment: Commercial recreational activities desiring rural settings have changed in character over the years. While golf courses and swim/tennis clubs are allowable by special use permit in the RA zoning district, commercial recreation such as zip lines and mountain biking may be more in keeping with rural character than golf courses and swim/tennis clubs. This topic was discussed briefly by the Board at their July 9, 2014 meeting with an understanding that it would be considered in more detail at this work session. Attachment F provides additional background and discusses the Commission's deliberation and recommendations.

- **Rural Interstate Interchanges** (pages 7.35 – 7-36)
Members of the Board of Supervisors have asked that the full board discuss recommendations for rural interstate interchanges because of their potential for economic development.

Staff comment: The Board of Supervisors has been discussing the benefits of interstate interchanges for economic growth since 2008. They asked the Planning Commission to consider changes to the County's policies for rural interchanges when the Commission began its work in 2011. Attachment G provides background on this topic and discusses the Commission's deliberation and recommendations.

- **Area B Recommendations** (pages 7.37 – 7.42)
Information on Area B land use is brought to the Board's attention so they are aware of the Area A and B boundaries and recommendations.

Staff comment: Area B land use recommendations are contained in several different documents. As part of this Comprehensive Plan update, the Commission supported the recommendation of the Planning and Coordination Council (PACC) to include Area B information within the respective Comprehensive Plans of the City and County. No changes to current land use are recommended. One area for which updating is needed, however, is the future use of the Milton Airport. Decisions by the Board of Supervisors regarding an indoor firing range in conjunction with the City and the University of Virginia were made after the Commission made its recommendations.

Recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan Draft include recommendations for future capital improvements and operations.

The Board is asked to identify any substantive changes to the recommendations herein presented and concur on those changes, focusing on content rather than wordsmithing. Staff will then make any necessary changes and bring them back to the Board for its approval prior to its public hearing.

Ms. Elaine Echols, Principal Planner, said the Board would accept public comment first, and then staff would get direction from the Board with special attention to the five items previously identified, and include a review of the other item which might not have been covered or that needed to be revisited.

The Chair opened the public comment portion of the work session.

Ms. Gerry Lee Chafin addressed the Board, stating that she lives in the Cismont area near the corner of Route 231 and Route 600, and presented a map of the area. Ms. Chafin pointed out the properties that face on Route 231 down to Grace Episcopal Church, and asked the Board to consider very carefully the effect of rural area uses on neighbors who have been there for many years, as well as properties which are very small. She stated that her property is 2.04 acres, and pointed out her property along with two other small properties. Ms. Chafin said they have lived there for 25 years in perfect happiness and, this year, a young couple moved into a house nearby bringing chickens, ducks, sheep, and a Mare Emma Sheepdog. She stated that those sheepdogs are recommended for ranches and large herds of sheep, and the dog barks at anything that moves or makes sounds. Ms. Chafin said another neighbor has a successful mushroom farm, and built his barn right by her back property line. She emphasized the impacts of these uses on smaller property owners.

Ms. Marcia Joseph addressed the Board, stating that she is a resident of the Rivanna District and was in attendance to discuss conservation easements. Ms. Joseph said a lot of wealthy people use conservation easement property, but she is aware of at least two family farms that were saved by the Acquisition of Conservation Easements (ACE) program years ago. She said she would like to see more of a commitment in the Comprehensive Plan to fund the program. She stated that large events, lodging and restaurants occurring in the rural area are not the types of activity that people expect when they buy land in the rural area, under conservation easement or not. Ms. Joseph said she lives on 11 acres in an ag/forest district and, if she had wanted all kinds of parties and music, she would have moved next to a fraternity house. She stated that there is an expectation when people move to the rural area, however, when these other activities are allowed, it changes the character of the area. Ms. Joseph said some of the comments made by the Planning Commission, which is the former body, not the current one about some of the uses indicate that there is an expectation that some of these uses could be done very well by supplemental regulations and just be by-right. She stated that this bothers her, because most people are not going to know what is happening until they receive a letter that some activity is going to happen next door to them. Ms. Joseph said it is really important that any of these uses contemplated are uses allowed by special use permit and allow public input so, when the neighbors provide input, Supervisors have a better idea. She stated that the restaurant and lodging uses are referenced in this chapter and, if the Board decides these uses are important to have, then those should be allowed by special use permit. Ms. Joseph said the other concern is that, once a large restaurant or lodge is built on a property and it does not make it, there is nothing that stops the owner from selling off any of the lots on the property.

Mr. Jeff Werner addressed the Board, stating that Albemarle County's policies have long reflected rural preservation as a priority, and one reason is that dispersed rural development is not fiscally

sustainable, especially in a county as large as Albemarle. He said it is critical that this remain a cornerstone of County policy, and emphasized that the revised plan represents a significant shift in the County's rural policy. He said the current policy stresses maintaining the rural character, protecting natural resources, encouraging appropriate land uses, limiting development, and limiting the fiscal impacts from that development. Mr. Werner stated that the revised policy suggests a weakened position on new development under the premise of mitigating pressure to subdivide, and suggests that the County should support and encourage non-ag commercial activities to include some that are currently discouraged. He said there are over 6,000 vacant rural lots, with almost 4,000 under 10 acres and, allowing by-right commercial activity will not curb rural home construction or reduce development potential but will merely allow more commercial activities. He stated that allowing such uses by-right takes away the special use permit, which allows neighbors to be heard and allows the County to impose conditions. Mr. Werner said rural development has resulted in increased traffic on rural roads, and encouraging non-ag commercial activities will further stress aging roads, bridges and culverts. He stated that, as new rural event facilities are developed and weddings become the new cash crop, he wondered how the County would respond to increased traffic on narrow, unimproved roads and on structurally deficient bridges. Mr. Werner asked if there was a plan to increase coverage by police and emergency services, and also at what point an aging bridge would need repair regardless of transportation priorities and what road projects would get bumped to fix the bridge. He stated that increased traffic from non-ag commercial activity, residential development, or both would impact the community. He said, in revising the rural policy, the County must account for the public cost and impacts on infrastructure which will result from those revisions. Mr. Werner emphasized that mitigating the pressure to subdivide land is one reason given for this policy shift, but there has been no data provided on the scope and scale of this pressure, and asked how many lots had been created in the last decade or so, what the range of sizes was, and how many were developed versus vacant. He asked if the pressure to subdivide was so great that rural residents must accept more and more non-ag activities with late-night music and increased traffic. He said the Board's discussion on this matter must include some solid information on the rate of subdivision, on the scale, pace and location of development, and on the fiscal impacts resulting from the increased traffic on rural roads. Mr. Werner said the Comprehensive Plan currently cites a 2007 ag census, but there is a 2012 version available. He stated that lacking current data, and moving forward under the dubious assumption that the increased non-ag activities would curb residential development, it is extremely premature for the County to significantly alter its long-held rural policies.

Mr. Wendell Wood addressed the Board, stating that he is a resident of the Ivy District but owns land in every district. Mr. Wood said he does not usually agree with Mr. Werner, but said that the rural areas need to be better defined as to their specific location. He stated that there are rural properties that meet every criteria for development, i.e. public water, public sewer, elementary schools, high schools, fire department, rescue squad, not in the watershed, and adjoins urban density land and, if that is the case, he is not sure that piece of property should not be considered rural. Mr. Wood said that forces the property to be developed as a large-lot rural subdivision. Mr. Wood said, as growth occurs, the County will have lost a piece of property which meets the criteria for development but would be situated somewhere in the rural area. He stated that he has been told numerous times that one of his properties is in the rural area, but it meets all the same criteria as development area land, and stated that the land would be developed, most likely in a less dense fashion. Mr. Wood asked the County to reassess the designation of some of the rural property, since some of it meets the development area criteria by the County's own rules.

The Chair closed the public comment period.

Ms. Echols presented the actions resulting from the Board's last meeting. She stated that the Board re-looked at new uses and criteria for new uses after it completed the rest of the chapter. She reported that the Board reversed objectives one and two in order to make "strong agricultural and forest economy" the first item; retained the recommendations from the Planning Commission for residential uses; and requested that community centers in crossroads communities should only be in existing buildings. She said, since that time, staff has heard that the Board wanted to revisit what the rural areas are for, what the main purposes are for preserving the rural areas, and what kinds of uses are appropriate in the rural area. Ms. Echols said the Board wanted to address those big picture items before getting into the discussion of lodging and restaurants, events, commercial recreation, interstate interchanges, and Area B. She stated that it would be up to the Board on how to proceed.

Ms. Palmer said she felt that some of the changes in the draft of the Comp Plan emphasized new uses rather than the traditional preferred uses of ag/forest and conservation of natural resources. She said she took the draft and made some suggestions on it and also wrote a letter to Ms. Echols with copies sent to each of the Supervisors. Ms. Palmer read her letter and said her suggestions were more about emphasizing that the County have three preferred rural land uses identified in the Comprehensive Plan: agriculture, forestry, and conservation of natural resources including biodiversity. Reading from her letter, she said that "many of the references to natural resource protection have been moved into the Natural Resources chapter," which is "quite reasonable for specific strategies," but because conservation of natural resources is one of the preferred rural land uses, it was important to emphasize it up front in the rural areas chapter of the Comp Plan. Ms. Palmer stated that she had done three things to help refocus the document on the three preferred land uses: adding conservation of natural resources to some of the places where ag/forest are mentioned, and moving some of the narrative focusing on the benefits of preserving rural areas for natural resource protection in front of the discussion of the potential new commercial uses and criteria for them; and adding a few sentences from the existing plan that help

emphasize the importance of natural resources protection in the rural areas. She said these changes take some of the emphasis off the new potential commercial uses and puts it back on preferred uses. Ms. Palmer said she thinks Supervisors need to all agree on what the rural areas ought to look like and what the emphasis should be, and that might inform the discussions on restaurants, lodging and those sorts of things.

Ms. Mallek asked if it would be a simple matter to describe the paragraphs that were moved.

Ms. Palmer said she had sent it to Ms. Echols, and agreed to summarize the three items she had identified. She stated that, for the relationship to the vision, she added that the rural areas provide places for agriculture/forestry and protection/preservation of natural resources and tourism, with the natural resources reference being added to the first block. Under the introduction, she said she added where it speaks of the County encouraging residential development in the development areas, not to conflict with "agriculture, forestry and conservation of natural resources." Ms. Palmer said, in the section on "land use plan for the rural areas," she took a section from the current Comp Plan – page 1 and page 18 – which emphasizes that agriculture, forestry and conservation are preferred uses, which helps highlight them as the focus and not new uses. She stated that, further in the document which shows a map of the location of designated rural areas, she has added a statement that the three preferred land uses have a "mutually supportive relationship, and all three provide great value to the community at large, including the City of Charlottesville and the County's development areas. Ms. Palmer said some of the benefits include, "the proximity of rural land, local agricultural enterprise, and the solitary contributions of the conservation lands to a clean and abundant water supply, clean air, scenic landscapes, and preservation of wildlife habitat, all of which are fundamental to a healthy and diverse biological community and a strong local economy."

Ms. Dittmar asked Board members for comments.

Mr. Boyd stated that, in reading the changes Ms. Palmer provided to the Board, he felt it was wordsmithing instead of looking at it from a higher level. He said one of his concerns with the suggestions was the lack of balance in the discussion of individual property rights, even though the sustainable living group identified that as one of its top priority items. Mr. Boyd stated that he did not know how the County would settle the neighbor-on-neighbor disputes, but what he felt the Board should keep coming back to is what the Planning Department's interpretation of what that means. He said he did not see any real problems with what Ms. Palmer had sent around, but he would like to understand staff's interpretation as that is the real significance of the Comp Plan document because staff will be the ones interacting with applicants.

Ms. Mallek said this is the Board's chance to find that out, to hash it out and make sure Supervisors are being specific enough, rather than at the special use permit phase. She said she found a lot of comfort in the paragraphs in the existing Comp Plan which need to be pushed to the front, because all of the smaller elements cascade from that instead of trying to play catch-up.

Ms. McKeel said she liked Ms. Palmer's emphasis on the three main uses and the changes she made. She stated that conservation emphasis is really good so, philosophically, she agrees with Ms. Palmer and Ms. Mallek.

Ms. Palmer said one of the reasons she moved those items up was not to wordsmith, but to, hopefully, give staff direction as to what was important to the Board, so that its interpretation would continue to emphasize conservation.

Mr. Boyd said his concern is what that would mean to Planning staff.

Ms. Echols said the Planning Commission worked hard to strike that balance and, on the first page of objective one – 7.11 – it talks about the need to strike that balance. She said the growth management section speaks to the importance of property rights, and the Commission made note of that, however, the Commission wanted to treat the property rights question by doing other things such as encouraging conservation easements and agriculture and forestry, encouraging people to join ag/forest districts, rather than saying "we discourage residential development in the rural areas." Ms. Echols said that was the Commission's way of dealing with personal property rights, but she was not sure the Board's perspective aligned with that.

Ms. Palmer said some of her other changes would address that. She stated that she had a lengthy conversation with Ms. Echols regarding items which needed to be raised because there was a different philosophical bend than what staff would ordinarily determine.

Mr. Boyd said he agreed with what Ms. Echols had just said. He said it appears the Planning Commission's intent was to encourage certain property uses in the rural areas rather than discouraging everything.

Ms. Palmer said it would depend on how far the Board goes with the specific wording. She said there are specific places in the document which might lessen that, would focus more on conservation, and also provide a more traditional view of what the rural areas mean.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that he has been doing this since 1986, and the consistency over the years in overall philosophy has been that the rural areas are first and foremost as it relates to ag/forestry activity, resource protection, and conservation. He said the devil is in the details of some of the things the Board might consider as the Planning Commission has proposed particular uses in the rural area, and how those get compared to the overall philosophy. Mr. Cilimberg said, when staff is interpreting special use permit requests or zoning changes, they are going to rely on the plan and staff is not seeing any fundamental changes regarding the rural areas. He added that staff sees this plan more as creating the potential for considerations of things in the rural area which might support what has traditionally happened, however, the Board might feel that would be going too far.

Ms. Palmer said she has not been doing this since 1986, but has read the current Comprehensive Plan and the new draft and finds them quite different, adding that the emphasis on commercialization is significant to at least the layperson who reads these two versions.

Mr. Cilimberg said, philosophically, the plan still emphasizes ag/forestry, natural resources and conservation, but the particular uses become the devil in the details. He stated that what the Board may be finding is that the philosophy is not being maintained by the uses being proposed for consideration. He stated that it becomes important to Mr. Boyd's concern about staff's interpretation of the plan.

Ms. Mallek said the reason people may have shared these concerns about a shift in philosophy is the presence of the development and commercial uses high on the list of strategies. She suggested moving the conservation strategies higher up and push the subdivision references, etc. father down on the list.

Mr. Foley stated that it sounds as though staff feels the same as the Board, but the question is whether Supervisors want to go through all of the specific language at this meeting or have staff take that direction and restructure this chapter so the emphasis to the public is different.

Ms. Mallek said changing it would be more consistent with the old plan, because the shift is what is troubling to people.

Ms. Palmer said how that is done is fine with her, but there are some changes in philosophy which need to be discussed at this point with the Board.

Ms. Echols said if the Board agrees that agriculture, forestry and natural resource conservation are the primary uses, then the potential uses can be looked at within that particular philosophy and, when the discussion comes around to residential development, the Board could discuss that issue at the end.

Ms. Palmer said those priorities should be made clear in this particular chapter.

Mr. Foley suggested that staff take a shot at that, rather than going through it item by item now.

Ms. Mallek noted that a lot of that work had already been done in the objectives section based on the suggestions made.

Ms. Echols reported that, prior to 2005, the Board discussed the importance of historic preservation but did not emphasize the importance of reuse of historic structures. She said, in 2005, it was mentioned that in the Plan; and, in 2014, the Plan talked about the importance of reusing existing structures. She stated that lodging in new structures has never been an expected use in the rural area, but there is a suggestion for consideration of it in 2014. She said the same is true for use of historic structures for food service for restaurants, as well as the 2005 rural areas section of the plan talked about that as a possible use in crossroads communities, and trying to reuse those historic resources so that is carried through in the 2014 plan. Ms. Echols stated that the plan has always said historic tourism was important and tourism, as a form of economic development, came through for the first time with any emphasis in 2005 and, now in the 2014 plan, the County recognizes it as part of its Economic Vitality Action Plan as well as what is in the proposed Comp Plan. She said special events in the rural area were mentioned in the 2005 Plan as an alternative to residential development, and the Plan also speaks about special events in 2014. Ms. Echols stated that the Plan speaks a little bit about commercial recreation in 2005 and addresses it a bit more in 2014. She said rural interstate interchanges have not had a lot of information on them in prior Comprehensive Plans because the emphasis has been on urban interstate interchanges and, in this particular plan, the Plan calls out some uses which are important at rural interstate interchanges. Finally, Ms. Echols stated that no rural area plans have addressed Area B, but it is addressed in this Comp Plan.

Ms. Echols stated that tourism plays into a lot of this and there is a bit of a shift taken with the economic development work. She said, in 2005, the Plan emphasized the importance of "authentic rural Albemarle" for tourists: you can come and look, but do not expect there to be facilities for you there. She said, in 2014, the Plan moved a little further into recognizing the economic importance of tourism and how the County can better support the visitor experience. Through that lens, she said the Planning Commission started talking about the other uses which might be available in the rural area.

Ms. Echols said, currently, transient lodging is allowed in the rural area under the Zoning Ordinance; there is by-right tourist lodging, which is not the definition of a bed and breakfast but is allowed in all residential districts by having a guest house as part of your home with up to five guest rooms. She stated that the County recently changed the ordinance to allow bed and breakfasts with up to two houses for transient/tourist lodging, five guestrooms each, provided there is adequate acreage. By special use permit, she said, if there are historic buildings that have been used as inns, those can be approved for lodging; and there are some nonconforming uses that might exist such as campgrounds that predate zoning regulations, as well as a boarding facility which is associated with a training program for developmentally disabled people. Ms. Echols said there is a lot more lodging going on in the rural area and, using just staff online research, in 2011, staff found at least 125 facilities that were advertising guest rooms – ranging from Clifton Inn to cabins at campgrounds, to one guest house at wineries, Air-BNBs, which are operating without a resident present. She stated that, in checking online today, she found 245 in Albemarle and Charlottesville with a lot of those in the rural area. Ms. Echols said Mount Ida Farm has almost 4,000 acres, 55 properties, and the owner informed the Planning Commission that it was important for them to be able to do this. She stated that what got the Commission's attention was the 4,000 acres, because a very large parcel with just one or two houses on it might provide some different opportunities.

Ms. Echols reported that concerns about lodging in the rural area, as mentioned in the Comp Plan, are issues with reversibility. She said tourist lodging in a house with an owner/occupant can always revert back to a house, but that was less important to the Planning Commission this time around. She stated that another issue with large facilities is well water and wastewater disposal, because those cannot be on public water and sewer; traffic and noise have also been identified as concerns. Ms. Echols said when the Planning Commission discussed this, it wanted to find ways to keep large properties intact, especially ones with multiple dependencies. She stated that the Commission felt that something bigger than tourist lodging and bed and breakfast should be available, but Commissioners could not come together as a group and make a recommendation as to what specific things should happen. Ms. Echols said the best Commissioners could do was to suggest that the Board consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow these types of uses and, as Board members go through the lodging uses in the rural areas, those issues should be worked out during the zoning text amendment process. She noted that, in strategy 6E on page 7.33, the Commission said the Board should "consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow for lodging in the rural area, with the parameters that ensure the scale is appropriate to its setting." Ms. Echols said, to get to that answer, the Commission felt the Board would need to consider the size of the property, the scale of the proposed use, and the context, as well as the water situation, roads and traffic, and how this keeps large estates intact. She said Commissioners also wondered if there might be a way to develop performance standards to make it possible by-right, and were also open to allowing new construction.

Ms. Echols emphasized that this is very different from where the County has been, and asked the Board if it wanted to consider more options than what currently exists for lodging in the rural area.

Ms. Palmer said she personally does not think that is necessary, however, if the rest of the Board decides that it does, she has made some suggested changes.

Ms. Mallek stated that she would not be in favor of new construction, and would support only small size uses only. She said the statement about "providing extra income to forestall subdivision" should be stricken completely and her first response would be not to make these changes, especially not by right. She stated that people in the rural areas have rights too, and felt they have been left out. She said they are always more angry than if they had been engaged to begin with, which is why the process is so important. Ms. Mallek said having resident managers is a requirement and, if the County is aware of people not doing that, the County needs to address it because, if an emergency strikes and someone is there who does not know the site, it could be a deadly situation.

Mr. Sheffield said he was fine with the way it is now in the current plan and, if anything, it should be a relaxing of the options for people trying to maximize the use of their property.

Mr. Boyd said he is open to considering options.

Ms. McKeel said she is concerned with the opportunity for "new construction," and Ms. Palmer's changes seem to open things up without changing them completely. She stated that she is concerned about not knowing what is currently going on with rural lodging.

Ms. Palmer stated that allowing people to have ten rooms, which is what they can do now, is reasonable to her.

Ms. Dittmar said, in working with volunteer fire and rescue and trying to get more police attention in rural areas, the County does not have the resources for those who live there now so she did not want to expand something before the County is able to serve it.

Ms. Palmer said she would rather go with the current plan. She said allowing more rooms on a property will necessitate the need for more safety measures which the County does not have the resources for right now. She emphasized that allowing ten rooms is enough, with one septic field and

well, and is reluctant to do anything until the General Assembly acts on this. She asked about the 4,000 acre property with all of the houses as mentioned before.

Ms. Mallek clarified that it is a bunch of small parcels which were put together.

Ms. Dittmar said the property is in the Scottsville District, and her thought on that lodging request is no.

Mr. Cilimberg said this direction is very helpful for staff because, if the Board is not going to go with the Commission's recommendation, that changes the Plan's substance and eliminates an action item for staff when the Plan is done.

Ms. Echols reported that restaurants are allowed in the rural area in historic restaurants, taverns and inns by special use permit, or in conjunction with a nonconforming restaurant or inn such as Clifton Inn or Keswick Hall. She said food services were allowed at wineries, cideries and farms as accessory use to those by-right uses; at country stores, considered an accessory use that is typical of a by-right use; and where there is tourist lodging at a bed & breakfast. Ms. Echols stated that she was surprised there is only one independent restaurant operating in the rural area which is Duner's and is a property that is commercially zoned. She said concerns in the prior plans were reversibility, water, wastewater, parking, traffic and noise and the Planning Commission was more directive about restaurants in the rural areas and did not want those to be destinations, but instead wanted them to be accessory. Ms. Echols stated that the only place where Commissioners felt those might be appropriate were in crossroads communities in existing buildings with preference but new buildings appropriate, perhaps even by right. She asked if the Board wanted to consider more options for food services or restaurants than what currently exists in the Comp Plan for the rural area. She noted that this is in the crossroads section under Strategy 3B, page 7.29, which states "consider allowing restaurants in crossroads communities, in historic buildings or new structures, with appropriate size limits and performance standards."

Ms. Palmer said there is basically no change from the current plan. Ms. Echols said there would be because this would allow for new structures and, currently, zoning provides for use of a historic building which has been used historically as a tavern or restaurant, with a special use permit.

Ms. Palmer asked, if the Batesville Store had wanted to build onto the existing building, how that would work. Mr. Cilimberg said it would be prohibited because it would expand a nonconforming use, but that could happen under this change if it were put into the Zoning Ordinance, and he emphasized that the Comp Plan is just guidance for taking up changes.

Ms. Dittmar asked if a building like Duner's, which used to be a gas station, could be turned into a restaurant. Ms. Echols and Mr. Cilimberg confirmed that it could not be under current zoning, unless it was historically used as a restaurant.

Mr. Cilimberg said there were changes made several years ago to introduce country stores by-right and those could have eating areas as well as offices.

Mr. Ron Higgins, Deputy Zoning Administrator, addressed the Board and stated that the words to consider are "historically used," with a building having been used as a country store any time before 1964. He said a country store can have up to 20% of its gross indoor area for some kind of food service, but it is an accessory to the store. He said the Batesville Store was still a country store and was able to have some of it devoted to food service, adding that a country store can also have 20% outside space, i.e., an outdoor seating area.

Ms. Palmer stated that a store like Batesville Store was a destination, and that is what the Planning Commission said it did not want. Mr. Cilimberg said the Commission wanted to consider limitations in size and other parameters, which would not automatically create it as a destination. He explained that people touring through the area or living in another part of the County would go to restaurants out in the County.

Ms. Mallek said the Inn at Little Washington is a good example.

Ms. Palmer stated that the Board should be careful about the details, but it seems to her that it does make sense to be able to use these crossroads communities with its charming buildings.

Ms. Dittmar said it is a service where people do not have to come all the way into town for, like Duner's.

Mr. Sheffield said Duner's is definitely a destination, but that is what sometimes happens when a person runs a successful restaurant.

Ms. Mallek stated that the Board might be able to change the wording so that an occasional or bi-weekly event could be held in a building at the crossroads, adding that it would be appealing to her to include provisions for improving existing structures rather than building all new structures.

Ms. Palmer commented that those would not be by-right. Mr. Cilimberg said those considerations would be made within the zoning text, and this does not change any ordinance provisions; it only sets guidance for the Board to consider as part of its follow-up work after the Comp Plan is adopted.

Ms. Mallek said "by-right" to her means no public process. Mr. Cilimberg said that would be part of the Board's future considerations.

Ms. Mallek stated that the essence of the country store debate was the expectation of brand new septic and large parking lots, versus them utilizing what is already available.

Ms. Echols said there would be some self-limiting based on the size of the lots, and it sounds as though the Board's direction is consideration of more options but preference should be given to existing structures.

Ms. Mallek said she would say "exclusively existing structures with modifications possible." Ms. Echols clarified that it is more than what the Zoning Ordinance allows now.

Mr. Sheffield said, without well water or septic, the size of the lot would automatically determine whether a business could be put in, and those are market demand aspects.

Ms. Palmer said there is also the number of tables to make it economically viable in addition to Health Department considerations of being able to have a stove and cook in the kitchen, etc., as well as the issue of fire department safety.

Mr. Sheffield emphasized that he would want to take a step back and identify the areas which have the highest potential for these types of developments so the County is putting its money in those areas for infrastructure improvements to help prepare for that.

Ms. Mallek said with housing, restaurants and any other uses, the consideration is the degradation of current roads and no money to fix them now. She said it is the service delivery and the bare minimum of transportation safety which should also be considered.

Ms. Echols said the idea here is not to be making improvements to serve these uses in the rural area, but using an existing structure to provide some support for the people who live in that area, and to ensure it is of a very small scale. She reiterated that the County does not want to make the rural areas into development areas. Mr. Cilimberg added that it has not been the Board's philosophy here.

Ms. Palmer asked about the comments in the Comprehensive Plan regarding master plans for these areas. Ms. Echols stated that before the Board can do anything about permissible uses in the crossroads communities, those crossroads communities need to be identified. She said there is a study available, but it needs to be put on the work program as a very first step. She said staff would also need to meet with residents as to where the boundaries of the community are, so staff would know what would be allowed and where by special use permit.

Mr. Cilimberg said that is Strategy 3A.

Mr. Sheffield noted that it is the job of Supervisors to listen to the community and find out where those opportunities exist and, for him, it is easy because there are not any in his district.

Ms. Mallek stated that White Hall residents are already requesting to be the first small area plan.

Ms. Echols reported that current zoning regulations for events allow up to 200 persons at farm wineries and cideries with a special use permit and, if those venues want to have a larger number of people, they have to get a special exception in order to increase the number. She said, in order to have an event anywhere else, up to 150 people are allowed and a special use permit is required. Ms. Echols said the state law which took effect in July 2014 stipulated that farm breweries must be treated the same as farm wineries, and a special use permit for activities cannot be required at agricultural operations except where there is substantial impact to public health, safety and welfare. She stated that, after the Planning Commission did its work on the Comprehensive Plan, Commissioners learned that it was tasked with responding to the General Assembly, so Commissioners have put together a zoning text amendment which has been to public hearing. She said the Planning Commission is prepared to make some recommendations to the Board in response to this new state law.

Ms. Echols said the work session would be held in September, and the Commission's recommendation regarding events should be delayed until that time. She noted that the Commission heard a lot of concern from a few wineries about the threshold of 200 people and, since that time, the noise regulations have changed, and it boiled down to just a couple farm wineries which had issues. Ms. Echols said the Board may or may not want to retain the recommendation to reevaluate the threshold, as reflected in 6A. She said, in 6B, the Commission had a long discussion about the definition of "special event," and felt that a special event was an infrequent occurrence for a large number of people so what is currently in the zoning regulations is fine. She stated that the Commission heard from some people that some of these farm winery events might be OK in a by-right setting, and the Commission did not want

small properties having big events. Ms. Echols said the question for the Board is whether it agrees with the Commission's strategies beginning on page 7.31 about reassessing that threshold for events, and also acknowledging that the current regulations are acceptable for special events with the exception of what is coming through in September, and whether the Board would even want to consider there be something called a "regular event in a home" granted by-right.

Ms. Mallek asked if the Commissioners were contemplating having fewer people at wineries by-right because many wineries have invested millions of dollars in structures so they could house their events inside to minimize noise and their entire business model has been based upon that, therefore, she is not in support of pulling that out.

Ms. Echols said the Commission was worried that 200 may or may not be the right number, and if there would be impacts with that threshold which were not expected.

Ms. Mallek stated that it varies from property to property and, in many ways, the industry has supervised itself and found ways to conform.

Mr. Sheffield asked where the 200-person threshold had originated. Mr. Cilimberg said, through a little bit of research at the time, staff made a recommendation that anything above 200 would be the threshold for a special use permit. He said this number was based on the work that was done when the state legislature and its committee on farm wineries were evaluating this. He stated that it was not really based on a history of volume, but noted that everything the County had previously was a 150 maximum, which was a special use permit.

Ms. Palmer asked what it meant to look at this, and what was expected of both the Board and staff. Mr. Cilimberg stated that it would be a work program item and, at that point, staff would review the County's history since the 200 threshold was created, see what had transpired since then, and then decide if any change was necessary. He noted that it would include farm breweries also once those code provisions were enacted and, under the new legislation, anything other than a farm winery or brewery would fall under new regulations which would have a different threshold.

Ms. Dittmar asked if there was a lot of staff effort required to examine this. Ms. Echols responded that, at the time, staff was dealing with complaints and did not have an alternative to deal with noise. She said, since that time, there have been some changes to the regulations and it has been sorted out that only those two wineries had concerns, so most of those issues have gone away. She said the Board might want to move on without further recommendation, or may want to review the impacts. She emphasized that the Board would hear about problems from farm wineries if those were prevalent.

Board members agreed to remove 6A.

Ms. Mallek said the very last sentence in 6A should remain and be reworded as: "event uses shall be secondary to the ag uses," which changes the word "should" to "shall."

Ms. Echols noted that the ZTA which is coming will provide some of that guidance, as there are a lot of new definitions.

Mr. Cilimberg said staff should perhaps address events in general as being secondary to agricultural use.

Ms. Echols stated that the last one is new and is related to the availability of a home on a large lot for a reception or meeting venue. She said the Planning Commission said that use would be acceptable, and suggested the Board consider amending the Zoning Ordinance for that.

Mr. Cilimberg said that type of use currently would be subject to a special use permit, and any rural area property may apply for a special event special use permit.

Ms. Dittmar asked how often that happens. Mr. Cilimberg and Ms. Echols said not very often.

Ms. Palmer said it is liable to happen, because the "farmettes" are already popping up, including one almost in her backyard.

Mr. Sheffield said it is a situation of – if there is not a demand, why is it in there and, if they put it in there, will the County see more demand. He said he is inclined to allow people to maximize the use of their property under reasonable conditions, adding that 150 people is reasonable, but the impact on infrastructure and frequency of events is certainly a concern.

Ms. Mallek said if it is a daughter's wedding, that is one thing but, if it is rock bands playing every weekend, then that is a different matter.

Ms. Dittmar said a family wedding is one thing, but charging admission for events pushes it into a different category.

Ms. Echols said Board consensus seems to be striking it, because it is currently available by special use permit if someone wants it.

Mr. Cilimberg said when the Board sees the zoning text amendment, it will not be recommending that this type of event on any property be allowed differently in the rural area; it will be focused only on ag operations where there is bonafide agricultural activity.

Mr. Sheffield asked how long it would take for someone to get a special permit for a paid event on their property. Mr. Cilimberg responded that it would be 90 days after application to the Planning Commission, but they would have to go through a pre-application process with staff and could involve a pre-submittal.

Mr. Sheffield said one of the issues with people in the community is the length of the application process.

Ms. Mallek said the application fee is \$2,500 which makes sense for a large festival like the Crozet Music Festival, that had the fee waived the first year, but not for a small harvest festival on a farm which might have hayrides and a string band.

Ms. Dittmar asked if she would need to obtain a permit to have an event on her property if she is a member of a club and wants to offer her farm for a party there. Mr. Higgins said staff would consider that a commercial event, adding that there are some nonprofits which hold special events such as fundraisers but there is a special process for that.

Mr. Boyd asked if that was true for political events. Ms. Echols responded that it would have to be considered on a case-by-case basis in order to determine what the event's characteristics are.

Mr. Davis said the delineation would be whether someone is inviting friends to a party or opening it up to the public.

Ms. Echols reported that the next part of the discussion would focus on commercial and recreational activities in the rural area, which is Strategy 6F. She said this was intended to do two things: make the Zoning Ordinance stipulate certain activities belonging in the rural area which are more current than what is reflected in the present Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Echols noted that there was a consideration to make those by-right with performance standards, but the Planning Commission rejected it outright and felt that any kind of recreational activity should require a special use permit. She said the second item for consideration was whether or not new golf courses and new swim and/or tennis clubs should be available in the rural area. She said, traditionally, those facilities serve a particular population which is more suited to the development areas, and the Planning Commission felt it should be studied further.

Ms. Palmer asked why the golf, swim and tennis are combined. Mr. Cilimberg said, in the Zoning Ordinance, swim, golf and tennis clubs are a use which requires a special use permit.

Ms. Echols stated that the Commission had a lot of discussion about this particular set of recommendations, so Supervisors may want to clarify what its preference is under this particular strategy.

Ms. Mallek said she would like to have "consider" added at the beginning of Strategy 6F.

Mr. Cilimberg said it would read, "Consider updating the Zoning Ordinance..."

Ms. Palmer agreed with Ms. Mallek's suggestion. She asked how these things were monitored to make sure they are safe and viable, for example, zip-lines.

Mr. Cilimberg said that would be part of the special use permit process and, as the Board works on a zoning text amendment, Supervisors would want to think about supplementary regulations to cover specific types of recreational facilities which might be allowed.

Ms. Echols said there would probably be specific certifications.

Ms. Mallek said there was a company inquiring a few years ago about setting up this type of activity on the eastern slope of the Buck's Elbow area because of the spectacular views.

Ms. Echols clarified that the word "consider" would be added, and to also consider removing the reference for swim, golf and tennis clubs as available uses in the rural area.

Mr. Boyd asked if that meant those would be taken out. Ms. Echols said those particular uses would no longer be on the list of special uses available in the rural area.

Mr. Cilimberg said it would be a consideration, and would be part of looking at the commercial uses in a zoning text amendment for special uses.

Mr. Boyd commented that he was not sure how a golf course would fit into the 5% of land designated for development.

Ms. Mallek suggested separating golf from swim and tennis. Ms. Echols explained that they are all in the same special use permit category of outdoor recreational activities. She said the Board's recommendation would be to take them out as "new uses," with existing ones continuing to operate if they are nonconforming and, if someone wanted a new club for swim, tennis or golf out in the rural area, that special use permit opportunity would no longer be there. She emphasized that, again, the term is "consider."

Ms. Palmer said she would like to leave it in and also suggested leaving in language that refers to taking care in consideration of whether to permit golf courses in the rural areas. She stated that the County and City already have seven public and private golf courses available for residents and visitors, with adjoining localities also having facilities such as Spring Creek and Wintergreen. She recommended eliminating the last two sentences in 7.34 referring to the impacts of golf course development.

Ms. Mallek said leaving it in creates more problems than it solves.

Mr. Sheffield suggested striking the entire paragraph relating to specific requirements, as it provides too much specificity and is not consistent with the general guidance in the rest of the section.

Mr. Cilimberg suggested the Board talk about the need for the amenities and associated impacts.

Mr. Sheffield said the previous Board talked a lot about soccer facilities, so these things come in waves, and a general comment about recreational uses seems more appropriate.

Mr. Boyd stated that he did not have a problem referencing the need for a special use permit, but he did not want to exclude any of these things.

Mr. Sheffield said someone who owns rural land will find a productive use for that land, but the County does not necessarily know what that might be.

Ms. Dittmar said the question is what amount of impact from recreation uses will the Board allow in the guidance set in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Echols stated that staff could take a stab at this, because it is all about impact and it probably needs to be more general in nature than specific, so staff would work on that and bring it back. She said at the next meeting, the Board could talk about the remaining rural areas topics and solid waste, and then start on development areas in September.

Ms. Palmer stated that the Solid Waste Committee has indicated that they are not sure they would be ready to give that input by next month, and she was unsure if there was enough to go on.

Board and staff agreed to finish up the rural areas chapter.

Mr. Cilimberg said staff would pick up any items from the first discussion in addition to what was covered at this meeting.

Non-Agenda Item. At 7:01 p.m., the Board recessed their meeting, and reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 21. Budget Planning for FY 16 - Budget Process: Budget Development Calendar.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that in an effort to continuously improve the County's operations, the Office of Management and Budget interviewed Board members after the FY 15 budget process to receive their feedback and suggestions on ways to improve the budget processes in the future. Staff provided a summary of the interview results to the Board on July 2, 2014 and received additional feedback. Staff stated it would provide a list of planned improvements to the Board along with options related to the Budget Development Calendar at the Board's August 6 meeting.

This Executive Summary includes two attachments: Attachment A outlines two options for changing the timing of when the board sets the tax rate for advertisement, including the benefits and challenges associated with each option. Attachment B provides a list of planned budget process improvements.

Staff has begun to create the FY 16 Budget Development Calendar and requests that the Board provide feedback regarding its preferences before the Calendar is finalized. Specifically, the Board will be asked to determine the timing of when in the process it would prefer to set the tax rate cap for advertisement. This date establishes the essential elements of the timeline that are associated with legal

notices, public hearings and work sessions. Staff supports option 1 as it accommodates the requirement of additional time for public/Board review recognizing, however, that the Board would be setting an advertised tax rate in advance of having received the County Executive's Recommended Budget and the School Board's Funding Request.

Additionally, the Board will be asked to provide any additional direction regarding the schedule. After this guidance is received from the Board, staff will finalize the recommended FY 16 Budget Development Calendar and will provide it to the Board for approval in September.

Staff recommends that the Board provide guidance regarding the Budget Development Calendar options set forth in Attachment A for the development of the FY 16 - FY 20 Five Year Financial Plan, the FY16 - FY 20 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and the Operating Budget for FY16, and, 2) review the budget process improvements set forth in Attachment B and provide any additional suggestions.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, addressed the Board, stating that there are several items staff would like to review with the Board regarding the budget process and schedule for the upcoming year. She noted that there are two areas which she needs guidance on: the calendar and budget development process improvements as suggested by Board members in her one-on-one interviews several months earlier. Ms. Allshouse said, as staff puts a budget together, there are some mandatory legal requirements in terms of advertising, scheduling, and other critical legal deadlines. She said the one giving staff pause is the 30-day notice for tax rate advertisement. She explained that, if the reassessment results in an increase of 1% or more, the tax rate would need to be adopted by April 15. She said there are also some seven-day notices for budget public hearing advertisements which must be worked in, adding that staff works closely with Mr. Davis to ensure the schedule adheres tightly to these legal deadlines.

Mr. Boyd asked if she estimated that assessments would go over 1% again next year. Ms. Allshouse said that is staff's assumption. She stated that it is challenging if they do not assume the increase and then have to work that out later.

Ms. Allshouse stated that staff is also considering the importance of public engagement opportunities, to ensure that there is plenty of time built in for the public to meet as well as having time to look at materials before they meet with staff or the Board. Ms. Allshouse said staff is very mindful of the Board's work session schedule and timing, and would not try to hold those work sessions back to back on budget items due to the research which is necessary in between meetings. She stated that a third consideration, which is important to the School Division, is the timing of the Schools' spring break. She said the School Board has, for several years, requested that the public hearing not be held during that time frame.

Ms. Allshouse reported that staff had developed a calendar but realized there were two options so staff developed two calendars with one major consideration impacting how it would unfold. She stated that the first option to consider is whether the Board advertises a proposed maximum calendar year 2015 tax rate during the first week of February, or advertise the Board's proposed maximum tax rate during the first week of March. Ms. Allshouse said the benefits of option one – advertising in February – are that the Board and the public would have some additional time to review the County Executive's recommended budget prior to the Board's first public hearing. She said staff could also space the work sessions farther apart, and the tax rate public hearing could be held at a different time.

Ms. Allshouse pointed out that the first option has some challenges: the maximum tax rate advertised would have to be set for advertisement prior to the Board receiving the recommended budget, so the tax rate would somewhat guide the budget. She stated that the Board would have to be mindful of accommodating further decisions regarding potential changes in expenditures and revenue, and staff thought of some changes which could be made in process to make that possible. Ms. Allshouse explained that one strategy is to make the five-year financial planning process more robust, with the Board and School Board setting goals in October. She said school involvement would be increased and there would be expanded public engagement opportunities. She emphasized that the first year of the five-year plan would provide initial guidance for the annual budget and, just before the tax rate is advertised, staff would provide an update in late January on property assessments. Ms. Allshouse said the Board would also have the current year second-quarter financial reports, and the Superintendent would have submitted her funding request to the School Board.

Ms. Allshouse said the second option would be setting the tax rate the first week of March, which would provide benefits in that the Board would not be required to advertise until it received the County Executive's budget and would have already held two work sessions and a public hearing. The challenges are that the Board and the public will have a little less time to review the County Executive's budget before the first public hearing; work sessions will be held in a tighter time schedule; and there will need to be a second public hearing to accommodate spring break.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was only one public hearing in option one. Ms. Allshouse said there would be two. Mr. Foley said the Board typically holds the budget hearing and the tax rate hearing at the

same time but, with the spring break issue, those hearings would need to be split and, also because of the timing of mailing the tax bills out.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the County were to secure enabling legislation from the General Assembly for new kinds of revenue which could take the pressure off of property tax, would that take effect July 1. Mr. Davis said that would most likely be the case.

Ms. McKeel said option one seems to provide one more month of a huge amount of emails.

Ms. Mallek said she assumed the Board would base the decisions on what it determines from the five-year plan process, so there would be concrete reasons why this would be needed, and it is all investment-based.

Ms. Palmer said the other issue that concerns her is whether there would be an incentive for the Board to pick a higher rate in order to leave a buffer, and then people get really upset. She also stated that the County Executive's recommended budget implies that the Board of Supervisors is changing that, and there is conflict between them. Ms. Palmer said this situation could make it worse so, if the Board does this, she would like to call it the "draft budget."

Mr. Foley said he understands the perceived conflict, but it is difficult to provide the Board a balanced budget without it being a recommended budget that has gone through the process and the scrutiny. He stated that, under Virginia code, he has been charged to make a recommendation, and the budget is one of the major drivers of that.

Ms. Mallek said she wondered if it would create a trap for Mr. Foley in some way.

Mr. Foley said that was his biggest concern, with the Board setting a ceiling, his recommended budget coming in lower, and then getting criticized for not doing what the Board said it was willing to go to.

Ms. Mallek said the Board would have to do a good job of explaining it to the public.

Mr. Foley said the downsides are things the Board specifically expressed concerns about, so staff put the priority of not having those go in option one. He stated that presenting a budget to the Board on a Friday, having a public hearing the following Monday, and having the public unable to get materials on Monday morning sends a bad message if public engagement is a priority for the Board. Mr. Foley added that, after the hearing in the last budget cycle, the Board had to attend work sessions and even cram in an extra one, in order to meet the deadline for setting the tax rate. He said the Board would have to justify coming in at whatever rate it sets, but that is much less of a problem than limiting public engagement.

Mr. Sheffield said option one puts more emphasis on five-year planning which will be presented to the Board in November and December.

Mr. Foley said the five-year plan focuses on the big picture issues, rather than one-year issues.

Mr. Sheffield said it almost becomes a needs-based budgeting approach, because it is unlikely that staff would come in with a budget that is radically different from the five-year planning effort.

Mr. Boyd suggested putting more emphasis on an acceptable rate to the majority of the Board in the five-year planning process, which gives staff better direction, and makes the public aware of the rate but not advertise it.

Ms. McKeel said she would like to have really good outreach along with community discussion over the five-year plan, what it means and also the ramifications.

Mr. Sheffield said option one invites more public engagement.

Ms. McKeel said she would prefer that rather than having the public look at just one number out of the blue, and not understanding how the Board got there.

Mr. Boyd said the Board has already decided to do that more in conjunction with the School Board this year, so the Board and School Board will be able to address those issues at the same time.

Ms. Palmer asked if the five-year planning was advertised.

Mr. Foley said the Board would not advertise anything on the five-year plan. He said advertising would not begin until it starts the annual process.

Ms. Mallek stated that Supervisors could certainly talk about what would be covered with several different numbers.

Mr. Foley said, after the five-year plan is presented on November 5 and leading up to Thanksgiving, there will be good opportunity for town hall meetings where Supervisors will be able to engage the public in big picture issues rather than some controversy about a one-year item.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would like to engage the public in a discussion of the five-year plan, and then advertise in March. She said she would like to try the new five-year process before getting into changing it this time.

Ms. Mallek said that is a super-compressed timeframe, given the work session schedule.

Ms. McKeel stated that the Board could plan its meetings in a different way, adding that new Board members would have a year under its belts which should help.

Mr. Foley said, in looking at the calendar and the March scenario, he would present the budget on Friday, with a public hearing the following Monday.

Mr. Boyd said Board members generally do not make any decisions at that public hearing; Supervisors simply listen to the public and have work sessions after that.

Mr. Foley said if the Board chooses that option, Supervisors would have to do all of those work sessions and advertise the rate in one week.

Ms. McKeel stated that, if the Board has done its work correctly on the five-year plan, Supervisors will have been talking about it since November, and would have had that period of time to engage the public. Ms. Allshouse said, under option two, the budget would be provided to the Board on a Thursday, the public hearing would be Monday night, a work session would be held the next day – Tuesday – and again on Thursday, and then the cap tax rate would be set on March 4 for advertising.

Mr. Boyd asked if it was possible for Mr. Foley to get his budget to the Board sooner, and have him tighten up the time schedule rather than having the Board tighten up its schedule. Ms. Allshouse said staff's problem is that the major revenue source comes from real estate assessments which are not finished until late January; so the Budget Office is pushing as hard as it can once they get that information from the Finance Department.

Ms. McKeel stated that staff is able to give the Superintendent a number in January.

Ms. Allshouse said that number is preliminary. She added that they would not want to go out with a very early number but would rather rely on the County Assessor's completed number to launch the budget development.

Mr. Foley said the Budget Office staff has pushed the timeline as tight as it possibly can.

Ms. Mallek said the Finance Department probably needs some additional time to deal with the new software this year.

Ms. Dittmar agreed that the five-year plan would allow for a better sense as to what tax rate ceiling the Board would want to set. She stated that, in the past, Mr. Boyd said setting terms earlier has reduced conflict.

Mr. Boyd said part of the problem this year was the large gap between the rate that was advertised and the current rate, so people were coming in and vying for that extra money on the table. In prior years, he said Supervisors hashed that out before the rate was announced, and the Board did not run into that conflict.

Ms. Mallek said she is intrigued by option one because it would help move away from the fixation on one number, and would also help Board members get to a big picture view of what it is trying to accomplish. She noted that a lot of other localities approach it from that standpoint, and then let the rate come from that.

Ms. Dittmar asked for a sense from the Board.

Mr. Sheffield said he prefers option two with an early hypothetical tax rate based on the five-year plan discussion, and provide that information to the public as an assumption.

Ms. Mallek said, at that point, why not just put it out there in February to allow time for additional work sessions and to accommodate for snow days.

Mr. Sheffield said, if something out of the Board's control happens such as a financial crash, Supervisors might get slammed.

Mr. Foley said the Board would know where things stand by the first of February because of the revenue estimates.

Ms. Mallek said the Board could have a certain amount in the emergency reserves.

Mr. Sheffield said option two also shifts the discussion away from the tax rate to the tax dollars, how those are being spent and also what County priorities are.

Mr. Davis said there would still be a failsafe built in because, up until the option two deadline, staff could always run another advertisement and the Board could hold a public hearing with a higher tax rate.

Ms. Mallek said, in the event of an emergency, the Board could advertise again in March. Mr. Davis confirmed that the Board could do that, as long as there was the 30-day window to advertise a tax rate and sets the tax rate before April 15.

Ms. Palmer said her preference would be to bring it out in November to see how it worked for the coming year, and then go to the earlier approach next year.

Mr. Foley mentioned that, with the five-year planning process, staff has always had a rate to work with in November, so this will not be entirely new in that regard.

Ms. Palmer said the public engagement part in the five-year planning process was new, and she wondered if people would pay attention to this over the holiday periods of November and December.

Mr. Sheffield said the Board could go with option two but go through the motions as if option one existed.

Ms. Dittmar stated that she prefers option one without advertising because she will know early on where she is.

Mr. Sheffield said the goal here is to try to get this out to the public as early as possible and not be so focused on an advertised rate.

Ms. Dittmar said it is the advertisement which starts to get people's attention. She said part of her bias is a desire to not repeat any part of last year that Supervisors could change intelligently this year.

Ms. Palmer said she is concerned about what the dynamic would be on the Board, if a rate is advertised without having the draft budget.

Mr. Boyd stated that the real point of this is not the physical advertising of the budget, it is having the discussion and there is nothing to say Supervisors cannot have the straw poll in February, but not actually advertise it until March.

Mr. Sheffield said the public would appreciate having the Board focused early on, and rallying around a rate in order to build a budget with justification offered if it deviates from it.

Mr. Foley said staff can address the five-year plan a little better than last year, but they will not be able to address the Board's timing which would make for one very tough week. He said, in summary, it would be: Thursday/Friday presentation; Monday public hearing; Tuesday, Thursday work sessions; setting the rate by the following Tuesday. Mr. Foley said this timeframe was really difficult last year – with most of the Supervisors being new – and then there was a second work session on that next Monday.

Ms. Dittmar said she did not understand why it had to be that compressed.

Mr. Davis said, even though the 30-day law began five years ago, it was right on the eve of the recession so the County had not had the reassessments that crossed the 1% threshold until last year, and the legal ramifications of doing so would effectively lower the tax rate.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was something halfway between the two options. Ms. Allshouse said these are the two options staff is aware of and, for what is required, the Board would need to land on a schedule.

Mr. Foley explained that the Board needs to either set it early, or set it as late as it can with a very short window to go through the budget and review it before the rate is set.

Ms. Palmer said Supervisors could operate as if the tax rate would be set in February, and proceed with discussions which should get the Board beyond that.

Mr. Foley said the Board could do that, but the only downside is that there would have to be multiple work sessions. He stated that the timeframe between getting the reassessments and establishing the budget is extremely tight, and they have maximized what staff is able to do.

Mr. Boyd asked when the decision about the stormwater management fee would be made.

Mr. Foley said the way staff laid out the calendar was to hold the 0.7 tax rate approved last year for a few years, so it would not be a decision again until FY16.

Board members agreed to go with option two, and staff agreed to build the calendar around that plan.

Ms. Allshouse reported that Attachment B to the Board's executive summary includes some recommendations for process improvements in the coming year. She said one of the primary concerns was to improve coordination with the School Division adding that everyone has been working closely with school staff and the School Board in this regard. She said County staff has been working with their staff on how they present their budget, and staff would now include a summary of the school budget, not just a link to it. Ms. Allshouse stated that the Board had asked for information around the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) process, and staff would bring a report back to Supervisors in September about how that process works and the criteria used. She said, before September, she would provide information to Board members on the cultural agencies funding, as the City is getting ready to move forward with its process and the County would like it to be coordinated.

Ms. Dittmar said, when she and Ms. McKeel toured the old jail, it occurred to them that tourism dollars could be used for the museum there, but she was unsure if the beds and heads formula would apply.

Ms. Lee Catlin said there was a funding process for those kinds of things, and she would bring information back to the Board about that process.

Mr. Foley said the Charlottesville/Albemarle Convention & Visitors Bureau (CACVB) would probably consider something like that because it has tourism value and marketing so it would be included.

Ms. Allshouse said the third area of process improvements includes collaboration with the School Division's staff on communication, and Ms. Catlin is already working with the schools on how to do that. She reported that the Board talked about expanding the public engagement process in the five-year plan, since there is no public hearing stipulation but could include focus groups and could utilize some of the new tools already in place such as Engage Albemarle. Ms. Allshouse added that staff would continue to support the Board's town hall meetings. She stated that, regarding work sessions, Board members commented that it would like a fuller picture of departmental challenges and needs, and staff has begun putting together five-year resource plans. Ms. Allshouse said the fifth area related to suggestions for the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) process improvements. She reported that the County is involving School personnel earlier in the process, with a meeting scheduled in both versions of the calendar to involve the Boards earlier in the process as well as sharing the minutes from the Oversight Committee. She added that the Board had also wanted more information about some of the fund balances and how capital works, so that would also be worked into the process.

Ms. Allshouse thanked the Board for its guidance and input, and asked Supervisors to provide her with any additional suggestions.

Mr. Boyd asked if Board members could get a copy of the scoring mechanism for the CIP projects so everyone understands how that works. Ms. Allshouse agreed to distribute it, and noted that the budget development calendar would be provided in September, a work session with the School Board in October on compensation and benefits, and also establishing five-year plan goals.

Agenda Item No. 11. Follow-up to Board of Supervisors' Retreat Priorities Discussion.

The executive summary states that the Board of Supervisors has formally engaged in the County's strategic planning efforts since 2001. Every five years, the plan is fully reconsidered by the Board at its annual retreat. At the other annual retreats, the Board assesses Strategic Plan progress and re-sets priorities within the context of the plan, if necessary. The County's current five-year Strategic Plan was adopted on July 1, 2012. On June 10, 2014, the Board held its annual retreat to consider and clarify top priorities to ensure staff's work is aligned with current Board priorities given the recent transition of the Board. This work resulted in the revised set of strategic priorities that are included in Attachment B.

At its June retreat, the Board drafted aspirational goals and identified associated priority items for each goal. At that time, both Board and staff indicated that additional work would be necessary to finalize the aspirational goals and priorities document.

The purpose of today's discussion is to give the Board an opportunity to reflect on the draft aspirational goals prior to a formal endorsement of these goals. A complete report of the retreat discussion can be found in Attachment A. Attachment B reformats the complete report slightly to include the draft aspirational goals and associated priority items, with year one priorities highlighted in green.

If the Board chooses to endorse the draft aspirational goals and year one priorities today, staff proposes to come back to the Board in the fall with a more formal draft strategic plan for the Board's discussion. This process will allow staff the opportunity to research "best practices" and provide its

recommendations for strategies, as well as to frame an implementation plan that will include information regarding required resources.

As some Board members have noted, a comparison of the existing adopted FY13-17 Strategic Plan (Attachment C) and the draft aspirational goals and associated priorities from the retreat (Attachment B) shows a substantial amount of overlap between the two documents. Given the dynamic nature of strategic planning, as well as the number of new Board members, staff recommends that the aspirational goals form the basis of a new strategic plan that replaces the existing adopted plan. This is consistent with the best practice of allowing a strategic plan to evolve as circumstances and needs change, and is essential to have a single set of strategic priorities to direct staff work. Currently all executive summaries reflect the adopted Strategic Plan. As part of this evolution to a new strategic plan, staff recommends that all future executive summaries instead reflect the new aspirational goals.

Finally, staff reviewed the Board's newly identified priorities to identify those where there is alignment with work that is already underway and/or priorities that may require immediate action/consideration in Year One. Those items, which are highlighted in green in Attachment B, are listed below for consideration as Year One priorities:

- In partnership with the school system, identify a process to identify potential improvements in funding strategies for K-12 and school readiness
- Establish a successful Economic Development Office that achieves the County's economic development goals
- Bring staffing capacity up to a level required to implement the Board's strategic priorities
- Improve citizen communication and participation
- Establish and implement a solid waste management plan with emphasis on reducing, reusing, and recycling
- Set up a program to improve water quality and successfully implement the County's stormwater management programs

Given the significance and/or time-sensitive nature of these identified items, staff will continue to clarify and work on these Year One priorities, as the remaining Year Two and Year Three priorities are finalized through future Board discussions as proposed above.

Board priorities and the Strategic Plan provide direction for the County's Five-Year Financial Plan and annual budget processes.

Staff recommends:

- 1) Approval of the aspirational goals, with any amendments the Board feels are appropriate.
- 2) Endorsement of identified Year One priority items
- 3) Endorsement of proposed next steps to finalize the remainder of the strategic plan

Mr. Foley stated that the purpose of this item was to look for the Board's official endorsement of the items identified at its retreat in June, where eight strategic priorities were set. He said the result of what staff had put together was before the Board and, beyond the goals; there were some priorities that were identified. He said staff was seeking endorsement of the one-year priorities as identified in Attachment B, which staff compiled based on what was going to occur in the next year and also aligned with what the Board said was important to be accomplished. Mr. Foley said staff is seeking Board endorsement of both the goals and the priorities in order to move forward. He said there would be information brought back to Board members regarding fiscal impacts and actions taken with much of this to be included in his Monthly Report. He said the other items which were not identified as one-year priorities are being addressed by staff teams in an effort to flesh those out more, give them further thought, as well as to provide additional items which are aligned with the goals but were not identified.

Mr. Foley said staff would be bringing back a plan as to how to address a "Blue Ribbon Commission" which would work to identify additional revenue sources, and involve both the Board and the School Board.

Ms. Mallek said, if there is differing opinion from the Board, the Board should determine if there are four votes to move ahead, prior to staff spending a lot of time on it. Mr. Foley agreed and said that would be step one. He emphasized that the word "consider" is in front of the "Blue Ribbon Commission," because he needed to work further with Dr. Moran to see what that might look like.

Mr. Foley said he would like the Board to endorse the eight priorities and also the one-year priorities, and then staff would bring the action plans back at another date.

Ms. McKeel said the word 'incentive' for economic development in the attachment to the report could mean very different things to different people. Mr. Foley said that particular topic would be before the Board next week as part of its economic development discussions.

Ms. Palmer stated that this says FY13-17. Mr. Foley said this was actually developed several years ago, and the strategic plan is a different document.

Ms. Palmer said the vision was changed, and Mr. Foley noted that the vision was changed in the Comprehensive Plan, not the strategic plan. Ms. Palmer indicated approval of the format of the document.

Ms. Dittmar noted that the retreat was very productive and effective, due in part to its own input but also due to great facilitation from Ms. Louise Wyatt.

Agenda Item No. 24. Route 29 Project Delivery Advisory Panel Update.

Mr. Sheffield reported that, at its last meeting, the panel covered the RFQ procurement process and set the aspirations for construction. He said he has been forwarding materials to the Board but was not sure what questions Supervisors had. He said, at the upcoming meeting, the panel would be talking more about community engagement along with a comprehensive timeline for the public. Mr. Sheffield said the next meeting would take place the following day at 2:00 p.m., and would be streamed live. He stated that, in thinking about the issue raised earlier in the meeting by Mr. Boyd about the effectiveness of the process and the panel, he wanted to make sure he was representing everyone on the Board. Mr. Sheffield said, once people begin to see the designs, they could start talking about the impacts on neighborhoods, businesses and travel patterns.

Mr. Boyd said the biggest comment he keeps hearing is the impacts of construction on the communities in the path, and what the plan is for mitigating that.

Ms. Mallek said it should be discussed before the RFP is issued because there needs to be specific requirements to which the companies can respond, specifically regarding preserving access to businesses.

Mr. Sheffield stated that the contractors would really be defining how to provide access and mitigate those things, although VDOT staff has been managing the process and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) needs to evaluate the competency of the contractor in that regard.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that the expectation has to be much more clear than it was with the previous design-build project which the County experienced [with the bypass], because there was a refusal to put those expectations in and, if the Board does not say ahead of time to the panel that these things are important and must be included, Supervisors will be disappointed when it comes out. She added that, when people have an option, they will only do what they have to do.

Mr. Sheffield said the RFP would be advertised on October 2, so the discussion would take place in September at the panel level and, at that point, they could really start defining those expectations.

Mr. Boyd said he heard there was a huge turnout for the RFQ meeting.

Mr. Sheffield reported that there were about 100 contractors present at the information meeting. He said this has been a much publicized process and communities like Albemarle are not really prepared to handle this level of construction, so other smaller localities are looking to see how this is handled.

Ms. Dittmar said she was pleased that Mr. Boyd expressed the deep frustration that businesses feel about the lack of information coming forth from the process thus far, and asked Mr. Sheffield to share that concern with the panel.

Mr. Sheffield said he would.

Mr. Foley noted that there is a third player in addition to VDOT and the contractor and that is the City and County. He reported that Ms. Catlin has already begun working with economic development staff in the City, along with Chip Boyles of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC), and they would need to work locally on neighborhood assistance which will not fall under the purview of the state. He said one example would be a temporary waiver of the sign ordinance to help the businesses continue to thrive during construction, and noted that there is discussion of an I Phone app being developed to help people navigate to a business while construction is going on. Mr. Foley said some of that would need to happen at the local level, and the communications piece crosses over all parties. He stated that it involves communication about the process but could also include marketing and promotions and other creative things other localities have done.

Ms. Catlin reported that City/County/VDOT staffs have had several coordination meetings with Lou Hatter of VDOT, who is putting together a draft communication plan. She noted that what is very important for this messaging is that they are very consistent and coordinated in everything that goes out. She said the VDOT website would be the central area of information, and the County would drive traffic to that site and draw attention to that material. Ms. Catlin stated that, once Mr. Hatter's plan is complete, staff would hold an open house for residents and others so they can come in and hear what the communication plan draft is, ask them to share how they want to receive communication during the process, and what they need to know. She said another facet underway is the business assistance part of the process. She stated that she has met with the City's economic development staff, along with

VDOT who would be putting together a map of the largest possible footprint, so that the City and County could put together a database of exactly who would be impacted by these projects. Ms. Catlin stated that they really need to hear from businesses as to what would be helpful for them, and Ms. Mallek had suggested having something like “quadrant captains” to encourage full representation. She said Mr. Sheffield has emphasized the buy local aspect of this, so putting together an inventory of the business services in those impacted areas would also be extremely valuable. She stated that there is a very broad area where staff will soon begin to engage with the business community.

Ms. Catlin presented draft project fact sheets to Board members.

Ms. McKeel asked about the Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) service, which is a critical piece of this project.

Ms. Catlin said Chip Boyles would address the panel at its meeting the following day about the need for a community stakeholders group, which would operate on a more detailed level than what Mr. Shucet’s panel is operating.

Mr. Foley read the intended outcome of the group Ms. Catlin is working with: “ensure a coordinated regional effort to communicate and assist businesses and neighborhoods during construction.”

Ms. Dittmar asked how the Board could best coordinate its flow of information.

Ms. Catlin said it would be very helpful if those could be sent to her because, if there is something that seems right for the communications plan or the operational aspects, she could weed through it and Mr. Sheffield could share it with the panel as well.

Mr. Boyd asked if there was any information available as to how much traffic would be put on Hillsdale Drive when the projects were completed.

Mr. Sheffield said he was not sure if the studies done in the past had been updated, but the Long Range Transportation Plan did modeling on those, and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has been looking at that with the removal of the bypass impacting those numbers.

Mr. Boyd stated that it would be an impact on Hillsdale Drive to have lots of additional traffic moving through there, and those residents should be made aware of that fact.

Mr. Sheffield said there would be impacts during and after construction, and they need the data now so they have some kind of benchmark. He asked fellow Board members to keep him in the loop if Supervisors receive those kinds of emails, and he would get with the MPO staff to get revised modeled numbers.

Ms. Catlin said staff is looking at the community engagement piece as a revisioning and reestablishing of a community, so there is a lot of important conversation which will need to go on.

Agenda Item No. 25. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Item No. 25a. City Liaison on the County Solid Waste Advisory Committee.

Ms. Palmer reported that the City had sent its manager of Public Works Department, Steve Lawson, as representative on the Long Range Solid Waste Advisory Committee. She reported that Mr. Lawson was very engaged, very knowledgeable, and he has cleared up some misconceptions about what the City was doing.

Mr. Boyd asked if she had considered putting Mr. Brownley on the committee.

Ms. Palmer said she had considered it and talked to Tom Frederick about it, but they did not finish that conversation.

Mr. Boyd said he could certainly add a perspective with regard to the Ivy landfill.

Ms. Palmer agreed, but said she would have to go through Mr. Frederick.

Item No. 25b. Public comment to Voter ID (Proposed amendment to 1VAC20-40-10).

Mr. Davis said his office followed up with the State Board of Elections, and found that the public comment period ended on August 4, and the public hearing is scheduled for August 6 at 1:00 p.m. He stated that he asked if public comments would be accepted after that time, and was told that comments could be sent in but there was no guarantee those would be considered.

Ms. Palmer explained that this related to a decision to be made at the end of August by the State Board of Elections as to whether expired driver licenses would be accepted at polling places as a form of photo identification, as has been done to date. She added that a state senator has suggested amending it to disallow expired licenses as picture IDs. She said she felt it was important, as older people may not have driven in a while.

Mr. Davis said he read this morning that the Attorney General was opining on this, and arguing that the proposed amendment to the regulations which define what a "valid license" is would have constitutional problems so there may be further analysis before this gets adopted, if it ever does get adopted.

Ms. Mallek stated that she provided a StreamWatch report for each Board member, adding that this report contains valuable information about water quality in the area. She said the Rivanna River Basin Commission (RRBC) has been working through the summer on having the Planning District adopt it for staff purposes, so that RRBC's work would carry on with staff help from the TJPDC and could extend their funds and its work on grants. She said it has not been formally voted on, but the Planning District would consider it the following day.

Agenda Item No. 26. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Foley said staff has spoken with each Supervisor about potential changes to the Board meeting schedule, and re-distributed a copy of the proposal he sent regarding a revised schedule. He said the Comprehensive Plan review would be moved to a separate night, with the Monday before the second meeting of the month as a good time for that. He said there seemed to be consensus to start the morning meetings at 1:00 p.m. instead, and have public comment at the beginning of the meeting; closed session from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m., with 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. reserved for presentations, joint meetings and any other work session items; 7:00 p.m. would include public hearings, and other action items following, with adjournment by 9:00 p.m. Mr. Foley said the second meeting of the month would feature land use matters, and work sessions starting at 4:00 p.m., with 6:00 p.m. public hearings. He stated that, if this is something the Board wanted to try, staff would need some notice. He added that this does allow the public to be more involved.

Ms. Mallek said she likes the idea of having two public comment opportunities because some people are unable to come at night and some are unable to come during the day.

Mr. Davis suggested the Board adopt this as its regular meeting schedule, effective in September, because there is an advertisement the Clerk would need to post in the newspaper.

Mr. Foley said staff would advertise this heavily and post it on the websites as well.

Ms. Dittmar said the Board would revisit this matter in January when it adopts the new schedule, so it will be possible to tweak it at that time, if necessary. She said if Supervisors finish the Comp Plan before the start of the budget cycle, the Board may want to keep that amount of time for budget work sessions.

Ms. McKeel said the budget work sessions are the one thing that the public could be better engaged in during the evenings.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to adopt a new regular meeting schedule as set forth in the attachment, to begin September 2014. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 27. Adjourn to August 12, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.

At 8:47 p.m., Ms. Dittmar **moved** to adjourn the meeting until August 12, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 03/04/2015
Initials: EWJ