

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on December 9, 2014, at 3:30 p.m., in the Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from December 3, 2014. The regular night meeting was held at 6:00 p.m., in the Lane Auditorium, County Office Building.

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. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 3:36 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Dittmar.

Agenda Item No. 2. Departmental Budget Presentations:

Item No. 2a. Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Bob Crickenberger, Director of Parks and Recreation, addressed the Board and presented the Department's mission statement: To preserve, protect, maintain its natural resources, public parkland, open space, trails and recreation facilities. He said the Department's stated values are: Provide very comprehensive programs and facilities and services that respond to the changing needs of our community, and goals are: To continue to maintain existing service levels and incrementally increase cost recovery on all of our fee-based activities, continue to seek opportunities to reduce our expenditures, and emphasize very strongly on volunteer recruitment. Mr. Crickenberger reported that Parks & Recreation has 13 facilities, over 3,775 acres of parkland, and he presented a picture of Walnut Creek Park.

Mr. Crickenberger stated that he wanted to spend some time talking about how the Department budgets, stating that Parks & Recreation only budgets what it needs and spends only what it needs. He said the operating budget for FY15 is \$2.4 million including salaries, benefits and overall operating costs. He said, currently, 47% of revenues are generated through various activities and classes which assist in off-setting the operational costs, and 69% of that operating budget, or \$1.6 million, is for salaries and benefits. He said 31% is allocated for actual operating costs such as repair and maintenance to buildings and grounds, vehicles, equipment, fuel, etc. Mr. Crickenberger said the Department has seven main functional areas: administration, maintenance, summer swim, athletic classes, community centers, special activities, and teen programs. He said the budget process involves a review of each and every operational line and all functional areas. He said staff will often go back two or three years to get a good idea and feel for the fit of each line item. He explained that, before they even begin the budget process, a potential list of expenditures is developed and the expenditure history is reviewed in order to develop a realistic request. Mr. Crickenberger said, each year, staff develops a new and replacement equipment budget which also assists in the budget development process, and that information is also provided to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) each year. He stated that they use a lot of other resources in budget development such as developing a maintenance management plan using best management practices, performing a facility condition assessment, and also performing an ADA compliance survey which helps the Department be proactive rather than reactive.

Ms. Dittmar asked why Darden Towe Park was not included. Mr. Crickenberger responded that Darden Towe Park is a separate fund and he would discuss that at the end of the discussion along with an overall summary of the Department where he would blend both the budget and revenues together. He said, at this point, Darden Towe Park is not included. He noted that the budget is currently comprised of maintenance at 54%, administration at 10%, teen activities at 8%, special activities at 8%, community events at 4%, athletic and classes at 9%, and summer swim program at 7%. Mr. Crickenberger presented a slide illustrating the operating expenses versus salaries and benefits, stating that those are prepared by OMB.

Ms. McKeel asked what 10% in administration included. Mr. Crickenberger said that is where postage, mailing, printing, dues and subscriptions, etc. are funded for the entire Department.

Mr. Crickenberger said the Department's self-generated revenues are approximately \$350,000 per year, with summer swim at 36%; special activities at 8%; community centers at 7%; athletic, fee-based classes and camps at 28%; Lane electric; Meadows rent; and teen programs.

Mr. Boyd asked if any of the Parks & Recreation programs were self-sustaining. Mr. Crickenberger responded that some are, and some are not, with summer swim being an example of one that is not.

Ms. Palmer asked for more information about Lane electric. Mr. Crickenberger explained that the County Parks & Recreation Department pays for the lights at the Lane League baseball field. He said, in

2010, due to budget reductions, the County asked the League to take over those expenses. He said the Department pays for electricity up front, and the League reimburses the Department. He said the average cost is approximately \$4,000 annually.

Mr. Foley said staff would follow up on what percentages of these programs are offset by revenue so the Board will have that information. He added that 46% of the operating expenses are offset by revenues.

Ms. Amy Smith, Recreation Division Manager, addressed the Board and stated that 46% applies to operating expenses, not the total budget. She stated that most of the adult programs are self-sufficient; however, most of the youth programs require additional funding support.

Ms. Mallek asked if there is a share of program fees that goes to the teacher, so that Parks & Recreation does not go out of pocket to pay teachers. Ms. Smith said there are a few classes like that but, most of the time, they hire the instructors and then people register for the classes.

Mr. Crickenberger explained that Darden Towe Park is a separate entity with a Special Revenue Fund in the County budget and is funded by the City and the County as well as other revenue sources like program fees and rent. He said the County's share is 69.38%; the City's share is 30.62%, which is projected for FY15 revenues for Towe Park.

Ms. Palmer asked how those percentages are determined. Mr. Crickenberger said there is a ten-year agreement in place which was developed and approved by the County Board and City Council years ago, and the percentages are driven by population.

Mr. Davis noted that the figures are adjusted, and are based on the Weldon Cooper Center estimates for population.

Mr. Crickenberger said the Department receives \$92,000 for Darden Towe, and the City is billed on an annual basis for its share. He said they are also billed for Ivy Creek Natural Area with the County being the fiscal agent for both properties.

Mr. Crickenberger then presented the general Parks and Recreation budget of over \$2.6 million, with revenues of \$400,000 including 20 staff members at 68% dedicated toward salaries and benefits and 32% toward operational costs. In comparison to peer communities, he said Albemarle has the least number of FTEs, the smallest budget, the largest park acres, the largest park acres per capita, and the third lowest expenses per capita.

Mr. Sheffield asked if Mr. Crickenberger had a per-acre figure of active park space. Mr. Crickenberger said his figures reflect open space, developed park, undeveloped park, natural areas, etc. and includes all park acreage.

Mr. Sheffield asked if Mr. Crickenberger could provide a figure of just developed park space. Mr. Foley said staff would need to do that for other localities too.

Mr. Sheffield said, for his own understanding, it would be helpful to have that information. Mr. Crickenberger said he would provide that to the Board as it would be helpful information.

Ms. Mallek said what would be added to it would be school grounds which are used after hours by families, playing fields, etc. Mr. Crickenberger confirmed that that information is not currently included, but he would provide the additional acreage that the partnership with the School Division brings back to the community.

Mr. Sheffield said part of his question is to get a sense of how much Parks & Recreation has to maintain. Mr. Crickenberger said it is difficult to quantify because Parks staff is going to maintain each and every acre, but at different levels.

Ms. Mallek said it would also be interesting to see Albemarle's level of volunteer and ownership versus other localities. She said many other jurisdictions have departments that offer fine arts classes as part of its recreation budgets and have employees who do that, whereas Albemarle County has partnerships with many private people who use school buildings such as the old Crozet Elementary.

Ms. Palmer asked for clarification as to who maintains the grounds. Mr. Crickenberger responded that Parks & Recreation staff maintain Darden Towe Park along with seven other parks. He said the grounds at COB-McIntire and COB-5th are maintained by General Services. He said Parks & Recreation maintains a lot of the school athletic fields but, outside of that, the grounds are maintained by the Division of Building Services. He said the reason why Parks & Recreation is involved with school maintenance is because those are considered community parks after hours. Mr. Crickenberger noted that Parks & Recreation maintains 22 athletic fields which are on school property.

Mr. Davis said, by County code, those school recreational fields are deemed to be county parks legally.

Mr. Foley said it is important to consider that acreage when making comparisons to other localities adding that, in some localities, there may be school personnel taking care of those sites.

Ms. Palmer asked if the County paid a lot of overtime. Mr. Crickenberger said they do not because they have gotten a lot smarter and more efficient over the years, employing a lot of different maintenance practices. He said the greatest amount of overtime is for snow removal, because they have to keep facilities open all the time. He said it is amazing that there is not more overtime, given the amount of facilities they have and the mileage they have to travel.

Mr. Crickenberger reported on the history of County Parks & Recreation stating that, in 2002, they had 20 employees and over 2,100 acres of parks; in 2005, they bumped it up to 22 employees, including the hiring of an inmate foreman and expansion of athletic field maintenance. He said, in 2010, the assistant director position was eliminated and the staff number dropped to 20, with 3,315 acres of parks. He said, today, they are still at a staffing level of 20, with 3,775 acres of parkland. Mr. Crickenberger said, since 2002, they have added 1,600 acres of parks and greenways and are operating at the same level as 2002. He presented an organizational chart showing 20 employees, including the director, an office associate, a park superintendent, a recreation division manager, an athletic programmer, an outdoor recreation supervisor, a trail maintenance supervisor, five park foremen, and eight grounds and facilities maintenance workers as well as three employees at Darden Towe Park. Mr. Crickenberger said they employ over 220 part-time employees; 17 of those support the maintenance division; four support the community centers that manage facility reservations, parties, etc.; 199 part-time employees support the recreational division as maintenance seasonal staff, working for 14 or 15 weeks.

Mr. Crickenberger reported on the Parks & Recreation facilities, noting that they include eight regional parks, two City/County regional parks – Darden Towe and Ivy Creek - three community parks, three community centers, three river access/boat launches, 176 acres of greenways, 28 parcels of greenway property, and over 62 miles of multi-use recreational trails, totaling over 3,000 acres.

Mr. Boyd asked if the Department would be impacted by the Affordable Care Act for those seasonal employees. Mr. Crickenberger said he did not have that answer yet and was waiting for direction from the Human Resources Department. He said some of those employees are working over 32 hours per week so, if they exceed a certain average over the course of three or four months, there is a good chance they would be impacted. He clarified that, currently, none of the part-time or seasonal employees are getting any benefits, adding that the Department tries to use them as much as possible to in order to avoid hiring permanent full-time staff.

Mr. Boyd asked if it was possible to keep those employees under 30 hours per week. Mr. Crickenberger said that would be one option which could be considered.

Ms. Mallek asked if the river accesses included Buck Island. Mr. Crickenberger said the only ones currently in the system are at Milton, Darden Towe and Hatton Ferry. In response to Mr. Foley's comment about the school fields, Mr. Crickenberger confirmed that his figures did not factor in school fields.

Mr. Crickenberger presented a map of parks maintenance districts to better identify the areas, stating that there are presently three maintenance districts: a northern, western and southern district. In each one, he said there are three employees: a park foreman and two ground maintenance operators with each district having additional support including an inmate foreman. Mr. Crickenberger said, at some point in time, the County would need to develop a fourth service district, which would be an eastern service district and would be driven by the fact that Rivanna Village would be coming on board with a dedication by the developer to help offset and mitigate some of the other pressure that this development could pose on some of the other existing recreational facilities. He said this is planned as a turn-key park, with the developer developing it and turning it over to the County. He said this new eastern district would also include Buck Island, Rivanna Park, the Milton Boat Launch, the Rivanna Greenway, Riverside Park, and some of the schools which are in that district.

Ms. Palmer said she did not understand what a maintenance service district meant. Mr. Crickenberger responded that this involves maintenance for a particular district and for all of the parks that fall within that district.

Mr. Foley explained that Mr. Crickenberger is indicating that Parks & Recreation will need some new staffing to deal with a new service district once those things get up and running, because the Department cannot handle it with current staffing numbers.

Ms. Mallek said, when the Board was talking about Arrowhead a year ago, Supervisors were well aware that more staff would be needed to develop these new areas and to ensure those were being used properly.

Ms. Dittmar asked what the timeframe is for the eastern district. Mr. Crickenberger said it would likely be three or four years out, although Parks & Recreation Department is planning for it now.

Ms. Mallek said Mr. Crickenberger included a strategic plan chart with short-term, mid-term and long-term items in the materials he sent the Board.

Mr. Crickenberger presented information on recreational offerings, fee-based classes, sports camps and other activities, adding that the sports clinic for middle schools has been a huge success. He stated that the Department generally runs 10 summer camps per year, but that can vary from year to year depending on CIP improvements happening at any given school over the summer. Mr. Crickenberger said the funding provided helps serve over 45% of county residents for the therapeutic recreation program, and 46% of the costs for the skate park. He stated that the County has partnered with the City for a number of years on the softball and volleyball programs, and that partnership has eliminated the non-County registration fee, so those participants are paying the same registration fee as a City resident.

Ms. McKeel stated that the Board had received a barrage of emails recently regarding the therapeutic recreation program, yet that budget is not being cut. Mr. Crickenberger said the public thought there was a lack of funding on the City side, but the City is not making any reductions whatsoever. He said the program is wonderful and badly needed.

Mr. Boyd said it would be helpful to have the list circulated as to what is self-sustaining or not. Mr. Crickenberger reported on attendance in Parks and Recreational programs, stating that there was a total attendance of over 37,000.

Ms. Dittmar asked if that information could be tracked to individual visitors, or just total visits. Mr. Crickenberger said staff would have to go back to the original bills of sale to track those visits, but they could differentiate between County and non-County visitors.

Ms. Mallek said swimming lessons are so important, especially for those children who cannot afford to have lessons elsewhere and who often end up in terrible drowning situations.

Ms. Palmer asked if the Department charges to go into Chris Greene Lake for everyone, not just those who are swimming. Mr. Crickenberger said anyone entering the park during operating hours is expected to pay the entry fee. He said the Department used to charge at the beach, but they moved it up to the front entrance as standard practice, which improved the behavior at those facilities tremendously.

Mr. Crickenberger reported that Parks & Recreation works with more than 30 youth and adult athletic leagues, serving over 9,000 participants, with 85% of those being actual County residents. He said the Department's involvement in terms of sponsorship is provision of facilities and maintenance, with the organizations providing the administrative parts of operating the leagues. He said a rough calculation shows that the cost for the County to run all of those leagues would mean an additional five FTEs to manage everything from registration, team placement, coach recruitment and background checks, scheduling and equipment.

Ms. McKeel asked if there was a replacement fund in place for the turf fields at the schools, which the Board had approved with lots of discussion and questions about replacement. Mr. Crickenberger responded that there is a replacement fund, but it is managed by the Schools and he is not sure how much was in that fund. He noted that the fields have about a ten-year lifespan.

Ms. Palmer asked how the department was using prison labor for maintenance. Mr. Crickenberger said the Department was using inmates three to four days per week, year-round, and they perform maintenance on County trails and greenways within the parks, painting, carpentry and other responsibilities. He stated that inmate labor cannot be used on school grounds when school is in session. He said the County pays a foreman to oversee them although the inmates themselves are not paid.

Ms. Mallek said less than half of the maintenance work is being done by inmates, but it is definitely very helpful.

Mr. Crickenberger reported that the Department's two biggest partners are Charlottesville Parks & Recreation and the School Division which adds an additional 750 acres to the system. He said his report includes a complete list of partners the County has worked with over the years, and presented a figure of the value brought to the department by volunteers which help offset operational costs.

Ms. Dittmar said she would be interested in finding out about the use of parks and recreational facilities, and the perception among citizens as to the adequacy of these offerings.

Mr. Foley said the citizens' survey would be on the Board's agenda in February. He asked Mr. Crickenberger if there were any plans for another Parks & Recreation survey, as they had done years ago.

Mr. Crickenberger said the Department does not have a survey planned but, at some point, they need to do another needs assessment as the last one was done in 2004. He stated that the life span of one of those assessments is 10-12 years.

Ms. Mallek commented that there are different interests and activities on the table now that were not relevant in 2004.

Mr. Crickenberger noted that a lot of the activities and parks activities are driven by that needs assessment, so it is a very helpful tool.

Ms. Mallek asked about the master plan for Darden Towe, which she recalled being ready for an update in 2015. Mr. Crickenberger said that is not funded in the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP).

Ms. Dittmar asked him to speak to the fact that the County was turning away land donations because there is no budget for those. Mr. Crickenberger said he was not personally turning down any land donations. He said there may have been one or two over the course of the years that were determined, after internal investigation, not to provide any strategic value. He stated that every land donation up to this point has been brought to the Board for discussion and consideration, direction and guidance as to whether to proceed or not.

Ms. Dittmar stated that there is currently a workgroup focusing on rivers and recreation potential, among other usages, and asked if he was involved with that group. Mr. Crickenberger said Dan Mahon of County staff was more involved with that group.

Mr. Boyd said a meeting was held earlier in the day, and Mr. Mahon was present. Mr. Crickenberger said Mr. Mahon was a better representative for that group since he is more focused on things like river access, but Parks & Recreation as a department is definitely involved.

Ms. Dittmar asked if he was aware of other revenue-generating sources. Mr. Crickenberger responded that he was not aware of anything off the top of his head.

Ms. Mallek said she felt this was a deeper discussion for another time. Ms. Dittmar said she would also like to see the details of parks visitation to capture statistics on unique visitors rather than cumulative totals.

Ms. Palmer said she would like to see a copy of the last needs assessment, and other Board members said they would like to see it also.

Ms. Palmer stated that she hears frequently from constituents about how the County needs more parks and, at some point, she would like to have a discussion of the Hedgerow land, as it has great potential for fundraising from the private sector, especially the University of Virginia (UVA).

Mr. Crickenberger said he would be happy to have a discussion about Hedgerow and how the Department ranks their facilities. He stated that, in looking at the facilities that have been in the CIP plan for a while, Buck Island was ranked higher because of the river access and all the other trail parks.

Item No. 2b. Community Development.

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development Department (CDD), said he would be discussing the annual work program for Community Development which usually comes before the Board in February. Mr. Graham said he would begin by providing the Department's history and functions, how the Department goes about developing its budget with programs and services, anticipated workload, revenues, and then looking forward. He said the Department was formed in 2004 when the County was looking to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of departments and combined three departments involved in development into one. Mr. Graham said this was intended to reduce confusion by the public also, as there was a lot of misdirection about who to go to for answers. He presented a list of programs in the FY15 adopted budget, noting that administration pertained to the department itself but includes the management of bonds, which are \$60-80 million. Mr. Graham said the Department also handles the application intake, totaling approximately 3,000 permit applications a year. He said CDD handles records management and, under Virginia law, the County is required to retain records and manage them. He stated that the Department deals with over 300 FOIA requests per year for with about 2.5 million pages of documents which the Department is required to retain. Mr. Graham said the Comprehensive Plan is also handled by this department and is a state-mandated program. He stated that the Department manages the Master Plan, and a lot of the Capital Improvements Plans (CIP) which originate through the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Graham said the building inspection program is also state-mandated, with the County's program pertaining to new construction only, however, there are provisions in the state code for a building maintenance program, which is more commonly implemented in cities.

Ms. McKeel asked if the building maintenance program is something the County may need to revisit as it is urbanizing. Mr. Graham responded that it is possible, adding that urbanized counties like Arlington have a building maintenance code. He said the City of Charlottesville has a building maintenance code as well.

Regarding non-mandated programs, Mr. Graham noted that there are 21 Boards and Commissions on which the Board has appointees. He said staff provides support either as the lead or a major contributor to the Acquisition of Conservation Easements (ACE) Committee, the Ag/Forestry Districts, stream buffer programs, the Public Recreation Facilities Authority, the Planning Commission, and the Architectural Review Board (ARB), among others. Mr. Graham said the Geographic Data System (GDS) is also a Board directive which includes mapping, reports such as the quarterly building reports, and data analysis. He stated the quarterly building activity reports which the Board receives are generated through the GDS. Mr. Graham said the Board's directive for code compliance is handled through the Zoning Department and encompasses a lot of work with zoning determinations including determinations of property rights and proffer management. He stated that a lot of people do not realize that zoning is not a state mandated function. He explained that development covers all site plans, subdivisions, water protection, and other things, all of which consume a lot of the department's time. Mr. Graham said CDD operates as a matrix organization, with staff members providing time and various levels of support for each of those programs. He said each program has a lead division or workgroup responsible for it and others that are major or minor contributors. He said the Department started with 81 staff members, reaching 84 FTEs in 2007, and, during the recession, CDD underwent a significant down-sizing and reduced by 30% or 25 FTEs which was done without any layoffs. He said that was accomplished through reassignments and early retirements. Mr. Graham said a lot of the down-sizing was managed through reduced workload but, given the revenue constraints, they were also looking at eliminating or reducing some of the County's enhanced programs such as the groundwater monitoring program, and reduced staff support of the Historic Preservation and Natural Heritage Committees. He stated that, from 2010 up until last year, CDD did not have any staffing increase. He said, last year, a building inspector was added because of the increased workload, adding that the growth in revenue covered that expense by using building permit fees. Mr. Graham said CDD had the mandated Virginia Stormwater Management Program, for which the Board adopted an ordinance earlier this year. He said CDD has also added a transportation planner within the last month.

Mr. Graham reported that, as far as budget development, CDD staff review programs and services, mandates, Board direction, Comprehensive Plan strategies, changes in programs, the Board's strategic plan and initiatives, and then look at the Community Development Department's work program. He said, as part of reviewing the programs and services, staff develops a list of resource changes that are needed, and they identified a few positions which they felt were needed just to catch up. He said that included a zoning position focused primarily on code compliance, additional planning positions, and an imaging technician position for records management. Mr. Graham said the other requests pertained to the keep up/move ahead category, which includes 14 additional positions, some of which relate to whether or not the Board wants to restore some of the services that were eliminated during the recession. He stated that the next factor staff looks at in budget development is the anticipated workload in staffing which involves at look at trends in applications and what the Board's expectations are. He said the final factor is anticipated revenues by looking at trends in applications as fees are generated which help fund the Department and also looking at the Board's expectations or proposals which might change the fee structure.

Mr. Graham explained that, in order to evaluate the anticipated workload, CDD reviews current trends and leading indicators, as rezonings lead to subdivisions and subdivisions lead to building permits. He said staff looks at workload processes and how that would impact staff workload, with one example being site plans adding that the Board's adopted ordinance changes make that process a lot more administrative and streamlined. Mr. Graham stated that CDD also tried to identify any additional materials that might be needed. He explained that enforcing noise requirements is something the Board has focused on a lot in the past with light meters likely being the next thing staff would come to them about. With regard to zoning violations, he said code compliance officers are used, and he presented a chart showing the overall number of violations received and recorded over the last five years. Mr. Graham said it does not look as if there has been a very significant change on those from year to year, however, in terms of violations per code compliance officer, it has gone from 45 to 75 or over a 50% increase in workload. He noted that this is a great example of a place where CDD is above capacity, and they begin to see that in the response times where, in the past, staff may have been able to look at a reported violation within a few days, it is now a few weeks. Mr. Graham said this position was one of staff's highest priorities for a resource request.

Ms. McKeel said this is one of the things she hears about from her constituents, in dealing with these issues in the urban areas. Mr. Graham said it is a bit of a triage situation because staff has to make a decision, i.e., how much time is spent with the violation, how thoroughly staff spends in dealing with a violation, and the quality of the service versus response time for the next violation. He stated that CDD staff tends to err on the side of response time rather than the quality of the service to ensure they are getting it done correctly.

Ms. McKeel said it is not that the constituents are upset about the response times, but how long it takes to deal with the situation. Mr. Graham said that is working within the legal framework the County has, adding that staff has set a target of four months from the time a complaint is received to the time it is abated. He said CDD is trying to hit the 90% range, but are not coming close to that currently.

Ms. McKeel said she could think of several issues which have been over a year or two.

Ms. Mallek asked if the four months included the three months it would take in court. Mr. Graham said the ones that go to court are the 10%, adding that the best solution is to avoid court whenever possible.

Ms. Mallek said that is true unless staff is giving the impression that people can get away with things, in which case it makes the workload go way up. Mr. Graham agreed, but said court is a last resort, not the first resort.

Ms. McKeel said it seems the County could make some slight adjustments to some issues so the County does not have to get that point. Mr. Graham stated that the reason for the drop in projected zoning numbers for 2014 is not because CDD is seeing fewer violations; it is because the process has changed with staff automatically separating out some of the minor violations and not having to enter those into the system.

Ms. Mallek said the ticket program is a part of that process change. Mr. Graham said that it was helping quite a bit.

Mr. Graham reported that there has been a 35% increase in ARB applications and the Department is starting to reach capacity. He said CDD did make up some efficiency over prior years with some of the changes made to processes, i.e., went to countywide permitting for things such as air conditioning units on top of buildings. Mr. Graham said the third example is the opposite, where they do not think they need additional resources with site plans adding that what they have seen over the last five years is the trend staying very flat. He stated that the General Assembly created a grandfathering of old site plans which would have, otherwise expired, and continued them until 2017.

Mr. Boyd commented that the ARB reviews he keeps seeing are related to signs, and it seems as though those could be handled fairly quickly. Mr. Graham said those can be. He said, if an applicant follows a standard sign procedure, those can be processed quickly and easily but businesses also see an advantage in coming up with a unique sign for themselves which is outside of the standard that sets them apart but it does require more time with the ARB.

Mr. Boyd said perhaps the Board will need to readdress the sign standard at some point.

Ms. Mallek said the form-based standard works fine as long as people stick to the form.

Mr. Boyd said the request from the Crozet Volunteer Fire Department ran into issues because they were interested in a new type of signage.

Ms. Mallek said digital signs have been available for five or so years, and are just now getting to it and addressing it. Mr. Graham said, in consideration of new technology, the ARB is working on that and looking at revising its design guidelines, which would then have to come to the Board for approval.

Ms. Mallek said the fire company is the lead applicant, but there are others that have given up over the years because it was not allowed. Mr. Graham said that is why there would be a requirement to monitor the light levels from some of these signs.

Ms. Mallek said there was a sign by the reservoir that was blinding, and it turned out to be someone who did not even have a permit.

Ms. Palmer asked about the site plans which are grandfathered now and if that meant there were site plans coming through which would have been reviewed differently had they been re-reviewed today. Mr. Graham responded that there were site plans which were approved and, for that reason, the General Assembly extended the approval to July 1, 2017. He stated that those would have otherwise expired and would have needed to be redone.

Ms. Mallek commented that the main drawback in having old approvals is sometimes regulations have changed and the County cannot hold them accountable for those. Mr. Graham said that was correct.

Mr. Graham reported that the next area was anticipated revenues with CDD staff looking at the anticipated workload and then applying the fee structure to that. He said the Virginia Stormwater Management Program and building permit fees are recovered at 100% of direct cost including personnel who are working on the applications. Mr. Graham stated that the County recovers about 50% of subdivision and water protection ordinance fees, and about 10% of zoning fees. He said all of those fees were set by the Board by looking at comparisons to other localities and trying to keep Albemarle County fairly comparable with those.

Ms. Dittmar asked when the Board would be looking at that. Mr. Graham said the Board looked at water protection this year and, by early next year, staff would be bringing the building permit fees to look at those again. He said zoning fees and subdivision fees will follow, so the Board will be looking at one ordinance at a time.

Ms. Mallek noted that, in 2010, the process staff had worked on for about a year and a half failed when it came before the Board, so she was glad to see it come back again. Mr. Graham said, for FY15, CDD has about \$2.25 million in revenues budgeted; for FY16, CDD is estimating that it will go up about 4-5% adding that, overall, the revenues of the Department are about 1/3 of the Department's expenditures. He noted the annual expenditures on the chart provided, in contrast to annual revenues, and the difference between them is a net cost necessitating General Fund support from the Board. Mr. Graham said staff has worked hard to lower that net cost, and have reduced it to a fairly appreciable level, but it may be as low as it can go.

In looking ahead, Mr. Graham said the Department has no excess capacity and is over-utilized in a number of places, so trying to take on new programs or expand current programs means adding resources or cutting programs elsewhere. Mr. Graham said staff is projecting continued small increases in development, with a 1-1.5% annual growth rate in population, and an expected similar amount of development growth from year to year. He stated that staff is anticipating having a higher workload for the same level of development because the County is transitioning away from greenfield development on big pieces of open ground into infill and redevelopment projects with smaller plans and that means more plans for the same amount of development. Mr. Graham said he also anticipates increased expectations for that development in terms of quality and neighborhood support. He stated that he worked in the McLean, Virginia area with private infill development, and it is an enormous change for a locality to shift to that type of work.

Ms. Dittmar commented that the Rio interchange is a redevelopment project, so the County is just now getting into this game even though it is not new land.

Ms. McKeel said the urbanizing areas have aging infrastructure in neighborhoods as well as on entrance corridors.

Mr. Boyd asked how Mr. Graham had determined that staff was at capacity, and if the calculation was based on present practices. Mr. Graham said that it was and involves evaluating how long it takes staff to do current processes and making a determination as to whether they have any staff capacity beyond that.

Mr. Boyd asked if Mr. Graham had ever run a comparison to other counties, similar to what the Board saw with the Parks & Recreation presentation earlier. Mr. Graham said staff has done those comparisons, however, it is a really difficult thing to do. He explained that looking on a per population basis yields one answer whereas looking at a per application basis gives a different answer due to the fact that different localities grow at different rates. He stated that they also consider the requirements of a locality, i.e., who has an ARB, landscaping standards, etc. Mr. Graham said an example he has used in the past is a comparison of the subdivision ordinance in Augusta County versus Albemarle County, and the difference in thickness between the two ordinances, with Augusta's about 1/8" thick and Albemarle's at 1". He said ignoring those factors and looking just at population, Albemarle is in the middle of the urbanizing counties whereas it used to be up near the top when the staffing level was at 84.

Mr. Boyd said he did not know if Mr. Graham had ever done a holistic review of the entire Community Development Department to ensure it is right-sized. Mr. Graham responded that he would be glad to bring that back as part of the work program review.

Ms. Mallek said Mr. Graham had done a comprehensive analysis of fees in the past. She said, in 2008 when she was a new Board member, she heard from constituents that Augusta County's level of staffing was much less, so she called the County Administer, Pat Coffield, and learned that Augusta County had five different departments doing the things that Albemarle's Community Development Department does.

Mr. Foley said some localities still have three departments, as Albemarle County did before it merged them.

Mr. Graham said it is very difficult to compare because a lot of localities have a public works department and all the engineering functions are there rather than in their community development or planning departments. He said he would have to do an interview with the directors in order to get a true comparison adding that he typically tries to visit two localities per year, spend the day with them and talk about what they are doing and where they are going.

Ms. Dittmar said she and Ms. McKeel had met recently with their Planning Commissioners, and they suggested that the group which was formed some years ago to look at streamlining administrative processes be reconvened to see how it has worked out.

Ms. Mallek said that was the Development Review Task Force, and she would be glad to serve on it again.

Mr. Foley said Mr. Graham will come back to the Board in February with the CDD work program and that would provide a good opportunity to discuss this further.

Recess. The Board recessed at 5:04 p.m., and reconvened at 5:12 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 3. **Work Session:** CPA-2013-01. Comprehensive Plan Update/Amendment, to begin with public comments and possible Board direction.

- Chapter Ten, Transportation
- Chapter Eleven, Parks, Recreation, etc.

The executive summary forwarded to the Board states that The Planning Commission's recommended Comprehensive Plan has been provided in the draft dated January 23, 2014 and previously provided to the Board of Supervisors. The Comprehensive Plan may be found online here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/Table_of_Contents_Final_1-23-14.pdf.

Recommendations regarding focused topics and information since the Commission's actions have also been identified for the Board's consideration. This work session is the eighth in the series of detailed Comprehensive Plan chapter reviews based on the Board's agreed upon review schedule which can be found here:

<http://www.albemarle.org/department.asp?department=cdd&relpage=17151>

The Board's direction to date has been recorded in Action Memos from Board meetings at which the topic was discussed.

At this meeting, the Board will begin review of **Chapter 10: Transportation** and **Chapter 12: Parks, Recreation, Greenways, Blueways, and Green Systems**.

Transportation

A link to the Transportation Chapter can be found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/10_Chapter_Transportation_final_1-23-14.pdf

A link to the appendices can be found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/A.10_Transportation_Final_1-23-14.pdf.

A link to the reference documents can be found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/Reference_10_Transportation_Final_1-23-14.pdf

The **Transportation** Goals, Objectives, Strategies, Implementation Priorities and Measures of Success are found in a single document at Attachment A. A comparison of the existing Comprehensive Plan's **Transportation** Goals, Objectives and Strategies to the proposed Draft is provided as Attachment B. A link to staff reports and the Planning Commission's discussions on **Transportation** may be found in Attachment C.

The **Transportation Chapter** provides information on the importance of:

- Planning for improvements in accord with the Growth Management Policy (pages 10.5 – 10.6)
- Participation in the State, region, and local transportation efforts (pages 10.6 – 10.11)
- Improving, promoting, and providing multimodal and accessible transportation options (pages 10.12 – 10.114)
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities (10.14 -10.16)
- Access management (10.16 – 10.18)
- Improved urban streets while recognizing multimodal opportunities (page 10.19)
- Providing safe and effective transportation options in the Rural Area (pages 10.19 – 10.20)
- Public transit provision (10.21 – 10.23)
- Implementing travel demand management (pages 10.23 – 10.25)
- Air transportation (pages 10.26 – 10.27)
- Supporting rail service (pages 10.27 – 10.30)

The proposed Transportation Chapter primarily reflects updates to reflect current local and regional planning efforts. The Commission did further strengthen text and recommendations related to multimodalism. Only one topic has been raised for specific discussion with the Transportation Chapter:

- **Rural Traffic Calming** (pages 10.20)
Objective 7 speaks to the need to provide safe and effective transportation while preserving the character of the Rural Area. This section provides information on the County's rural road design standards. It also references a study completed by the Piedmont Environmental Council, "The Route 22/231 Corridor: Concepts for a Rural Traffic Calming Plan." That study can be found on page R.10.15 and at this link:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/R.10.15_Rural_Traffic_Calming.pdf

This report was presented by the Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC) to the Planning Commission during review of the Comprehensive Plan update. It was provided as an example of how traffic calming might be considered for rural roads and intersections. The Commission asked for the information to be provided as a reference document, but not as a Comprehensive Plan recommendation. The specificity of the location in Keswick, however, has created much confusion in the community. Residents have interpreted this example to mean that the specific improvements shown in the study for the intersection of Route 22 and Route 231 are planned for construction.

Staff comment: Typically, the County has shied away from using site specific examples in the Comprehensive Plan to prevent this type of confusion. When the PEC made its presentation to the Commission, the Commission believed the document provided useful guidance for the County and VDOT when considering safety improvements for rural intersections. Having the document in the Reference section and not the Appendix was to make clear that the Plan was showing a potential example to consider for improvements to this or other rural intersections. Given the amount of concern and consternation from the community, however, staff believes that using an Albemarle County example is not the best option. Staff believes a similar example or examples from other localities can adequately convey the concept so that confusion is eliminated.

Parks, Recreation, Greenways, Blueways, and Green Systems

A link to the Parks, Recreation, Greenways, Blueways, and Green Systems Chapter (Parks) can be found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/11_Chapter_ParksRec_Greenways_final_1-23-14.pdf

The Appendix, which contains parks and recreation standards as well as the Greenway Plan can be found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/11_Chapter_ParksRec_Greenways_final_1-23-14.pdf

There are no reference documents for this Chapter.

The Goals, Objectives, Strategies, Implementation Priorities and Measures of Success are found in a single document at Attachment D. A comparison of the existing Comprehensive Plan's Goals, Objectives and Strategies to the proposed Draft is provided as Attachment E. A link to staff reports and the Planning Commission's discussions on may be found in Attachment C.

The **Parks** Chapter provides information on the importance of:

- Preserving and maintaining important County-owned natural areas, parks, and areas jointly owned with the City (pages 11.9 – 11.10)
- Completing the greenway trail system (pages 11.10 – 11.15)
- Providing access points to greenways and blueways (page 11.15)
- Developing parks for active recreation in both the Rural Area and the Development Areas (pages 11.15 - 11.17)
- Providing walking and biking connections between City and County parks and other centers in the Development Areas (page 11.17)
- Working with Charlottesville on joint projects to improve parks, recreation, and greenways

The proposed **Parks** Chapter primarily reflects formatting changes from the existing Comprehensive Plan. Also, clearer Greenway maps than those provided with the January 23, 2014 Draft are provided as Attachment G. Attachment H contains a list of Parks and Trails improvements identified in the Plan for the Rural Area and provided to the Commission in August 2013. This table should be placed in the Appendix.

Staff has identified one area for Board discussion:

Rural Parks for Preservation

The County has identified five types of parks for which standards are provided in the Appendix. The smaller parks, pocket parks and neighborhood parks, are in the Development Areas and, if not part of a school complex, are expected to be privately owned. Regional parks (to support larger geographic areas within the County) and County-wide parks (expected to serve the entire County) are generally Rural Area parks. In 2013, the County was offered property for the purpose of long term preservation and very limited recreational use. Accepting land for this purpose is not supported in the existing Community Facilities Plan for Parks and Recreation. However, land preservation is a specific Rural Area and Natural Resource expectation.

Staff Comment: The Planning Commission's work on the Comprehensive Plan was complete prior to an offer by the owner of Arrowhead Farm for a "preservation park". With

increasing offers for land in the Rural Area, attention is now needed for developing standards and criteria for acceptance. Attachment F provides additional information with staff recommendations for developing criteria for accepting land for preservation in the Rural Area.

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, addressed the Board, stating that the Board has been working on the Comprehensive Plan for quite a while and the end is in sight, with tonight's session focusing on transportation and parks. She said, next month, the Board will be discussing community facilities and recommendations from the Planning Commission. In February, she said the Board would be looking at the Implementation chapter, which involves how the Plan is implemented but also priorities and measurements of progress. Ms. Echols stated that the Board would also look at the red-line chapters 1-7 and, while Economic Development is still not up, all the rest are. In March, she said the Board would finish looking at the red-lines of the last chapters, final changes and measures of progress. She stated that the Board sent some things to the Planning Commission for review and, on December 9, they looked at artists' communities and residencies in the rural area, and also at the Keith Woodard request for lofts at Moore's Creek. Ms. Echols said, on December 16, the Commission would hold a public hearing on the solid waste management recommendations, as well as the Borches Comprehensive Plan Amendment at Route 29, Rio Road and Berkmar. She stated that, in January, the Board would be looking at Woolen Mills and the redevelopment infill items which Ms. McKeel had requested. Ms. Echols noted that, by January, staff would present some recommendations to the Board with some additional recommendations in March.

Ms. Echols reported that this work session was for transportation, parks and recreation, greenways, blue-ways, and green systems, adding that there would be time for public comment now as well as at 7:00 pm. when the Board reconvenes. She said there was only one topic which came to the floor for transportation, which was the rural traffic-calming example. She said, for Parks & Recreation, the only item which came up was the rural area land for preservation parks.

The Chair opened the public comment period.

Mr. Petie Craddock addressed the Board, stating that he lives in the Scottsville District and is from Milton, VA. He said he is also a property owner and has family in the Cismont, Virginia area. He stated that he travels the Route 22/231 corridor often, and would concur with staff's recommendation to eliminate any reference to Albemarle County's Route 22/231 corridor as an example of rural traffic calming. He also asked the Board of Supervisors to consider removing the Piedmont Environmental Council's (PEC) examples from the reference section and the appendix, and remove it completely from the rest of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Craddock said, from past experience on legislative bodies, items that linger tend to be items of reference or benchmarks when the actual situation comes forward for action and review. He said he learned the previous evening that Albemarle County's Fire Chief and his assistants were not aware of any studies on increased response times involving roundabouts, especially the large number proposed between Keswick Post Office and Kloeckner Road. He said there is currently no impediment on Route 22/231 from the traffic light at Shadwell to the roundabout in Gordonsville, and not only would Albemarle County Fire & Rescue and Police have longer response times, but emergency vehicles from Orange, Louisa and the state police accessing the emergency room at Martha Jefferson Hospital would also experience these increases. Mr. Craddock said, with the overwhelming sentiment at Supervisor Boyd's town hall meeting in March at Grace Episcopal Church in Cismont expressing opposition to this plan, he trusted that the Board would not include these private recommendations, which have caused much concern and consternation with the citizens of the area.

Mr. Jeff Werner of the Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC) addressed the Board, stating that PEC is extremely disappointed that staff is recommending removal of the Route 22/231 traffic calming plan from the Comprehensive Plan appendix. Mr. Werner said the document, as the Planning Commission articulated during its review, presents only a series of conceptual solutions for traffic concerns in that corridor. For over two decades, he said residents of the corridor have expressed concerns about traffic safety, primarily about increased truck traffic. He said, in 1995 and also in 2004, the County requested truck restrictions on Route 22/231 but, both times, the state rejected that request. Mr. Werner said, in 2005, VDOT's long-range plan proposed some major changes to the corridor, including four-laning of the road from Shadwell to Cismont. He said, in response to that and to the communities, concern about safety, PEC hired a consultant to develop some solutions and, for a week in spring 2010, he met with over 100 local residents and several local officials, reviewed traffic data and made first-hand observations. He said he then presented to the community some ideas for consideration. Mr. Werner said the consultant also explained that nothing could be pursued without a longer, more thorough public process, and that process would be more successful if linked to the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that, in response to what the community told him, it was clear they preferred simple solutions over intensive ones and, in the Plan, it says, "There are many ways to implement this vision; however, it is

recommended that it be accomplished through a series of projects, from least intrusive to most intrusive, understanding that residents have indicated a preference to prioritize simple changes over traumatic ones.” Mr. Werner said the individual concepts in any suggested locations were only recommendations by the consultant and, being in the Plan or being shown on a conceptual map have never represented endorsement by the community, the County, PEC or VDOT. He noted that he had distributed a slightly revised version of the document and took out the map that caused so many problems, and PEC and Keswick took the initial steps to develop some concepts that would be a starting point for a longer discussion. He stated that the Plan in no way precludes ideas and the concepts in it can be modified, revised and even rejected by the community. Mr. Werner said the next step is for the County to engage the Keswick community in solutions and that was the whole point of this, so to throw it out over some hysteria over traffic circles which are not going to happen is extraordinarily unfortunate. He added that these concepts are something which could be used for the entire rural area, and are a kit of parts that perhaps could be used elsewhere.

Mr. Tony Vanderwalker addressed the Board, stating that he is a resident of Keswick on Route 231 and personally raised \$40,000 from people up and down Route 231 to hire an internationally recognized traffic engineer. He said a few of those people were major donors to the Supervisors’ last campaign, and he is baffled as to why the Board is supporting a group of misinformed people, many of whom do not even live on Route 231. Mr. Vanderwalker said, at a meeting his Supervisor held, he did not recognize even one of the opponents although he has lived on the road for almost 20 years. He stated that these people have a “keep your hands off my Medicare” kind of misconstrued point of view, and have characterized the traffic calming study and the PEC as being out to wreck the character of Keswick but, for 40 years, PEC has worked to preserve the character of Keswick, so it is silly to think they would do anything to disturb that marvelous landscape. He said this study is \$40,000 worth of valid, up-to-date measures to improve the safety of rural roads, and everyone who has lived on the road has had at least one near-death experience with his wife having had three – the latest happening just earlier that morning. Mr. Vanderwalker said it is a perilous road to drive on because of the construction of the road, the drop-offs on the sides, the speeding that goes on, the truck traffic and, while they have been able to get the speed reduced, they have not been able to reduce the truck traffic. He stated that the study was meant to be an a la carte series of changes to slow people down by providing distractions, feedback on how fast they are going, and other established tactics to improve safety – among them, a few tight roundabouts such as the one in Gordonsville. Mr. Vanderwalker said Ann Lockwood, the traffic engineer hired, designed the roundabouts at 50 and 15 and, as a result of their success, that is now VDOT’s default intersection. He stated that this is a valid traffic study funded by the community, approved in two open meetings by people living on the road, and offered to the County as a potential alternative to building an expensive bypass around Keswick, or four-laning Route 231. Mr. Vanderwalker said the measures do not have to be implemented, just kept in the Comprehensive Plan so, if there is a series of accidents or political pressure to change the character of Route 231, the community and the County would have an established backup.

Mr. Rex Linville addressed the Board, stating that he was speaking as a resident of Albemarle County as well as a staff person with the Piedmont Environment Council (PEC), and as a member of a group of trail and recreation advocates that had been convening over the past year. He said, in reading through the Parks & Recreation section of the Comprehensive Plan, he was struck with how significant the aspirational language of that part of the Plan seems to conflict with actual implementation of parks and greenways in Albemarle County. He said that is particularly true in the urban ring which surrounds the City of Charlottesville, an area which houses approximately 50% of the County’s population. Mr. Linville said the biggest issue is the disconnect which seems embodied in these two statements: objective five of the Parks and Recreation says that the objective is, “To provide bicycle and pedestrian connections to City and County parks and schools in the development area from neighborhoods, employment centers, shopping areas, public parks and public schools,” yet the executive summary before the Board this evening for Chapter 11 states, “The small parks, pocket parks and neighborhood parks are in the development areas and, if not a part of a school complex, are expected to be privately owned.” Mr. Linville said County staff has indicated that the policy statement is driven primarily by a lack of resources so, in other words, the County is putting out great aspirational language in the Plan because it knows what should happen and what the community wants, but then is not doing anything to fund the implementation of those goals. He stated that he met recently with members of the Board and County staff looking for financial assistance for a key greenway acquisition in the urban area, but was told there was no money to fund that kind of acquisition and, instead, left it up to proffers. Mr. Linville said the City of Charlottesville, fortunately, cared enough about the acquisition to put its own money up for funding of the greenway corridor in the County. He stated that the other consideration is integration with the County Plan and the City Plan and, currently, the Plan before the Board stops at the County line and does not extend those corridors into the City. He emphasized that, without an integrated plan, the County is not going to effectively connect places where people live, places where people shop, places where people recreate, and where the jobs are. Mr. Linville said the County needs a plan for bikes, pedestrians and a greenway corridor which would effectively link together an alternative transportation network, bringing the City and the County together so that people have different ways of getting to recreation areas, to home and to jobs and would be an economic engine for the community. Mr. Linville asked the Board to work cooperatively with the City and direct the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) to begin putting together a comprehensive plan for the two localities, and that the County would begin funding its implementation. He said he did not want the next generation to have to wait for proffers for implementation, and wanted the residents who live here today to be able to enjoy this type of amenity.

Ms. Pat Napoleon addressed the Board, stating that she is a Charlottesville resident but owns property in Cismont. She stated that many residents have been concerned for years about the PEC-initiated traffic calming proposal for Routes 22 and 231. She stated that VDOT has explained to a number of people over and over that there is not enough existing right of way for creating roundabouts or other structures without taking private property. Ms. Napoleon said roundabouts must be large enough so that emergency vehicles and large trucks can access the structure, and signage and artificial lighting are a huge concern. She stated that she is relieved in viewing the revisions of the proposal, but also requested the County provide clarification and a detailed explanation for the ultimate disposition for traffic calming. Ms. Napoleon asked the Board to assure residents that there would not be any maps detailing specific sites or specific properties flagged for roundabouts or other pullovers. She said many Supervisors have objected to bypass-devaluing properties, yet measures such as gateways, bridges, landscapes, views, pull-offs and roundabouts would take private property. Ms. Napoleon mentioned that, some years ago, her father who resided on Route 22 suffered a serious heart attack. She said East Rivanna Fire Station's vehicle arrived onsite before the rescue squad, just in time to provide care. She stated that he may not have survived had there been a delay. Ms. Napoleon thanked the Board for carefully thinking this issue through and for protecting an existing and beautiful historic corridor.

Mr. Peter Thompson addressed the Board, stating that he is a resident of the Samuel Miller District and wanted to address the draft Comprehensive Plan section on Parks & Recreation. Mr. Thompson applauded the County for its great work on parks and recreation, and for the greenspace which has grown a lot in the past 5-10 years. He said the reality is a lot of people cannot access those outdoor spaces. He stated that people with limited mobility, older adults, people with disabilities, and people with limited transportation often do not have access to a lot of the parkland. Mr. Thompson said the reality is the County needs a lot more indoor recreation space, and he wanted to encourage two interrelated concepts: it has been 10 years since the County conducted a parks and recreation needs assessment, and that is referenced a few times in the Comprehensive Plan even though it is a decade old. He emphasized that the world has changed a lot, needs have changed a lot, the environment has changed a lot, resources have changed a lot, and planning has changed a lot. He encouraged the Board to figure out a way to do a fresh needs assessment which would help drive the County's parks and recreation needs. If that is not feasible, he said the Board should at least reference the 2004 needs assessment in the Comprehensive Plan. He said the study is mentioned a few times but is not stated to be the County's living, guiding document. Mr. Thompson said, if it is the latter, he suggested that language from the needs study be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan, which states, "When indoor facilities are analyzed, it is apparent that the County has very limited indoor facilities, and the City – despite its seeming high numbers – actually has limited indoor facilities in size and magnitude. This, in fact, places more reliance on private and nonprofit providers in this area." He stated that the Comprehensive Plan, as drafted, does not address the need for indoor recreation space, and he encouraged Supervisors to find a way to do that in order to provide access for all ages.

Ms. Diane Weber addressed the Board, stating that she is a Cismont resident and was before Supervisors to talk about the rural traffic calming project. She stated that the PEC claims to have held community meetings and to have community support, but neither she nor any of her neighbors were invited to those meetings and asked when does someone have to be a member of the PEC to be a member of the community. Ms. Weber stated that the two assumptions behind the project have proven to be false, as VDOT has no plans to turn the road into four lanes and, according to VDOT's own statistics, Route 22/231 does not have a higher accident rate than any other comparable road. She said the proposed scheme for six roundabouts and other hardscape additions to the rural road would not only destroy the rural rustic character of the Southwest Mountains, but the larger issue pertains to safety for those residents who live along the road and who use the road. Ms. Weber said the concepts referred to by Mr. Werner are a hazard to all residents, as roundabouts will slow down emergency vehicles by at least 20-40 minutes during rush hour, which puts all residents at risk for medical or fire emergencies, and for heart attack or stroke victims and those minutes can mean life or death. She said children will have to be on school buses earlier and dropped off later, there will be constant air and noise pollution as well as light pollution at night, there will be higher fuel costs driving into town, and will be subject to higher delivery and labor costs for commercial vehicles. Ms. Weber said there are no intersections along Route 22/231 which require even flashing yellow lights, and there is a steady stream of traffic going 45-50 mph at all times and a roundabout that appears unexpectedly is likely to cause a traffic accident, not saving lives but costing lives. She said, like her neighbors in Cismont, she is bewildered as to how this scheme made it into reference material in the first place. Ms. Weber said she appreciates that County planners have at least temporarily removed this document from the reference material, due to what they call "concern and consternation from the community," as evidenced at Mr. Boyd's town hall meeting. She said one local resident called the document a "zombie," stating that it might come back to life at any time, even if it is stuffed into the reference material. She said many in the community would feel more comfortable if they had assurance from the Board of Supervisors which becomes a matter of record that the proposal is no longer under consideration and has been removed entirely from the planning documents as well as the County's website.

Ms. Elizabeth Hubert addressed the Board, stating that she is a property owner on Gordonsville Road, and her property is adjacent to the Lindsay Road intersection. Ms. Hubert said she inherited the farm from her father 10 years ago, and the property has been in her family since 1960, so this is a very emotional issue for her. She said she is very close to the road and is constantly dealing with the sound of traffic as it is now, and her biggest concern is that something more economical and more feasible was not considered years ago, i.e. reducing commercial traffic on Route 22/231. Ms. Hubert said there is no

reason for logging trucks to be on that road as it is a scenic route; it has been since she was a child, and PEC wants it to continue as a scenic route. She said there are other alternative routes, i.e. I-64 to Route 15 and Route 33 that would not cost millions and millions of dollars and would satisfy the issue of too much traffic on this road. Ms. Hubert said she would be directly impacted by a roundabout at the Lindsay Road intersection with Route 231, would be able to see the lighting from her front porch and would be able to hear the tractor-trailers downshift, and she did not understand why this would be put in the forefront. She stated that she commutes on the road twice per day, usually six days per week, and she would appreciate more thoughtful consideration towards this. Ms. Hubert added that she is an environmentalist, is part of the Blue Run Ag/Forestral District and is not opposed to environmental efforts on that road.

Mr. Michael Johnson addressed the Board, stating that he lives one mile from Cismont on Route 600 and commented that he did not think this plan would work as a traffic calming measure, nor would it be needed. Mr. Johnson said he asked VDOT for statistics on accidents for the road and, from Route 22/250 out to Cismont, between 2010-2012, there were 143.4 accidents per hundred million vehicle miles traveled. He said VDOT also pointed out that the average for this type of road in the state of Virginia is 142, so this is a typical road from that point of view, not a high accident road. Mr. Johnson said extending that out to Route 231 toward the County line in Gordonsville, the actual number on that section of road is 110 so it is better than normal. He stated that there are other roads in the County which are decidedly worse, such as Route 53, which has 150 accidents. He said the number of accidents on Route 22, from Cismont to Cobham, is 434, so if the County really wants to improve a road, perhaps that should be the one. Mr. Johnson said the only way for timing to work is if there is a viable alternative route and, going over to Route 29 puts cars into heavy traffic; taking a six-mile gravel route across the mountain would put someone on Route 20, which is not much better; and going out to Zion's Crossroads and coming into town from the east would add 10-12 more miles to the trip. He said none of these things sound like a good alternative, and neither does slowing down and speeding up along the road.

Mr. Travis Pietila of the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC) addressed the Board, stating that his comments would focus on transportation. He said a number of important things related to transportation have happened since the Comprehensive Plan draft was put out in January. Mr. Pietila said the draft continues to refer to "UNJAM 2035" as the current long-range transportation plan, but the MPO adopted a new 2040 long-range plan last spring. He stated that the Board, the MPO and the state have removed its support for the Western Bypass and are now moving forward with the Route 29 Solutions package of improvements, many of which have been in the community's plans for a number of years, so those references are now obsolete. Mr. Pietila said SELC also recommends adding mention of the third train from Lynchburg to D.C., which is part of the Route 29 Solutions package, to the draft's discussion of passenger rail, starting on page 10.27. He said the third recommendation is related to the General Assembly's passage of House Bill 2, which sets out a new prioritization process that will guide the future selection of transportation projects in the Commonwealth. Mr. Pietila said it will be important for the County to continue to weigh in on this process as it develops and starts to be implemented, and to make sure the community's priorities are adequately considered. He said the SELC hopes the Board would incorporate this new information to make sure the draft is as up to date as possible when it is adopted.

There being no further speakers, the Chair close the public comment period.

Ms. Echols stated that the Board usually begins the chapters with the goal for the chapter, and this one has an emphasis on multi-modal transportation. She said there are a number of objectives in this chapter, which she would quickly review. She said the first objective has to do with using the growth management objectives: the growth management policy for transportation planning, participating in the efforts of the state and region for multi-modal transportation options, providing pedestrian and bicycle facilities along urban streets, improving those urban streets, providing safe options for the rural area, and enhancing public transit. Ms. Echols said this is an important aspect of transportation planning, and travel demand management is a technique used to try to reduce the number of trips along a road, air travel for consumers as well as the shipment of goods, as well as the importance of rail. She stated that the Planning Commission spent most of its time on this chapter trying to enhance the statements related to multi-modalism, and believed that it was critical to look at more alternatives than just automobile traffic. Ms. Echols said it was so important that Commissioners asked staff to include a new principle in the Neighborhood Model on multi-modalism. She said the recommendation made through the Livability Project relating to transportation was to try to remove barriers to interconnections between the City for pedestrians and bicyclists. She said the City and County maps as those relate to trails and bike lanes have been put together and mapped and, if it is something the Board feels is important to include, staff can do that.

Ms. Echols said the main issue relates to some of the issues spoken about tonight which is the rural traffic calming example provided to the Planning Commission, i.e. the case study on how to improve traffic flow in a rural context. She stated that the Commission looked at this as an example of how something might be done in a rural setting which would help preserve the rural character while improving safety and traffic flow. Since that time, she said there have been a lot of questions as to what this means, and a lot of confusion as to whether the Comprehensive Plan is making this as a recommended plan for change, or whether it is just an example. Ms. Echols said, in past Plans, staff has tried not to create specific examples because it creates that confusion. She said this kind of improvement is not on any

project list currently, however, staff believes they can find some examples to be used in the reference section which talk about ways the County could do rural traffic calming and minimize this confusion. Ms. Echols said, when the County did the Neighborhood Model, the North Point development was one that was a case study, but staff very deliberately did not use that as part of the Comprehensive Plan because they did not want to imply that this is what the Comprehensive Plan said about this particular place. She said, obviously, there are people concerned about traffic and different ways to create solutions, so staff felt it was best to eliminate any confusion about the status of those solutions. Ms. Echols noted that the Planning Commission was persuaded that having this was a good idea to include in an effort to show how something could be done.

Ms. Echols added that staff does need to make some minor modifications and updates, and needs to update references to the long-range transportation plan as well as the bypass. Ms. Echols said she would ensure the Board has the most current information related to expanded rail service and House Bill 2, and also would make sure they have included references to all the plans which are a part of regional transportation planning, so there is no confusion in the future as to whether this is part of Albemarle County's planning. She said there was an email sent out by the Chair related to crude oil shipments by rail and, if the Board felt this was important to address, staff could add an additional strategy either in the Transportation section or Community Facilities, and hyperlink them, regarding the need to develop emergency plans for training and public safety in relation to oil shipments by rail.

Ms. Dittmar asked Board members where it wanted to begin the discussion.

Ms. Palmer suggested Supervisors address the map issue brought forth by the public.

Ms. Dittmar said she had attended Mr. Boyd's town hall meeting last spring and heard a number of residents express a strong desire to see this pulled out of the Comprehensive Plan as a resource. She stated that residents were not necessarily opposed to roundabouts, they were just concerned that it would be confusing to people as it was confusing to them.

Mr. Boyd agreed, stating that it was clear to him in the town hall meeting that the majority of people were interested in removing it from the Plan. He said staff has built a very good case as to why, based on precedent, not to include specific plans as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Palmer said she understands the concerns of citizens, but a significant amount of money was spent on the study and there are obviously people who are concerned about traffic in that area so she wonders if there is a way to salvage any of this information. She stated that, in years to come, it would be useful to have actual examples such as these. She said, perhaps if the references to the specific properties were removed, it would be very clear that the area is not planned to be affected by roundabouts.

Mr. Boyd suggested taking out references to Route 22 and Route 231, but include mention of what has been done in places like Middleburg.

Ms. Mallek said best management practices stand alone as suggestions, and she concurs with whatever editing the majority felt needed to be done. She said putting a big note across page one which indicates this was background for methodology as opposed to any plan. She pointed out that they do not have to go outside of the County to see very successful roundabouts. Ms. Mallek said it took her ten years of fighting with VDOT to get approval for the roundabout at the Airport, where there was a death every single year at the four-way stop, and no accidents since the roundabout was put in. She said there are 60-foot box trucks that go around the roundabout daily and do not have a problem, and there is no lighting so that should not be an issue. Ms. Mallek agreed that she did not want to lose the work on this, and hoped that, in the future, a solution like this which allowed vehicle movement and did not stop 50% of traffic would be implemented.

Mr. Sheffield said, in the end, it is VDOT who is funding this and doing its own designs so, in his mind, the County is doing more harm than good by keeping the design in.

Ms. Mallek said these are conceptual designs; they are not anything which would be used.

Mr. Boyd said he would like to get rid of the Route 22/231 references. He stated that Earlysville Road would be a good example of how to do traffic calming measures in the rural area.

Mr. Sheffield said he did not agree.

Ms. Mallek said the roundabout on Earlysville Road has been fabulously successful, even during rush hour.

Ms. Dittmar said no one wants to say roundabouts are bad, adding that the issue is what the County wants in the Comprehensive Plan. She explained that this is a gift from Albemarle County citizens who hired an expert but the question is whether it is prudent to have a study from an outside group included in the Comprehensive Plan. She said if Board members were permitted by the author to

pull out some of the report information to talk about what roundabouts can do, that is great for educational purposes.

Mr. Sheffield said he was fine with the concept; however, he did not like the idea of specifically calling out a corridor and coming up with ideas for it that would sit. He stated that there are so many other transportation projects which need funding, the horizon of this was pretty far out, and things like this tend to sit in plans and become almost institutionalized.

Ms. Dittmar asked if there was another place which could serve as a repository for this study, if not the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Mallek asked for clarification as to the difference between the appendix and the reference.

Ms. Echols explained that this report was in the reference documents, which is not part of the Comprehensive Plan, but includes background information and general information which might be useful in the future as examples, etc. She said the appendix is part of the Comprehensive Plan so it was deliberately not put in the appendix. She said it seems to still be causing confusion even in the reference documents, and that is her concern. Ms. Echols said staff could work with the PEC to pull out the concepts, take out the references to the particular places, and perhaps retain the integrity of the concepts without putting in a particular location. She said that would be her personal preference.

Ms. Mallek said many of the items in the list of reference documents comes from outside groups, including the Rivanna River Basin Commission, the MPO, etc.

Mr. Boyd said those are things the Board participated in creating.

Ms. Mallek said some are more remote than that.

Ms. Dittmar asked what the County's policy was for saying yes or no to allowing outside reference material.

Mr. V. Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning, said inclusion of a reference document in the Comprehensive Plan would be a decision of the Board of Supervisors. He stated that there is no policy and is something that does not happen regularly. He explained that the group asked the Planning Commission to consider this as that kind of document, so the Commission's recommendation was specific to this. He explained that it is not a policy-driven decision; it is a decision based on what the Board would ultimately consider to be appropriate in the case of the Plan being approved.

Ms. McKeel asked if this study would be more appropriate as a reference document if the identifiers were stripped out. Ms. Echols said it would be, as Mr. Boyd had suggested. She said staff can pull the concepts out, take away the reference location and any kind of particular identifiers so there is no future confusion about its status.

Ms. McKeel said that seems to be the appropriate place for it.

Ms. Dittmar said another concern is that, while Board members happen to like this study from an outside group, her concern is what happens when an outside group comes along with a study which the Board does not like. She questioned if the Board would want to be involved in the minutia of voting on reference materials.

Mr. Boyd said the Smart 29 group hired a consulting group to do a traffic study of the Rio Road interchange, and that group came up with very different results than what the County is moving forward with. He asked if a credible study done by a recognizable group would be put in the Comprehensive Plan or perhaps change the County's direction.

Ms. Mallek said, if it persuaded four people on the Board, she assumed that would be enough.

Ms. Palmer asked if the PEC had brought the study to the Planning Commission after the fact, and if the Commission was not aware until that time.

Mr. Cilimberg explained that, during the work of PEC's consultant, staff was not involved and that was somewhat intentional because they wanted to make sure it was viewed as an independent analysis. He said he and David Benish were invited to see some of the work as it was in progress, so they were aware of it but were not asked to provide any specific input. Mr. Cilimberg said the Commission's thought was that it was a study which had been commissioned through the PEC, and that the ideas of the study were more important than the study itself, with the concepts being proposed as the most valuable element of what could be potentially included as a reference document in the Comprehensive Plan. He said when the Planning Commission considered including this as a reference, it was after the work had been completed and was considered as work from the PEC that was done by a consultant. With the agreement of PEC, he said it is a little awkward to begin taking labels and titles off of it and putting it in the County's own plan. He stated that staff would want to make sure they were agreeable to the idea of

excerpting some of the elements that were concepts of value and including them as a reference which is more directly representative of that rather than the study of PEC.

Mr. Jeff Werner said he is frustrated that this all focuses on roundabouts, because that is the very last thing in the report. He stated that the single most important thing that could be done on the road is fixing the twelve inch drop-offs. He said what was done in Middleburg in the 1990s took over 20 years for the community to get behind it, and that is when VDOT was talking about four-laning Route 50 and so forth, and now people in Keswick are fearful of that. Mr. Werner said PEC was asked to help out and do this, PEC met with people and it was positive, and now he is being somewhat demonized. He said he does not care if the study is completely ripped apart as long as it refers to the concepts, because this allows the County to get back to the community with rural traffic calming ideas, with the clear understanding that the County would have to go through VDOT anyway. Mr. Werner said this was never intended to build a bunch of roundabouts and lights to slow down school buses and fire trucks, but Mr. Cilimberg's assessment was accurate, and it would be great if the recommended measures could be considered throughout the County's rural areas. He added that there are people in Keswick who feel strongly about doing something so, to represent them, he is hopeful that some steps can be taken.

Ms. Echols said, regarding outside groups providing information, the Monticello viewshed information was done by PEC as groundwork with photo imaging which established the parameters around which parcels can be identified as potentially visible from Monticello. She said there is a recommendation related to this in the Comprehensive Plan draft, and it is been looked at by the Historic Preservation Committee as an extremely important resource which staff might put on the County's GIS website. She said the other example was the Rivanna River Basin Commission, which had a set of recommendations related to the river corridor, and staff has put that in the recommended reference documents with that Commission's recommendation for the Board to consider when it does a study.

Ms. Mallek said chapter after chapter of the early Comprehensive Plans have different work products in the Plan.

Mr. Boyd read staff report's comment about "given the amount of concern and consternation" from the community," and it bothers him that the Board would create this strife unnecessarily. He said the Plan could simply talk about general traffic calming in the rural area without institutionalizing it.

Mr. Cilimberg said staff can borrow from the report's illustrations, as some of them were from outside Albemarle.

Ms. Palmer suggested that Ms. Echols work with PEC to take out specific references to the roads. She thanked the PEC for its work and the community for voicing their concerns.

Mr. Sheffield asked Mr. Cilimberg if the County were going to do anything with the state multi-modal transportation studies staff had participated in years ago. Mr. Cilimberg said the RPG group that did the study did some work for the County which borrowed from the multi-modal study and context-sensitive design, adding that there is a table in the Plan which reflects that work. He said that is a way for staff to identify the difference in corridors and the relationships of streets of development in those corridors.

Ms. Echols noted that the study was in the Development Areas appendix with the design guidance.

Mr. Sheffield said it is a pretty interesting study, and is specific to the actual road in question with thought given to different levels and context.

Mr. Cilimberg said an interesting aspect is that Route 29 is an arterial through the state, and how it functions depends on where it is. He said that was part of RPG's work in contract with the state and acknowledges that parts of roads, even as arterials, may need to be treated differently because of their function in the location in which they exist, as opposed to providing interconnection between regions. He said some of that echoes what has been said as, "29 is our Main Street."

Mr. Boyd said he would like to expand on the last bullet, and felt staff needed to remove the barriers to interconnections between neighborhoods and commercial districts in designated growth areas and do something to connect the neighborhoods on Route 29 and Route 250 to the commercial sides.

Ms. McKeel agreed.

Mr. Cilimberg said the County's master plans had attempted to do that and, perhaps, those specific things can be identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Boyd said not having those connections creates barriers for pedestrians and bicycles between neighborhoods and commercial districts.

Ms. McKeel commented that it is not just the new neighborhoods, as there are lots of older neighborhoods which would like to have those amenities as well.

Ms. Dittmar said it occurred to her that the trails are really part of the transportation network, and wondered if there was some way to better link those chapters.

Ms. Echols said there is a way to link those chapters, adding that it is somewhat of a challenge because the pedestrian linkages are sidewalks, trails, greenway trails, etc. She said staff would make the linkage between parks and recreation and transportation.

Ms. Palmer said she wanted to be sure staff was updating all of the things mentioned in the Route 29 Solutions.

Mr. Cilimberg said staff would make reference to House Bill 2, although it is still a work in progress and, over the next year, the work is intended to define how the criteria gets applied and which are priorities. He said that would be done through the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and there is a plan to review that with the County's Planning Commission, the City's Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Mallek commented that every time Nick Donahue comes to talk to the Board, he says the information will be available "sometime next year," and perhaps one of the introductory paragraphs from the MPO minutes could be dropped in as a reference to the new state legislation and is a work in progress.

Mr. Boyd said the Board must remember that this is not the last time it will ever update the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Sheffield asked which section public safety was under, as developing emergency plans and training for public safety and EMS staff seemed to fit more under services than transportation. Ms. Echols said public safety falls under community facilities.

Mr. Boyd said he thought that was something the County was developing under its emergency preparedness system.

Ms. Mallek said Chief Eggleston's email this week indicated that state leaders had directed shippers to be in contact with localities about shipping, as well as EMS training needed for response.

Mr. Boyd said it sits in the Disaster Planning Committee, and it seems to him that would be the place to work out all of those details.

Mr. Sheffield said Ms. Echols was looking for some direction on where to put it in the Plan, and said that Community Facilities was his recommendation.

Ms. Dittmar stated that there are people who have been trying to get improvements done on their rural roads. She asked how the money comes and how the six-year plan and long-range plans work. She asked if there was a way to tie it all together for citizens, perhaps with a flowchart that could be easily emailed or used in presentations.

Ms. Mallek said the first few pages of the Transportation chapter cover this very thoroughly.

Mr. Sheffield said different transportation projects could qualify for different funding sources and go through different processes.

Ms. Echols said staff could do a flowchart which could be in the reference documents or in the body, adding that staff is actually working on something similar now.

In response to Mr. Thompson's comments, Mr. Boyd said the Board had heard a presentation from Parks and Recreation earlier in the afternoon, and one of the things that was discussed was upgrading a needs assessment in the near future.

Recess. The Board recessed their meeting at 6:22 p.m., and reconvened at 7:01 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 4. Continuation of Work Session to include public comments and possible Board direction.

Ms. Echols reported that the reason for the long chapter name is because it was important to include everything in this chapter [Chapter 10: Parks, Recreation, Greenways, Blueways, and Green Systems]. She explained that the chapter is more than just parks, more than just greenways. She said the County is looking for a system of high-quality parks and recreational facilities which are connected and available to all residents.

Mr. Sheffield asked why the statement "to all residents" was included.

Ms. Mallek said her assumption is due to the efforts that have taken place over the last 10-15 years to improve accessibility at several of the County's parks for people who are handicapped, such as Walnut Creek Park.

Mr. Sheffield said it might be better to say, "unrestricted access."

Ms. Mallek said it is restricted though, based on hours of operation.

Mr. Sheffield said it seems odd to reference residents and not visitors.

Ms. Echols said she did not think anything was lost by ending the statement after the word "paths."

Mr. Sheffield said his only concern was there was no history behind it, and a short goal statement may be better than a long one.

Ms. Echols reported that the objectives are: to preserve and maintain our parkland, complete our systems, make sure the County provides access, develop some parks for active recreation in the development area and rural area. She said the rural area park is a little different from an active recreation standpoint, and the activities are a bit different than what is found in the development area, but that does not mean there would be no activity there.

Ms. Palmer asked if there was a clear distinction between rural parks and others. Ms. Echols said the difference is in the amount of activity, i.e. there would be no basketball courts and tennis courts out in the middle of the rural area. She said other objectives include providing bike and pedestrian connections to the parks, connecting rural area parks to each other and the development areas, working with the City on projects that benefit both localities which came out of the Livability Project sets of recommendations, as there are some parks jointly own and managed. Ms. Echols said there was a lot of interest from the Planning Commission in finding ways to serve both sets of residents – City and County – in a way that enhances their experience here. She said she was speaking with Mr. Linville about the mapping done for the Livability Project that relates to the parks and the accessibility to the parks, and the other ways to get to City and County parks such as trails. Ms. Echols said mapping could be included in the reference documents so people can see that it already exists.

Ms. Echols said the only topic for discussion had to do with the rural park preserves. She said, in 2013, there were discussions about Arrowhead Farm, which put the County in the position of taking on a particular kind of park that had specific conservation needs because of some rare and endangered species and the County had not done that, historically. She said the question came up as to whether this kind of issue might come before the County again. She stated that a preservation or conservation area is different from a place where the County would want to put in a lot of trails or activity, especially if the goal is to preserve what is on the site. Ms. Echols said the County receives a lot of offers of land for a number of uses, including parks, and the Parks and Recreation Department feels it is important to have established criteria to see if the Board wants to get into accepting more of these kinds of parks, and talking about what those implications are. She said the strategy would be for staff to develop the standards for these kinds of parks, bring them back to the Board to review and accept, and potentially amend into the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Echols said she has been working with the Parks & Recreation Department on criteria for acceptance, but there were a lot of variables for each situation and not every piece of land offers the same kinds of benefits to the County, if any benefits at all. She said that is something Parks and Recreation Department would like to work on within the next few years and bring back to the Board, so that would be staff's recommendation.

Ms. Mallek suggested that the Natural Heritage Committee would be a good partner, especially when they are talking about the rural preserve because of their expertise and different approach. She said she has been excited about this initiative because, for the first time, it has been clearly shown that different parks have different attributes, and not all parks have to have every amenity such as paved trails.

Mr. Boyd noted that Arrowhead was a complicated situation which had many different aspects, and he was not sure he wanted to establish a policy and procedure where people who want to get land off their tax rolls simply donate it to the County and the County is not able to do anything with it. He said the Board set up the preservation/conservation park because it was going to be donated to somebody. He said this was done in coordination with a group from the Shenandoah Valley that would be maintaining the animal habitat there. He added that he was not disagreeing with Ms. Mallek's approach, but did not want to lock future Boards in to accepting every piece of property that comes along.

Ms. Mallek said she did not mean to suggest the County accept every parcel, but having a thoughtful process laid out ahead of time would be helpful, because it was sort of a scramble and was hard on the department to have to do that.

Mr. Boyd said the question of accepting or turning down property came up earlier, but there may not be money to do anything with it, adding that an active park takes funding to operate.

Ms. Mallek said the one she brought forth several years ago was not accepted by the Board because it was in the growth area, and they did not want to turn it into soccer fields when it could have been apartments. She said it was complicated for lots of different reasons, from the Comprehensive Plan to Zoning to other elements.

Mr. Boyd said he was unsure if he was really supportive of putting together a pathway to get more conservation of historic parks. He said the question is whether that is a business the County wants to be in because all property owners are doing is taking them off the tax rolls, adding that visitation by the public would be limited because of the nature of the property.

Ms. Mallek said people would probably be able to visit in the future.

Ms. Echols said the idea is that this would be thoughtfully put together and brought back to the Board, however, if that was something the Board did not want to do or felt it should be more limited, that would be the Board's prerogative, and that is why there was not an expectation the Board would set up any standards now. She said all of those concerns are legitimate: what do we want, what happens when we get it, etc., so the idea here was to prevent the Board from having to scramble in the future.

Ms. Echols reported that minor modifications which need to be done include the greenway and parks maps. She said staff needs to add back into the Plan information on the recreational use of drinking reservoirs, which is one of the things that got lost between the Natural Resources and the Parks and Recreation chapters, as well as to carry over existing trail standards information into the new greenways maps. Ms. Echols said the Board heard from two speakers: one talked about indoor recreational facilities, and another talked about the importance of neighborhood parks.

Mr. Sheffield said Peter Thompson's comment also related to indoor facilities, accessibility for people with handicaps, as well as generational indoor facilities for people of all ages.

Mr. Boyd said the 2004 Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment indicated that there was a lack of indoor exercise facilities in the County. He said he was not sure what was going on with the YMCA which was the direction the County seemed to be taking at the time and was the answer to that issue. He suggested the County consider updating the needs assessment since it has been 10 years, although he was not sure how much it would cost to do that.

Mr. Sheffield said the County could probably get partners to help with it.

Ms. Palmer said she had a question about goal 7E, "Encourage the maintenance and enhancement of existing public access points to Shenandoah National Park and the Appalachian Trail to provide for public trail connections for visitors to the park." She said this always brings her back to the Sugar Hollow debacle, and asked if this goal could be strengthened because the access to Sugar Hollow is deteriorating from overuse.

Ms. Mallek said county-located properties owned by the City are mentioned in the chapter, which is another complicating factor with Sugar Hollow. She said the City, at the time, made a point to make sure the Brown's Gap Turnpike remained as a County road for access to that part of Shenandoah Park, so it is an important item to mention and is made clear going forward.

Mr. Cilimberg said staff could add the conditions in the strategies as examples which necessitate good maintenance and enhancement principles.

Ms. Palmer said staff should not say "maintaining," because it needs to be strengthened beyond what is happening now which is people parking in the woods and making their own pathways.

Ms. Mallek agreed, stating that it should say something like, "Strengthen the control of and maintenance of existing public access points."

Ms. Echols summarized what Supervisors seem to be saying which is to make a change to the goal which would acknowledge the Natural Heritage Committee as a partner in the study work for the strategies, not presuming it will be standard operating procedure, but providing some guidance for the Board to make decisions. She said the County would want to acknowledge the need for more indoor facilities, the need to update the Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment, and to provide more information on expectations under 7E.

Ms. Palmer said she wanted to see some additional wording related to the protection of headwaters of the County's watershed, as it is an important area which is being degraded due to a lack of control with parking, etc.

Ms. Mallek said there is driving in the river, piles of dirty diapers, etc.

Mr. Cilimberg suggested cross-referencing that with the Natural Resource section.

Ms. Echols said staff would make those cross-references and also link them.

Mr. Boyd said he thought Rivanna put some boulders up to prevent driving in the river.

Ms. Palmer said Rivanna did that with one access into the river, but did not mark off the parking lot, which has a downward slope into the river. She said there are several other areas including another area, which is not blocked off where people are driving into the river.

Ms. Dittmar asked Ms. Echols to speak about the comments she made early in her presentation related to contradictions in the Plan.

Ms. Echols said Albemarle County is transitioning from a rural to a rural and urban county and, in the past, much attention to parks has been geared towards the larger rural parks. She said, in the recommended Comprehensive Plan, there is a statement that having neighborhood parks is important, but the expectation is that those are going to be related to new developments that come in. Ms. Echols said this raises the question of whether or not the County should be looking toward having public neighborhood parks or expecting neighborhoods to have and maintain their own parks with new developments. She stated that there is an expense involved in owning and maintaining neighborhood parks, but there are also advantages in that if someone is part of a new development that had dedicated amenities, there is a place for those people to go from a public standpoint. Ms. Echols said the County has some requirements in the Zoning Ordinance related to recreational facilities, mostly related to apartment complexes, and certain recreational standards based on how many units there are in a particular complex. She said she did not know what the Board may have covered in the presentation from Parks and Recreation staff but, Supervisors may want to talk about whether or not the Board would want more public neighborhood parks as well as a plan for doing that kind of thing.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was an assumption that outside residents are not allowed to use the parks in the case of a rezoning where there is parkland or greenspace provided. She asked if the County could require that those parks be available to others, i.e. such as Hollymead Town Center, where a small central park is being put in.

Mr. Boyd said that was the nature of his question regarding Rivanna Village putting in a regional park as opposed to a community park, and there is a specific designation. He stated that people in that area did not want a regional park, and that was part of the discussion when the Board approved the development the first time around.

Ms. Palmer said residents would have cards in order to enter, adding that they would probably have to pay for those.

Mr. Boyd asked how the private sector parks like MonU soccer will be dealt with, stating that the indoor park the Board recently approved would be another example. He said these groups have come before the Board in the past to get special use permits for things like floodplains.

Ms. Echols said that is a very good question because the expectations for playing fields is not something that has been specifically addressed. She said if it is something the Board was interested in, staff could come up with an approach based on what has been said in the past.

Mr. Cilimberg said, in the past, there has been a recognition of private side facilities that provide for some of the need, and not necessarily dictating that there should be those kinds of facilities but recognizing that they provide for that need.

Mr. Boyd said there should be a place for that to happen.

Ms. Mallek said having it on the list of amenities might encourage people to choose one of those, which they may not choose right now.

Mr. Boyd said one of the comments he hears frequently is there are not enough all-purpose rectangular fields for soccer. He said he also receives lots of complaints about Darden Towe Park regarding the overuse of the fields and the grass being worn down.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that Parks and Recreation has had Capital Improvement Program (CIP) requests for field improvements.

Mr. Foley said there are a considerable amount of requests in the CIP for park fields. He said staff has done studies on how worn out the fields are getting.

Mr. Boyd said if clubs like MonU and SOCA could be encouraged to develop those kinds of fields, it puts the expense on them to maintain it and keep it the way they want to use it for their players.

Mr. Davis said the Cove Creek baseball facility was an interesting special use permit back in the mid-1990s which the Board struggled with because of its location and lighting, so there are lots of issues related to locating these things in the rural areas.

Mr. Boyd said his grandson plays in a baseball league in Richmond, and they have huge organizations which build their own facilities.

Ms. Dittmar noted that Mr. Linville had mentioned contradictions in the Plan, so perhaps the Plan language needs to be addressed.

Ms. Echols said there seems to be two questions: whether or not there is an expectation that the smaller parks will be private, or if the Board wanted to acknowledge that there would be public and private parks. She said the second piece is the implementation part, which is moving forward to make sure they actually happen. She stated that the County has not had the funding to create neighborhood parks so, if there is that expectation, the resources will be needed to do that.

Ms. McKeel commented that there is a lot of infill in the development area around older neighborhoods, such as Out of Bounds, which has a pocket park going in and that development is now being connected to an older neighborhood. She asked if the park would be off limits to the people in the older neighborhood, who are now dealing with the traffic generated from that new development.

Ms. Echols said it depends on how the development sets it up, but typically they set it up to be private because it is the homeowners that are doing the maintenance, so the expectation is that they are doing the maintenance for the residents who are paying the homeowners' fees. She noted that the County has had instances where private facilities have been used by a neighboring development that have caused a lot of problems to the first development, and there are people who get kicked out of the recreational facilities of private developments. Ms. Echols said that someone is not typically allowed to use the parks and trails of the neighbors' developments unless it is designed that way.

Ms. McKeel said, at the same time, the Board should encourage some public parks for people who are living in some of the areas where residents currently do not have anything.

Ms. Dittmar asked if a neighborhood park must stay private or could it later be turned into a County park. Mr. Davis said, if some point in the future, they wanted to donate it to the County and the County was willing to accept it, that could happen but it would be at their choice.

Ms. McKeel said, as the Board is talking about how to make these aging neighborhoods better, it would be nice to have some language which would encourage finding space in the development area to set aside for some parks.

Mr. Cilimberg said the County has had areas within rezonings from time to time that were dedicated for public use as an amenity, especially greenway type dedications.

Mr. Davis commented that Biscuit Run was going to have some amenities.

Mr. Cilimberg said Rivanna Village would be one example, but the smaller pocket neighborhood parks have typically not been proffered for public use, but instead as amenities of the development. He said the question is whether the County would want to get into the business of maintaining or even building those kinds of parks as urban amenities.

Mr. Boyd said that becomes a bit of a Pandora's Box. He said he sat on the board of a swim and racquet club in his neighborhood which has been a struggle in terms of membership and maintenance.

Ms. Palmer said it is usually the homeowners association that would be responsible for maintaining a private park, and asked what would happen when the neighborhood starts to deteriorate.

Ms. McKeel said the neighborhoods she is concerned with do not have neighborhood associations.

Ms. Palmer asked for clarification that the County is not talking about the County maintaining private parks. Mr. Cilimberg said the County would not want to get into the business of maintaining private parks, and the question is whether or not some of those would be public parks.

Mr. Foley said if those parks are public, the question is maintaining those. He said, if the County is not providing any field space, which has been identified as a need, and it is just a general park, that is an amenity for a neighborhood. He said the question is whether the Board would want to get into that business. He said cities often do that.

Mr. Boyd pointed out that the County currently has banked property that it is not turning into parks because there are no funds to do so.

Ms. Palmer asked about the one Mr. Crickenberger had referenced. Mr. Foley said Mr. Crickenberger talked about the need for a fourth service district once the Rivanna Village facility is completed, and that was dedicated to public use through the rezoning there. He stated that it would be a fairly significant facility to take care of and one that would push Parks & Recreation over the edge in

terms of having another service district with additional staff to take care of it. He said there will be fields there and will have some good facilities for the community, and will not be restricted to Rivanna Village.

Ms. Dittmar said Supervisors cannot really make these decisions tonight without a good deal of thought. She asked if the Board might want to develop a philosophy and strategy for urban parks for the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Cilimberg said that could be wrapped into the idea of a new assessment of facilities.

Mr. Boyd suggested not including any regulations which specifically oppose that, as a different approach.

Mr. Cilimberg said the County has never really opposed getting those kinds of facilities, either public or private.

Mr. Boyd said perhaps the Board does not need to address it in the Comprehensive Plan if it is working.

Ms. Echols said Old Trail was one place where the County did get it. She said what the County found out is that it was not as usable for a public park as the County would have liked, because the area outside of the floodplain was very limited. She noted that this was the first time the County had actually gotten into looking at neighborhood parks and connecting them to public parks. She said staff could work on a strategy to bring back to the Board for review.

Ms. Mallek said, in staff's comparison chart between the present and the proposed, the strategy seemed to be modified to shift the focus to the rural area and she would like to find a way to better describe the recreational needs in the development areas because those areas should be wonderful places to live as well.

Ms. Dittmar said Ms. Mallek's report at the last Board meeting on Rivanna Station indicated that she had ascertained the Comprehensive Plan might need some additional wording, and asked Ms. Echols to comment.

Ms. Echols said there were some questions asked about how to address the relationship between the County and Rivanna Station, i.e. the National Ground Intelligence Center (NGIC) area. She said, with the Places 29 plan, staff said this was a growing part of the community and economy, and crafted a few paragraphs to explain why it was an important area. She stated that, during the Economic Development chapter of the Comprehensive Plan update, she said an accommodation was made for the target industry strategies in an effort to help grow business and industry related to NGIC. She stated that there may need to be some minor tweaking which would help tie that to the land use section and some indication about the importance of the County's responsibility in helping to protect national security, which was related to one of the requests.

Mr. Boyd stated he did not have a problem with doing that. He said he has been involved in many conversations with NGIC over the years however, NGIC and the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) are sometimes headed in different directions and do not always coordinate with each other on what they are doing. He said they are so dependent on funding from Congress and when he has asked about projects, he is always told they would not know if there would be any funding for it, which is the confusing part about dealing with Rivanna Station.

Ms. Mallek said Rivanna Station is working on an expansion plan right now, which is what the environmental assessment meeting was about.

Mr. Boyd said the problem is the expansion plan is not funded.

Ms. Mallek said they have to do the planning in order to get the funding.

Ms. Dittmar said there is a requirement in the Virginia Code about this.

Mr. Davis said there is a notification requirement which the Planning Commission must provide in Comprehensive Plan and zoning text amendments.

Mr. Boyd said that is fine, but the County cannot always expect feedback as to whether NGIC or DIA like it or not.

Ms. Dittmar said it is okay as long as the County is following through on what it has said it would do and is a good host.

Ms. Dittmar also stated that, in reviewing the Plan's red-lines, there are comments and ideas which have come forward after a chapter discussion has concluded so, if there is a new idea to talk about, it is not too late. She said Supervisors should not send anything back to the Planning Commission unless it is a major shift, and the Board should also think about different models for adoption.

Ms. Echols said she had also talked with Ms. Dittmar about broadband and whether Supervisors wanted something to come back to the Board in January when it discusses the Community Facilities chapter.

Ms. Dittmar said she would suggest putting a placeholder in the document, even though the Board is far from having any solutions at this point.

Ms. Echols noted that the next Comprehensive Plan meeting is scheduled for January 13, 2015.

Agenda Item No. 5. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. Mallek said she received an email from an astronomy professor asking if the Board would like to have a private tour of Fan Mountain. She reported that the professor indicated his concern about dark skies provisions and he provided reasons why those provisions are important.

Ms. Mallek also congratulated staff on the recent CountyPalooza event. She announced that the County has saved 36% in energy costs for the McIntire Office Building since 2009 as an annual expense, which is a really great return on the investment for things such as insulation and light bulb replacements.

Ms. Dittmar announced that there was an employee luncheon scheduled for the following day from 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. at the County Office Building on 5th Street.

Agenda Item No. 6. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There was no report.

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn to December 10, 2014, 4:00 p.m.

At 7:46 p.m., Ms. Mallek **moved** to adjourn the Board meeting to December 10, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. Mr. Sheffield **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 04/01/2015
Initials: EWJ