

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes August 13, 2019**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, August 13, 2019, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Tim Keller, Chair; Julian Bivins; Daphne Spain, Vice-Chair; Jennie More; Pam Riley; Bruce Dotson; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Members absent: Karen Firehock.

Other officials present were David Benish, Interim Director of Planning; Lori Allshouse; Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission; Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive; and Andy Herrick, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Keller called the regular meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. and established a quorum.

From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda

Mr. Keller invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. Hearing none, he moved on to the first public hearing item.

Consent Agenda

There were no consent agenda items.

Deferred Items

SUB201900085 Montgomery Ridge Subdivision Phase 4 – Special Exceptions

Mr. Keller asked if there was a motion.

Ms. Spain moved to defer SUB201900085 Montgomery Ridge Subdivision Phase 4 – Special Exceptions.

Ms. More seconded the motion.

Mr. Walker asked to clarify if this was a motion to defer the item indefinitely.

Mr. Keller replied this was correct.

The motion was carried by a vote of 6:0 (with Ms. Firehock being absent).

Work Session

Future CIP Process, PC Role

Mr. Benish explained that he would turn the conversation over to others in staff to take over the program. He introduced Lori Allshouse, Director of Office of Management and Budget, and said that she would be providing an overview, background, and status report of the current CIP process that has been used to date and is currently being used in the current CIP review process. Mr. Benish said that after the Commission has their questions answered by Ms. Allshouse, he would turn the presentation over to Mr. Dotson to discuss the second part of the work session regarding the Planning Commission's future role in the CIP.

Ms. Allshouse introduced herself and explain she would be providing information to the Commission, as requested. She said that she would first provide background on the CIP process and why the process is different today than it has been in the past. Ms. Allshouse said that she would introduce the Commission to FY 21-25 CIP development process and provide updates of where the county currently is in the process, as well as what is coming next.

Ms. Allshouse provided background on the previous CIP development process that the county has been using for the past 20 or more years, with some tweaks. She indicated to information on a presentation slide that starts with submittals, then goes through several reviews (including a Technical Review Committee, a Financial Review Committee), and moves on to an update to the Planning Commission and both Boards in November. Ms. Allshouse explained that the process then goes back to the Oversight Committee that has a representative of the Planning Commission on this committee, as well as two representatives from the school Board, the Board of Supervisors, and a citizen. She said that after the Oversight Committee, the process is worked on to form scenarios that include the projects the county is trying to undertake, as well as setting the funding available. Ms. Allshouse said that the process then goes on to the Executive Office and in January or February, the county executive would place the recommended CIP, along with the capital budget and recommended budget, to the Board of Supervisors. She explained that the first time the Board of Supervisors would see how the CIP looks would be February or April. Ms. Allshouse said that the CIP would be approved in April, along with the capital and operating budgets. She said that this is the process the county undertook for many years.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide that showed additional meetings that occurred in the process. She said that the last time the county undertook the full CIP process was when they were putting together the FY 19-23 CIP, noting that CIPs are for a 5-year period. Ms. Allshouse said that at the end of this particular process, there were multiple additional meetings, totaling 11 additional meetings and work sessions, many of them being held jointly with the Board of Supervisors and the School Board and discussing adding projects in as well as referendums.

Ms. Allshouse said that since that time, there has been a full year in which the county looks at each submission that comes in, and that the following year is called an "Amendment Year." She said that an Amendment Year is more of a streamlined process and all the projects coming in during this time are emergencies and urgent projects, with some projects being adjusted on timing and scope as well as the revenues. Ms. Allshouse said that after the last full process, the last time there was a process for FY 20-24 (noting that they are currently in FY 20), it was an Amendment Year process.

Ms. Allshouse presented a chart that showed (in blue and yellow boxes) how the year was amended. She noted that things were done differently as the FY 20-24 Amendment Year process was put together. Ms.

Allshouse said that Mr. Dotson would remember that in the Oversight Committee, there was only one project that came in, which was an urgent project from the school division. She indicated to one of the boxes on the chart and said that they moved forward and started spending a lot of time discussing policy and about streamlining the FY 21-24 process. Ms. Allshouse said that there were many discussions about whether the current CIP process should continue to be used moving forward, especially after the prior year in which there were many additional meetings and discussions about the CIP. She said that this was the transition year, and in January 2019 of this transition year, the Oversight Committee recommended a change in the CIP development process based on information from the previous slide. Ms. Allshouse noted that a TRC had recommended changes, and many parties had begun to think about perhaps doing the CIP in a different way in the county.

Ms. Allshouse said that the Oversight Committee recommended reconceptualizing the planning for the capital and operating budgets and consider doing them together. She said that the committee discussed conducting a shared visioning session to include the Board of Supervisors, School Board, and the remaining members of the Oversight Committee, and that the schools and local government should spend more time talking and sharing their projects and priorities. Ms. Allshouse said that this recommendation from the Oversight Committee came out of their memo that went to the county executive (and was copied to many others) in January 2019.

Ms. Allshouse said that the Board of Supervisors took the memo and, in March 2019, instructed staff to set up the meeting that was suggested by the Oversight Committee. She said that the meeting was set up on May 9, 2019 and included the Board of Supervisors, School Board, and Mr. Dotson (who represented the Oversight Committee). Ms. Allshouse said that at that meeting, they reconceptualized the way the county approaches capital planning, reviewed the current CIP, and identified affordability constraints in the context of growth and needs. She said that this was very different in that they actually discussed financial constraints very early in the process, which was a major change. Ms. Allshouse said that the meeting participants also discussed determining a maximum amount of funding they believe should go in the next 5-year plan in the CIP as well as the "equivalent tax rate," which doesn't necessarily mean there would be a change in tax rate, but that the county would take the dollar amount and say that if they cannot actually pull it off in the revenues they are estimating that will come in over the next five years, there may be a tax rate associated with it. She said that there was also an initial brainstorm done on funding options, tools, and alternatives which included discussion on how they do business from being more transactional to more transformative in terms of the way they think about the CIP together.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide that outlined the new CIP process being undertaken in the current year, based on the background. She indicated to a timeline on a chart that runs from May 2019 to April 2020. Ms. Allshouse said that it begins with the May work session she had just explained, and that the process then moves to the June-August timeframe with the plan of having the general government staff presenting recommendations to the Board of Supervisors of some projects they would recommend being funded. She said that the Board would then hold a work session to finalize the general government priorities, noting that this is different in that the Board of Supervisors would be involved very early in the process. Ms. Allshouse said that the School Division has a Long-Range Planning Committee that does a great deal of work ahead of time and actually presents their findings to the School Board, noting that this is not a change for the School Board and that they will continue with their same process. She said that the School Board would then hold work sessions to finalize the School Division's priorities. Ms. Allshouse said that in September, the two Boards would again come together and share their priorities, noting that this is based on the Oversight Committee's recommendations that both Boards should share and talk through their priorities together in one meeting. She continued that this is tentatively planned for September 11

and the date is still being finalized, and that the meeting would review the total priorities for the county rather than being done in two different meetings.

Ms. Allshouse said that in October, the plan is for the CIP Oversight Committee to be renamed to the CIP Advisory Committee. She said that there is no anticipated change in the makeup of the committee, and that she hoped a Planning Commission member is selected to join the committee. Ms. Allshouse said that the Advisory Committee will take the affordability level that the schools, local government, and Oversight Committee set a couple months ago and run scenarios, hearing what the priorities are coming from schools and local government and investigating how they can put potential models together for consideration.

Ms. Allshouse said that November is always when long-range planning for the county is done on the operations side, looking out five years at operations in terms of salaries, health care, growth and enrollment. She said that long-range planning is done looking at the revenues that are coming in, and that it makes sense to combine the capital program with this, as the capital CIP is a five-year plan. Ms. Allshouse said that the plan is to put these long-range plans together and discuss them all at once so that the CIP is not done outside of this, noting this would involve the Board of Supervisors and School Board coming back together in November. She explained the two Boards have been doing this for many years to share the two operating plans, but that the new process would put the five-year CIP in context.

Ms. Allshouse said that in December, the finalization of the five-year CIP would take place, and that the budget would be adopted in April. She explained that when the budget is adopted, it is the first year of the CIP, which they call the FY 21 Capital Budget.

Ms. Allshouse said that the new plan is different and will likely be tweaked, with there already being some information about a couple changes to be made. She said that the biggest change is that the two Boards are working together much earlier in the process to share priorities and consider affordability out the door, rather than at the very end. Ms. Allshouse said that this makes for a stronger financial conversation at the beginning of the process. She asked if there were any questions, and hearing none, she continued her presentation.

Ms. Allshouse said that she would share information on what has been done to date. She said that in May, which Mr. Dotson had attended, the affordability cap was discussed. Ms. Allshouse said that the CIP is already about \$208 million, and that the cap would not be taking anything away from it but rather, it would allow them to consider what they could add while still staying within the debt ratios and being in an area where the county feels they would be comfortable with when considering equivalent tax rates. She said that they looked at a 7-year period as a starting period because in the out years of the current CIP, there is a very large courts project. Ms. Allshouse said that the General District and Circuit Court Project is estimated to cost about \$41 million and explained that if this was spent within the 5-year plan, often debt payments come in later. She said that this is borrowing money and then having to pay on the borrowed money, and that where much of the debt will be coming to the county and coming due to begin paying on is in the out years. Ms. Allshouse said that they therefore did not think it was right to look at a 5-year period, and instead looked at a 7-year period, noting there is a very large expenditure in the end years of the CIP. She said that modeling was done for the 7-year period and was based on many assumptions. Ms. Allshouse said that based on those assumptions, the School Board, Oversight Committee member, and Board of Supervisors agreed that they should not add more than \$61 million in capital projects over the next 7-year period. She said that together, they came up with a starting point out the front door of what they believe they can do staying within capacity and affordability level they feel

comfortable with. Ms. Allshouse noted that the estimate will change, but based on current revenue projections and other information of the timing of projects, it would possibly be a tax rate equivalent up to 4.5 to 6 cents over the current tax rate that would be dedicated to the capital program to cover this. She noted again that this is an estimate.

Ms. Allshouse said that in the May work session, the participants also discussed other alternatives in terms of if the CIP is constricted with affordability, what else can be done to help move the capital program forward, as there are many needs. She said that the alternative of, "Encourage the use of public-private partnerships and economic development" was ranked as number one.

Ms. Allshouse said that "Utilizing a referendum" was also ranked high, which she noted doesn't bring in more money, but that it is a tool to be used to sometimes get a lower interest rate and that the community would vote on it. She said that this idea was tied with, "Consider leasing instead of building new facilities," noting that as soon as new facilities are built, they must be maintained, and maintenance costs are also built into the CIP as well as other associated costs.

Ms. Allshouse said that the third highest-ranked idea was, "Consider reducing operating budgets to fund the capital budget," explaining that by looking at the budgets together, there could be consideration as to how to divide funding across the Board.

Ms. Allshouse said that the fourth highest-ranking alternative was, "Review current prioritization of maintenance and replacement projects." She explained that in the past, especially through the recession, the county decided to maintain and replace what it currently has and take care of its current infrastructure before building more. She said that they made a solid commitment to this, as the county has many facilities that cost a good deal of money. Ms. Allshouse said that she believed it was still very important to consider this first, and that the Oversight Committee agreed that this currently prioritization should at least be reviewed as to if it is automatic or something that is considered differently.

Ms. Allshouse said that the fifth highest-ranking alternative was, "Consider investing more in solar and renewable energies" to save on operating costs and costs down the line.

Ms. Allshouse said that moving forward into July and August, there has been more activity occurring based on the process. She said that the School Division's Long-Range Planning Advisory Committee has prioritized a list of \$181 million in School Division's projects, and noted she had a copy with her that is also available on the internet. Ms. Allshouse said that at the same time, the Board of Supervisors prioritized \$120 million in general government projects that were presented to them to consider. She said that the School Board will finalize their CIP priorities on August 22, and that they have already had one or two work sessions. Ms. Allshouse said that the county had its work session in July, in keeping with the process and current efforts going on.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide that addressed what would be coming next in the process. She said that there will be a joint work session with the Board of Supervisors and the School Board in September, with a tentative date of September 11, during which they will share their priorities together and hold discussions to provide greater guidance to the new advisory team that she hopes will be coming together earlier this year in October, rather than in November. Ms. Allshouse said that she hopes enough guidance will be provided to the Advisory Committee from the September work session on how to move forward. She indicated on the slide to a limitation on funding and noted that the needs are high, making this a hard process with difficult decisions to be made. Ms. Allshouse again expressed her hope that

recommendations will be provided to the Advisory Committee that will go back to the joint work session taking place in November.

Ms. Allshouse thanked the Commission for its attention and offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Keller asked if there were questions.

Mr. Bivins asked if Ms. Allshouse could explain what happens regarding operations and maintenance in the capital fund once a project is endorsed, actualized, or passed. He asked if the CIP has to be revisited each year, or if those funds run into the operating budget.

Ms. Allshouse said that when a request comes in, staff identifies the associated operating costs. She said that a school building, for example, would have additional electric costs and possibly additional staff, and that these costs would be identified. Ms. Allshouse said that sometimes when the request has a significant cost, such as Center 2 for the schools, additional revenues will be identified and addressed, and it will then move over to the operating budget. She said that if it requires an additional tax rate increase, it will be identified. Ms. Allshouse said that as for the maintenance of the building itself, it will be wrapped into the county's maintenance programs, and noted there is a General Government Maintenance Program, a School Facility Maintenance Program, and Parks and Recreation. She said that once something is actually built, the actual maintenance costs that are capital related stay in the capital budget (e.g., a new roof). Ms. Allshouse noted that the maintenance part of the capital project grows, as well as the operating costs.

Ms. Riley told Ms. Allshouse she did a great job explaining to the Commission not only the proposed CIP process, but the primary reasons for revising the process. She said that she would like to have those reasons recapped, and noted having the Board of Supervisors and School Board brought together earlier on in the process as well as an affordability cap. Ms. Riley asked for clarification in Ms. Allshouse perhaps alluding to a reduction in the number of meetings due to a more streamlined process, and if this was one of the primary reasons for the new process.

Ms. Allshouse expressed her belief that there are multiple reasons to change the process and recalled that Ms. Riley had mentioned streamlining it. She recalled the slide she presented that highlighted the meetings including the Technical Review Committee, Oversight Committee, Financial Review Committee, and all the work happening for multiple projects that were submitted very early. Ms. Allshouse said that they did intense study of each project in great detail much ahead of time in the program, and said that she hoped there will be a reduction in meetings, noting that the real details of the projects should not occur until they are prioritized more. She said that she believes there will be much staff time saved in not having to do a lot of analysis on multiple projects until they know which ones they will be taking on during the next five years. Ms. Allshouse said that she believes this could streamline staff work, and that it has been at times frustrating for staff to do a lot of work on project details and then later find out that there isn't funding to do the project. She said that when staff turned in the requests this year, it was more like a short form and was similar to grant programs in which a small application is done, and then if selected to move forward, more details are asked for. Ms. Allshouse said that they are trying to streamline the process, but they will likely still ask for many details this year, as they are still learning which ones will actually move forward at the end. She again expressed hope that there would be a reduction in meetings, recalling that there were so many meetings in the last full CIP process, with 11 additional meetings.

Mr. Keller said that he had a question about where the CNA and CIP intersect in terms of the "shopping list" that gets built each time. He said that the things that come up in any given year that do not have the

opportunities to expend funds for and get pushed to the next year are often high priorities. Mr. Keller said that yet, things in all categories have been pushed (not only in Planning) often in the future in the CNA. He said that having looked at this now for five years, it seems as if there are items that are important in the long term but that always get eclipsed by the heat of the moment. Mr. Keller asked if Ms. Allshouse could see this process being able to affect this challenge.

Ms. Allshouse noted that this was a great question, and that Mr. Benish may need to help her answer it. She said that the process homes in on a five-year program and in the past, there was a CNA that was also talked about in the full-blown year when all the requests come in.

Mr. Benish said that the prior processes had the sixth year (6-10), which served as a placeholder for longer-term projects and provided for some ability for the applicant to identify to the Board of Supervisors and budget office that the project was a long-term or mid-term (10-year) need. He said that in recent years, they have focused on the first five years of the plan, but that the CNA has always been important for staff to plan out and to reflect what is in the master plans. Mr. Benish said that when master plans are developed, that short-, mid-, and long-term implementation measures are developed for those plans. He said that staff relies on these to make its CIP and uses them as a way to project those needs out to the Board of Supervisors and to OMB.

Ms. Allshouse acknowledged there may have not been as much attention paid to it, and that some projects did slip to the out years, from the budget's perspective. She said that if the projects couldn't get into the five-year period, they would be classified as CNA.

Mr. Keller asked if the new process would have any kind of positive effect on those types of items.

Ms. Allshouse reiterated that she is focused on the five-year and first year with this process, and that moving forward, they will have to consider long-term planning.

Mr. Benish told Mr. Keller that this was something he could engage in with his comments throughout the process. He said that there is a role for the Planning Commission and that perhaps identifying longer-term needs could be a part of that role.

Mr. Bivins said that one of the things the Commission has been hearing recently is that it would be helpful if the county could increase its investment in matching funds for VDOT in order for the county to put aside some funds for roads. He asked if the CIP process could be the place that the Commission might put forward its recommendations and (realizing that it may be a small amount) if there could be a designated amount of money the county could hold onto to later determine when it is ready to put in matching funds for roads.

Mr. Benish said that this is what the program has been. He said that his department will typically make a request for funding for transportation called a "Transportation Leveraging Fund." He said that the idea is that the money is used for various state programs, and that a revenue-sharing program from the state draws a 50% match. Mr. Benish said that the Smart Scale program is theoretically 100% funded by the state, adding that it is a competitive process and that in many cases, in order to be a competitive application, there are times when advanced planning and design work needs to be done, as well as right-of-way acquisitions. He said that this is where money for proffers, or money set aside for more advanced planning work, could make it a more competitive grant. Mr. Benish said that this is what their CIP request

really is, explaining that the Board of Supervisors creates a priority list of improvements, and that staff then tries to work from those while leveraging opportunities to spread the money as far as it can go.

Ms. Allshouse added that at the July work session, the Transportation Leveraging Fund was a number one priority by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Keller asked if Mr. Dotson was ready to present.

Mr. Dotson said that he first had a question. He said that the most recently completed master plan was Pantops, which included a chapter on things needed to implement that plan. Mr. Dotson said that work will soon begin on the Crozet master plan, and there is a request still in the early phases for the Rio-29 master plan to be reviewed by the CAC. He asked where those newly identified projects would enter into the flow chart Ms. Allshouse had presented.

Ms. Allshouse asked if Mr. Dotson was referring to the money that would be used to do the planning.

Mr. Dotson replied no, that he was referring to the money that would be used to implement the infrastructure and CIP items.

Ms. Allshouse replied this would be a CIP request.

Mr. Benish agreed this would be a CIP request, and it was a request that was made this year, which was submitted as "Master Plan Implementation." He explained there were about 12 projects in this submittal for the four master plans, which included all the catalyst projects for Rio-29 and the projects for Pantops. Mr. Benish said that the corridor study for Rio Road was also requested, which had been a request by the Planning Commission coming out of the discussion of the Rio 999 rezoning. He said that there was time to include this, and the general corridor analysis was generally reflected in the Places29 master plan. Mr. Benish explained that these types of requests for implementing projects are still CIP requests. He said that the answer to the study monies would be nailed down.

Ms. Riley asked if it was correct that the recommendation comes from staff in this case.

Mr. Benish clarified that for staff's initial submittal to the budget office through the CIP, staff bases it primarily on the master plans that have been drafted by the Planning Commission and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. He noted that while other projects come up from time to time, one of the main sources of guidance staff has for implementing the master plans is through those implementation sections, and that this is what they usually base their CIP requests on.

Mr. Dotson said that he believed that much of the interest of the Planning Commission may lie in the first two boxes on the flow chart presented. He said that it seemed that much of what had been considered are the interactions of the School Board and Board of Supervisors. Mr. Dotson said that his own interest is in how things get before the Board of Supervisors and the School Board, and how these things correlate with small area plans, master plans, and the comprehensive plan. He said that in some sense, the Commission's immediate interest may be in fleshing out the "General Government" and (to a lesser degree) "School Division" sections of the flow chart.

Ms. Allshouse said that she had forgotten to animate sections of the flow chart and wanted to present them. She said that one thing the joint work session discussed was coming back before the Planning

Commission after the September work session to share where they are in the process again. Ms. Allshouse apologized for not mentioning before that this year, the county is working closely with City Council, as the Board of Supervisors and City Council often work on projects that are close to the city-county boundaries (e.g. roads, bike lanes, pathways). She said that there was a joint meeting between the Board and City Council that was held in May, and that another one is planned for September 9. Ms. Allshouse said that these are informative moments of the process and apologized again for not animating those points on the slide. She said that she would like to come back to the Planning Commission again in September if there is time on their agenda.

Mr. Keller let Ms. Allshouse know that she would be invited back.

Mr. Keller said that he had one more question before Mr. Dotson presents. He said that he was curious about how a bond issue funding and proffer funding would fit with the CIP. Mr. Keller said that there had been an interesting side-bar comment from one of the developers when they were considering a project for Rivanna Village. He said that in the comprehensive plan, it suggested that development possibly shouldn't occur until transportation or other improvements were made.

Mr. Keller said that the developer asked if this could be put in all of the planning and have it be a roadblock to development, then ideally (through bond issues) do the infrastructure improvement and take it all the way through schools, then ask for proffers back from developers in those areas to pay back those impacts that have been borrowed money through bond issues. He said that while he doesn't know if this is possible, if supervisors and senior staff were interested in the idea, he wondered how those decisions would intersect with the decisions on the amount of money for the CIP.

Ms. Allshouse noted that this was a creative question. She said that if she understands it correctly, Mr. Keller is saying the county would borrow the money and state the proffers to pay back the bond (which are often 20 years). Ms. Allshouse said that this would mean the proffer is paying the bond back. She said that she was not sure legally what could be done, but that this was a creative question.

Mr. Walker said that though it is creative, it would need to be handled cautiously because even though the 2019 proffer legislation liberalizes and allows developers to come to voluntary agreements, if the developers choose not to, the county would still be limited on residential redevelopments to transportation, schools, public safety, and parks.

Mr. Benish said that in a rezoning situation, there is always consideration as to what the impacts of the development are. He said that the first thing is to plan based on whether the capacities for the infrastructure are present, and then (in collaboration with the community) the county decides the highest priority items that are needed in terms of capital improvements to address the deficiencies in the infrastructure. Mr. Benish said that if that timing is not correct for the proposed development, it sets up the possibility for the development to advance and address the impacts of development. He said that from staff's perspective, they will be looking at development proposals as to whether the infrastructure is there and making the decision. Mr. Benish said that for Rivanna Village, based on the importance of the area and its conditions, the comp plan set a much clearer expectation that they leave more to an ongoing judgment in the comp plan. He said that this has been discussed before and that to some extent, the priority areas identified in the master plans do state their desires for development and that the capital investment should be focused into those areas to support this development. Mr. Benish said that the priority areas are telling the county to put money in the priority area and allow development to take place there, as that is what is desired and where the infrastructure is located. He said that when it comes to

requesting the CIP, proffers are always looked at as a way to help augment and address the needs, but it is incumbent on staff to identify the projects and get them in the CIP first.

Ms. Allshouse said that Mr. Walker had reminded her that they still have debt limits they have to be mindful of. She said that the county currently has about \$191 million in existing debt, and part of what the Oversight Committee looked at in terms of the affordability cap is that they are pushing closer to their actual debt limit as well. Ms. Allshouse said that if this counted against it, even though the source might be coming back from a developer to help pay it back, the county will still be taking the debt on.

Mr. Benish said that the performance agreements are one of the things have been used to address this. He explained that when the community doesn't have enough money to do a project that would allow for an approval, a developer can enter into an agreement to assist the county in moving a project forward.

Mr. Keller said that perhaps he shouldn't have brought up the other piece and wished to revisit the CIP process. He noted that Ms. Allshouse had presented on the CIP and the general operating budget, and that these two pieces were used in setting the limit. Mr. Keller said that he wondered if there was a third piece of bond issues and decisions that are made on this. He said that this was obviously considered in terms of the courts and schools. Mr. Keller said that it seemed there needs to be a preamble piece each year where the committee decides on the bond issue. He said that the Commission is consistently hearing from the public that they would like amenity-type infrastructure issues to be addressed as part of the development projects, and that these are the types of things they are often seeing bits and pieces of in the CIP.

Mr. Keller expressed that it would be helpful to have a philosophy of why some improvements can't be done through the bond process. He cited the example of major park system improvements not being able to go through the bond process and having to be done through a series of smaller projects (with some being put off for many years) that would result in informal recreation areas because they can't be developed. Mr. Keller said that he used this example because it was a potential bond issue and something that people were excited about. He said that consideration should be made as to whether it is realistic for a project to be actuated in five or ten years in terms of the CIP, what the budget can be, and how high it can be with the debt limit and tax increases.

Ms. Allshouse said that she didn't know if Mr. Keller was referring to the bond referendum they had discussed. She said that the additional 11 meetings she had mentioned in her presentation included discussions on a bond referendum, but that the projects were still put in the CIP and that they would not be done through a bond referendum. Ms. Allshouse said that in discussing the high school Center 2, they discussed additional school improvements, as well as bike-ped and parks and recreation projects, which were also included in the CIP. She said that there was about \$57 million added in without a bond referendum, noting that there is still a revenue bond with a large portion financed. Ms. Allshouse said that there were multiple reasons why the bond referendum was not done, but that the projects stayed in the CIP.

Mr. Keller said that in terms of the flow chart, he had been referring to what would happen in the process.

Ms. Allshouse said that she believed what could happen this time in the process, as the projects begin to be prioritized September through November, they will hear whether or not a bond referendum makes sense, or if another type of financing would work. She said that the dollar amount of the cap still applies, whether a bond referendum or another type of borrowing is used. Ms. Allshouse said that there has been

conversation in the Budget office about “pay as you go” or “pay-go.” She said that in the past, prior to her working for the county, many of the CIP projects were all paid for in cash, noting that this is difficult but that some jurisdictions do more “pay-go” than Albemarle does. Ms. Allshouse said that this is being considered because as the county comes closer to its debt capacity limit, the other alternative is cash. She said that it is sometimes more appropriate to stretch out a payment over 20-30 years with payback, and this is something to consider as well.

Mr. Keller said that the final piece of this is the proffers that have been out there for a long time and almost get forgotten by the public. He cited the example of a school ground that was proffered and took 20 years for development and the population in the area to come to a point, and then it moves into the system. Mr. Keller said that when putting together the flow chart for the CIP, there almost needs to be an additional piece for the public that shows where all the pieces are coming in each year. He said that there used to be a place on the county website that explained it well, and it may still exist, but that he was wondering if there was something more specific to the CIP of the year to share in regard to other income streams.

Ms. Allshouse said that this was a good point, and it is part of the process when getting ready to do the capital budget to look at all funding, as well as the Community Development department to review the CIP to identify any proffer that is appropriate that could be applied to the CIP. She acknowledged it is not as transparent as to when the timing of the process is, and that this could definitely be an improvement.

Ms. More recalled Mr. Benish discussing projects in the master plans, and asked if Community Development pushes those forward, adding that she was thinking specifically about transportation.

Mr. Benish said that transportation is the project type that staff deals with most, including sidewalks. He said that other agencies, such as Parks and Recreation, that will implement a number of the recommendations and will make requests consistent with the master plans. Mr. Benish said that staff coordinates with them on an ongoing basis, and as a CIP is submitted, they double-check with each other to ensure the lead on the project and if it’s reflected in their department. He said that other departments may make a request, but that his department primarily makes the ones for transportation.

Ms. More asked when in the flow chart those projects would be pushed forward.

Mr. Benish said that the General Government portion of the flow chart is the influx of the requests coming from the various departments and agencies.

Ms. More asked if this would be a part of the flow where they would pull from the master plan recommendations.

Mr. Benish replied yes, explaining that those agencies that have functional areas they are charged with implementing (such as Parks and Recreation and Planning) will be reviewing the master plan documents to determine what they are supposed to be implementing. He said that if it is a capital project (i.e. more than \$20,000 and a longer life than 5 years), they will be requested by those agencies.

Ms. More said that she agreed with Mr. Dotson’s earlier comment that some of the Commission’s interests may lie in this piece. She said that, echoing Mr. Keller’s comments, that a reverse scenario has happened in which the Commission has promoted, encouraged, allowed, and rezoned where they want development to be.

Ms. More cited Crozet as an example, explaining that the eastern part of Crozet has had intense development, and there is a major problem with a connection that will not be achieved unless the county pays for a bridge. She said that she wasn't sure if there was proffer money that has gone into the bridge, but that in this area, the development was encouraged and allowed predicated on an important connection highly desired by the community that would allow them access to Route 250. Ms. More said that there is a stub in the neighborhood where the connection would come through, and there is a sign there saying it is a future site, adding that it is from the plan that was made in 2009 that was adopted in 2010. She said that proffers have been accepted, and the neighborhoods have developed in a way in which every neighborhood developed further creates the neighborhood-to-neighborhood connection. Ms. More continued that developers have proffered extensions beyond which they may have had to do to create small connections. She said that one will finally come through Western Ridge to connect from the foothills, explaining that currently, there is a large amount of housing that only has one way out.

Ms. More said that there is still a piece (the bridge) that is the county's that they still have not delivered, but they have taken on a huge amount of development. She said that she sees the Planning Commission's role as helping to advocate for those projects but to make sure they are clear with the community about expectations. Ms. More said that when the connection project was planned in 2009, Crozet didn't believe it would be built in 1-2 years, but she thinks they expected to see it done by now.

Mr. Benish said that the bridge is one of the top five projects that the Board of Supervisors has prioritized under their transportation priority list, and that there was just one application that didn't get awarded. He said that they would try to do revenue sharing requests for it, which has a greater chance of being funded, but they have to have enough money to do 50% of the project. Mr. Benish said that the bridge project is a \$12-15 million project, and they have to have sufficient money to do that, but it has been prioritized and they are actively working for it. He agreed that the Commission's role is helping to advocate those projects in the plan.

Ms. More said that it seems to be a more positive way to work, rather than putting the Commission in a position to say that development cannot take place in areas that they are encouraging to be developed. She said that what has happened in this case is a more positive way to promote the projects to say that while they want them to happen, they have to keep pieces that pull the puzzle together in play. Ms. More expressed that this is a constant struggle and that there may even be similar cases than the example she gave that are more pressing. She said that she would like to keep the Commission in the position in which they are not forced to say that no further development can happen until something else happens first. Ms. More said that in the Crozet example, part of what has helped get them to the connection was allowing development, and if there had been none allowed there, they wouldn't have any roads there (acknowledging that, on a different subject, the schools wouldn't be over capacity).

Ms. Spain said that another specific example was the situation with Rivanna Village. She asked if this was prioritized in the CIP in the same way that the Crozet project is.

Mr. Benish replied that he believed that most of the projects that were requested in the CIP of the present year were non-road projects, such as the study for the crossing of Route 250-East, as well as some other sidewalk, trail, and park connections. He said that about 7-8 catalyst projects were prioritized in the master plan implementation for funding, including various first steps for the projects (depending on the projects). Mr. Benish said that the road projects primarily fall under the Transportation Leveraging funding. He said that when the Board of Supervisors looked at the initial priority setting, they had two

different priorities for them, so they are not at the same priority, noting that one was the highest priority (Transportation), and that the other (Master Plan Implementation) was priority 6 out of 12.

Ms. Spain expressed her confusion and asked if the bulk of the funding comes from VDOT or from grant applications, acknowledging that some of it is funding by the county.

Mr. Benish said that the bulk of road projects have to come from VDOT because of the cost.

Ms. Spain said that the Commission had explained this to the Rivanna Village residents, and that Mr. McDermott had discussed Smart Scale. She asked if (unless it is on the county CIP as a top priority) there is no guarantee that it can happen.

Mr. Benish replied that transportation projects are different because they can be funded fully by the state through the Smart Scale program, for which the county or the TJPDC needs to make an application. He said that TJPDC is actually making one of these requests for the Pantops area. Mr. Benish continued that under the Smart Scale program, those projects can be funded 100% by the state. He noted it is a competitive program, and that a total of seven criteria need to be met.

Mr. Benish said that depending on how strong the request is, full funding may be granted, but that some of the criteria may call for the county to provide more funding in order to make the project more competitive. He said that if design work is done in advance, this can help with the scoring. Mr. Benish said that in some cases, even the projects that are funded by the state need some infusion of money by the county to make them competitive enough to be rewarded.

Ms. Spain said that she understood enough about Smart Scale, but that she wondered if the Commission would ever be in a position to be able to say to citizens that they will have the improvements, as the county would fund the design portion and make it its intention. She acknowledged that VDOT funding couldn't be promised and asked if there is still a way to tell residents that the improvements are in the county's immediate plans.

Mr. Benish replied that the catalysts projects are in a request, and if they are funded by the Board of Supervisors to make the improvements and design work necessary to implement them, they can. He said that it is up to the Board's decision to actually fund the requests.

Ms. Spain remarked that the Commission should make sure the CACs know how this works. She said that there is a work session done each year, which is important, but at places such as Pantops and 29 North, they don't discuss the CIP so much. Ms. Spain said that if the citizens recognized that the CIP is where the action is, and one of their roles is to advocate for particular inclusion in the CIP, this can be translated in the position of the commissioners in the process.

Ms. More agreed with Ms. Spain's remarks, and added that part of this is the timing piece so that the CACs understand the CIP and are discussing it far ahead of when it needs to be pushed forward.

Mr. Keller recalled that the Commission had asked planning staff for priorities several weeks ago, and the time frame was such that they couldn't come to the Commission. He asked that in the new process, if the hope was that the priorities would be able to come in timely fashion not just to Planning, but all areas.

Ms. Allshouse acknowledged that it was a short notice this time in the process.

Ms. Riley said that an issue was raised at the last meeting that the Commission felt they may need to hold a work session on, and that was the role of the public-private partnerships. She recalled that one of the slides in the presentation listed a number of potentially new revenue sources, and that public-private partnerships had topped the list. Ms. Riley said that from P3 potential, with the relocation of the court, and with two performance agreements that were recently approved by the Board of Supervisors for both Southwood and Crozet, this is a related question regarding the role of the Planning Commission because in these cases, in theory, those performance agreements are being developed in conjunction with a set of priorities that the Board of Supervisors has established. She said that the role of the private sector in the process is a new element and makes her wonder if there are some potential pitfalls in terms of looking at the long-range planning needs.

Ms. Riley said that in Southwood's case, despite the Long-Range Planning Advisory Committee's recommendations, Cale Elementary and the middle schools were the outliers in the process where it was recognized that they couldn't find satisfactory conclusions for the fact that Cale Elementary is over capacity currently. She said that in the case of a performance agreement, through which private investment is being incentivized in the area, there isn't a hard look on the impacts on the schools and traffic, and there is no role for the Planning Commission to do this. Ms. Riley expressed that this was troubling to her, and that she didn't have a specific request as far as how to change the development process flow chart. She said that one of the biggest concerns for the area is that there won't be enough elementary school seats, that they don't have the necessary seats now, and seemingly are not allowed to consider it in a rezoning process.

Ms. Riley asked if, in the discussion of the development process, it means the Commission should be able to put input into the first two parts of the flow chart. She said that she had specifically asked for the School Board representative to meet with her about four months ago, as she didn't understand how the need for Cale Elementary hadn't risen to a higher level in terms of projects that have been recently permitted. Ms. Riley said that now that there is a major rezoning, it's almost as if the Commission isn't allowed to talk about it, and it seems that it doesn't rise to high enough impact.

Ms. Riley said that transportation is the other area in which every application that comes through requires the Planning Commission to explain to citizens that despite the range of failing roads (from F to D), they are still approving the development. She recommended that with the new private-public partnership, there needs to be more open discussion about the implications on the role of the Planning Commission in helping to establish priorities (even on a case-by-case basis).

Ms. More added that the projects are all different, and that for Crozet, while she did not participate in meetings that were about the public-private partnership for the Barnes Lumber rezoning (though she had offered to, but felt there were "too many cooks in the kitchen"), the nature of the project was different as it was more about commercial development. She said that there are a very small number of units in the first phase, that residential was not the focus there, and they may not even achieve the 52 maximum residential units. Ms. More said that this project was promoting furthering a goal in the Crozet master plan that is like no other than they have been able to achieve since Crozet was designated as a growth area. She said that Crozet has put in an abundance of houses and that consultants have stressed the importance of keeping Downtown Crozet alive.

Mr. Keller said that he didn't believe that this was about going back and discussing the projects so much as the future CIP process and what role the EDA plays versus the Planning Commission, versus the Board

of Supervisors.

Ms. More said that her point was that she believes they need to discuss this in the future, but as a commissioner for the Crozet area, she felt very welcome to participate in the project and but chose to receive reports on the process, given all the participants in the process and feeling as if they had it under control. She noted that this doesn't speak to the Planning Commission as a body – that they are informed – but that for her piece, she was given opportunities to be at the table as the project moved along. Ms. More acknowledged that this may not be the bigger question for moving forward, and that she could see Mr. Keller's point.

Mr. Keller asked if the group was ready for Mr. Dotson to present.

Mr. Benish pointed out that Wayne Cilinberg has been working with Mr. Dotson and has a long history of CIP processes in Albemarle County. He noted that if there are questions for staff, he may ask Mr. Cilinberg to answer some questions.

Mr. Keller told staff that the Commission appreciated their work on the CIP process and that they would come back again in September.

Mr. Dotson asked if the slides showing the original CIP development process was still available to present on the screen. He said that last May, the Board of Supervisors and Board of Education met (which was then known as the Oversight Committee) along with two members (Mr. Dotson and Cal Morris, noting that Mr. Morris was unable to attend). Mr. Dotson said that when the new process diagram was put up, he had asked what the Planning Commission's role would be in the process, and that there seemed to be confusion as to what the role of the Planning Commission actually was. He said that one particular member of the Board of Supervisors indicated that instead of the committee discussing it, they should ask the Planning Commission itself, which was the reason for the present discussion.

Mr. Dotson said that the process diagram was useful in the following sense in that it shows the overall flow from the genesis of projects and submittals to whatever the new process is for staff review, which he remarked had not yet been defined on the other chart. He indicated to the right side of the chart where the Planning Commission's role was noted, which he said that suggests that the Commission is provided information by the Executive Office and staff. Mr. Dotson indicated to arrows, explaining that the Commission then sends something down to the Oversight Committee. He said that after the Oversight Committee discusses the submittal, they issue a report, and the Commission is informed of that (noting that there were no arrows on the diagram leading out of this process point). Mr. Dotson said that the process goes on to the Board of Supervisors, etc.

Mr. Dotson asked the Commission to keep this in mind as an overall flow. He said that this may not be the best plan, and the best plan may conceivably be to have very limited Planning Commission role, or an earlier Planning Commission role. Mr. Dotson said that as a preface that he was not trying to prove any particular point, and that he was truly asking an honest question of what the Commission's role should be. He expressed his desire for the Planning Commission to add value, rather than simply working for the staff or potentially delaying. Mr. Dotson said that he would like the Commission to find a role for itself, with the concurrence of the staff and Board, in which it could contribute definite value.

Mr. Dotson said that he didn't believe that, given where things stand for this year, that the focus should be on the present year, and that they should be looking beyond it. He suggested that the Commission be

focused on the comprehensive plan, master plans, and small area plans, as well as the applications they receive. Mr. Dotson said that having sat on the Oversight Committee, one of the requests was for a police department robot to deal with potential bomb situations. He said that this is not the Planning Commission's turf, but the comp plan, master plans, small area plans, and applications are.

Mr. Dotson said that while he was not saying that any of his ideas were good, and that they may be crossed off or added to, he put together some ideas that proceed chronologically. He said that initially, project proposals are generated, and Option 1 (referring to Attachment D) says that the Planning Commission could potentially nominate projects. Mr. Dotson said that they wouldn't know enough to estimate costs or some of the technical details and that staff would have to help determine those, but if there was a project that the Commission wanted to nominate, this could be a role. He said that, on the other hand, they could decide that this is stepping outside of the Commission's confidence area.

Mr. Dotson said that Option 2 entails the Planning Commission reviewing and commenting on staff-nominated projects. He said that staff would prepare the project proposals for the Commission's review, and the Commission's commentary would become part of the submittal. Mr. Dotson said that the phrase, "The Planning Commission said that..." would be one of the headings.

Mr. Dotson said that Option 3 would involve, rather than the Planning Commission being involved in projects, the Commission taking a longer view and at some interval (two years or longer), the Commission would perform an audit to determine how it is doing with keeping up with CIP needs and the pace of development. He said that with this option, a report would be issued for the School Board, Board of Supervisors, and staff.

Mr. Dotson said that Option 4 involves the Planning Commission simply staying informed. He said that after the Board takes its final action, Ms. Allshouse or someone from staff would inform the Commission of the action so that in reviewing applications, the Commission can be realistic in terms of the Board stating what will or won't happen in the coming years.

Mr. Dotson said that Option 5 would involve sharpening the master plans. He said that the Pantops master plan perhaps does the best job of this and was the most recent in having its critical projects and secondary projects identified so that any citizen reading it could understand it. Mr. Dotson said that as the Crozet and Rio-29 master plans are developed the Planning Commission would take a hard look at the implementation chapters in the plans.

Mr. Dotson said that Option 6 involves continuing to select a Commission member to participate in the Oversight Committee (which will be called the Advisory Committee). He cautioned that this is only one member and that the committee meets sometimes once, sometimes two or three times. Mr. Dotson said that due to this, it was not a potent role.

Mr. Dotson said that another option was to use none of the above options. He recalled the phrase used earlier of "too many cooks in the kitchen," and remarked that in the CIP process, there are already lots of "cooks." Mr. Dotson said that the participants are well-informed (more so than the Planning Commission is) on budgeting, and perhaps the Commission doesn't take on any of the options as roles.

Mr. Dotson explained that this was a conversation starter, and that the aspiration immediately was to be able to provide Mr. Benish and staff a sense of what the Planning Commission thinks about its role, in broad-brush terms. He said that there are many details that may need to be considered, depending on

the role, and that there could perhaps be a second follow-up session to revisit the discussion once staff has had a chance to consider the details. Mr. Dotson added that if the Commission arrives to a point at which it could engage with the Board of Supervisors on the topic during its next joint session with them in the fall, after it comes up with something meaningful to present to them. He turned the meeting over to Mr. Keller to lead the Commission through a discussion.

Ms. Spain said that she was surprised that Mr. Dotson didn't include an Option 8, which would be "All of the Above," because the Commission is already doing some of those tasks. She acknowledged that some of the tasks, such as nominating the projects, were not currently being done by the Commission, and that given the present year, those projects would have transportation as a high priority. Ms. Spain said that they are already being informed through the existing model, they work with master plans, and they have representation on the CIP Advisory Committee. She said that a work session with staff could cover Option 2 regarding staff-nominated projects. Ms. Spain said that the audit memo seems to be the most time-consuming, perhaps also most important, role other than being able to nominate projects. She thanked Mr. Dotson for the options, and again remarked there should be an eighth option.

Mr. Carrazana acknowledged that he was not as intimately involved with the process as the commissioners are, and that in many ways, he holds an outsider perspective. He said that he was struck by what seemed to be a lack of intimate knowledge with the CIP and the priorities by the Commission. Mr. Carrazana said that he found this to be odd. He said that if this is the case, if there is a need to get more direction from the commissioners (as they are the advocates in many ways for the master plans, small area plans, and comprehensive plan), that Option 5 strikes him as being key. He said that the logic for the priorities are the master plans which serve as the vision and goals. Mr. Carrazana said that it was once said that "vision without implementation is delusion." He said that if master plans are being developed, the logical next step is to develop an implementation plan. Mr. Carrazana said that there must be strategic initiatives that come from the visions and goals, and there must be initial investments, which are the high-priority or critical projects. He said that the county does not always have this, and out of all the master plans, only a few (such as the Pantops master plan) have been so well done to have a vision, clarity, and a logic as to the critical investments that needed to be made.

Mr. Carrazana said that this leads to the question of how to fund the projects, and that though there are many questions as to how to fund, the question is who the advocate is. He asked for the new flow chart to be presented again, noting that he didn't see advocacy in the process. Mr. Carrazana said that the Planning Commission would be the advocate in that it has direct contact with the public and has the connection with the Board. He indicated to the work session on the flow chart and said that what is missing here is the Planning Commission, explaining that when the strategy sessions are held, the Commission has the opportunity to be the advocate for the projects that are being derived from the master plans. Mr. Carrazana said that this was the logic – that if there is an approved master plan, then there is not just a Planning Commission that recommended it, but that hopefully the Board of Supervisors has approved it as well. He again stated that there seems to be something missing from the plan in terms of advocacy and a voice for the visionary piece.

Mr. Carrazana noted that it is easy to be caught up in the immediacy of needs, such as deferred maintenance and infrastructure, but if the county doesn't look beyond these with a broader vision, it will not make progress. He encouraged the Commission to think about Option 5, stating that it is key regarding implementation strategies from the plans that should become priorities.

Ms. Riley said that it is easy to continue on Mr. Carrazana's line of thinking and agreed with what he said

that. She said that in regard to the flow chart, it makes sense for the Planning Commission to at least be involved in discussions during the work session point and that it not only gives the Commission the opportunity to advocate and focus on master and small area plans (as listed in Option 5 as a role), but it would also allow the Commission to perform the role listed in Option 2 (review and comment on staff-nominated projects), assuming that at that point, the staff-nominated projects have already been identified as they are in the case of General Government and School Division.

Ms. Riley added that the Commission should absolutely retain Option 6, which is having a seat on the Oversight Committee.

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Benish if he could pull up the annual report because as he recalled, it seemed to respond to both Options 8 and 5. He said that in terms of the annual schedule, depending upon when it is presented to the Commission, since it is working off the comprehensive plan, it has an implied work plan in it. Mr. Keller said that it could be the case that this is something staff will have worked on, which is presented to the Planning Commission to tweak, which it could then pass into its process with its priorities. He said that it seems that the Commission's priorities and staff's priorities are never very far apart, but that it would be nice if the Commission had an opportunity to discuss the priorities before they have been pared down by staff.

Mr. Keller said that though Mr. Benish was unable to pull up the annual report, the commissioners should all take a look at it, because it was a comprehensive effort at looking at everything that they should consider, and therefore responding to the question of what the overriding pieces are if they are trying to gain a "forest for the trees" perspective.

Mr. Bivins said that all the options are really about how to work together as a Commission, staff, and with the CACs. He said that perhaps also what is being asked is that the conversation these players have is shaped differently over time, and that Mr. Benish keeps the Commission informed of projects that are about to happen. Mr. Bivins said that the commissioners know they are asked to provide people with information on key things that are happening, and that the options presented seem to be the normal course of business with the nature of the work. He said that if staff believes there are things that are important to bring to those who will fund the project, those projects should come before the Commission to be validated so at the least, the supervisors (a direct link to the Commission) can be consulted. Mr. Bivins said that Mr. Carrazana, being the UVA representative, has a direct link into a group at the university who have a different level of conversation with the supervisors than the Commission has. He noted that Mr. Dotson is directly linked to the School Board. Mr. Bivins said that there are many ways to think about how to retune the Commission's business to achieve many of the options.

Mr. Bivins said that Option 6 is a given, whether it is Mr. Dotson or someone else, and noted that the Oversight or Advisory Committee meetings are open meetings.

Mr. Bivins said that the Commission has the most rigorous work to do between Options 3 and 5 and that he would combine those options, as he believes there is correlation in terms of how to look at and integrate with the master plans. He said that the Commission has an obligation to assess how well they have done for the master plan, recalling that they voted in favor of the Pantops master plan and that hopefully, they would vote in favor of the Rio-29 and Crozet plans. Mr. Bivins suggested the Commission should self-audit the work they do, perhaps every two years, to assess how they are doing. He said that the Commission is in a strong position to go to the Board of Supervisors to provide their self-assessment and inform them of what the Commission believes the supervisors should be concentrating on and

endorsing. Mr. Bivins acknowledged that people tend to get nervous when spilling off the table, and that he was trying to think about things that are at the Commission's table that would give them full authority to inform the governing Board as well as collaborating with staff. He said that combining Options 3 and 5 are well within the Commission's ability and instead of receiving reports on things that are interesting, they perhaps receive reports on things with dollars attached to them.

Ms. More agreed with other commissioners that Option 5 (sharpening the master plans) was feasible, and added that there should be a timely review of those plans in order to get the Planning Commission back on track in reviewing plans within an expected period and keeping the plans sharp. She said that if the master plans (as done with Pantops and what will be for Crozet) have implementation chapters that are outlined, she did not see the need for Option 1, as the chapters provide better clarity for staff.

Ms. More said that she could see the Commission coming into the process early on Option 2 in which they get to see the list of proposals, particularly for plans that have lagged behind to ensure they don't slip off and to view the implementation plans to make sure they are up to speed. She said that if using Option 5, the list should be there for staff to pull from, and she likes the idea of the Commission being able to see and comment on the list. Ms. More said that she was unsure if they should be nominating projects as she felt as if they would be outlined in the implementation plans, which would put the Commission at a level in which it doesn't need to be. She said that she was in favor of having the CAC role, and even for the newer plans, noting that sometimes having eyes on the ground gets the Commission's attention on a particular project that they may have not thought to comment on.

Ms. More said that she supported having the Commission review early in the process what staff has nominated and added that what staff would nominate will be clearer as the master plans are sharpened. She again expressed the need for more timely reviews of the plans, which would ideally move faster if the plans are kept up to date, as there would be less to re-review over time.

Ms. More recalled that Mr. Bivins had suggested combining Options 3 and 5, and said that it was important for the Commission to stay informed, adding that the second part of Option 4 is also important. She said that the Commission staying informed and knowing what projects are in the pipeline is part of their decision making, especially as they hear the pressures of traffic and schools. Ms. More added that Mr. Dotson is a great person for Option 6 (representation on the Oversight/Advisory Committee).

Ms. Spain again expressed her opinion that all the options are valid.

Ms. More again expressed that she didn't believe the Commission should be nominating projects. She said that the master plans should contain these projects, though this does become somewhat political as far as choosing one implementation plan over the other. Ms. More said that she trusts staff, if master plans are done well (with a new look, such as the ones for Pantops and Crozet), and that she doesn't see a need for Option 1.

Ms. Spain reasoned that she was thinking about the transportation thread they have heard for the last six months or six years. She said that she doesn't believe the planning staff is losing sight of it, and perhaps they don't need to be redundant, but that this will be part of every master plan and small area plan. Ms. Spain said that she was thinking in terms of a big-picture overview of concurrency, transportation, and infrastructure, rather than in terms of any detail the Commission would develop. She said that the Commission would be stating their major concerns.

Ms. More said that she had hoped that if staff came with the review and nominations pulled from the master plans, that the Commission would see those concerns reflected in the projects. She said that if they don't see the concerns reflected, the Commission could then comment.

Mr. Dotson said that the conversation has been very useful, and that his own take was that he would be glad to eliminate Options 1, 7, and 8, with the sense that Option 2 gets at the project level input (working with staff either way) and perhaps Option 1 was a false option.

Mr. Keller asked to jump in about Option 1. He said that it seemed to him that they have nominated, with the recommendation the Commission gave on Rio Road, and that staff has taken that recommendation. Mr. Keller said that if the Commission has the good working relationship with staff, when something has been important enough in the course of the year, the Commission has let staff or supervisors know. He said that because of this, they don't have to have a special option (1) to be able to nominate because, by the Commission's work and advocacy, they have effectively done that.

Mr. Dotson said that he would put the emphasis on Options 3 and 5, as they add value; and then categorize Options 2, 4, and 6 as tactical ways of getting there. He continued that his vision is that when the Commission does have comments on projects (such as with Option 2), the project narrative would include Planning Commission comments. Mr. Dotson theorized that this could be included under "Justification," and that the comments would be clearly linked into the kinds of plans over which the Commission has some responsibility.

Mr. Bivins referred to Attachment B. He asked if it was referring to having rigorous work ready in the Government piece of the process (the shadowed box on the flow chart) and expressed that it seemed to be out of place as it gives everyone some opportunity to actually exercise it. Mr. Bivins expressed his concern that if the Commission wants to enter the process at the point where the General Government presents the recommendations, that is a passive point, and if the Commission actually wants to help shape the conversation, this would happen in the Government shadow box, assuming that this is where the work would take place (as opposed to General Government, which seemed like more of a presentation piece).

Ms. More recalled an image that showed the Planning Commission entering into the process at the Government point.

Mr. Bivins replied that the Planning Commission entered the process at the joint work session, but that this was more about staff informing the Commission of what happened.

[Someone was able to display the process points in question on the screen.]

Mr. Bivins noted that the Planning Commission piece is where staff would be reporting back to them, and that his question (given Mr. Dotson's comments) was that if the Commission wants to have input into the process, should that conversation take place in the General Government section of the process.

Mr. Dotson replied that by the time the process gets to the September joint work session in future years, all of the staff review that has taken place in Ms. Allshouse's office would be completed, and the Commission's priorities would be passed along to the Board of Supervisors and Board of Education. He said that the Commission has one seat on the CIP Advisory Committee (assuming that the representative would still be a part of the joint work sessions, as was true in May), and that this person could speak up. Mr. Dotson acknowledged, however, that this is just one voice. He said that he personally felt that much

of the work has to be done beforehand, but that Mr. Bivins' point was that it needs to be carried forward.

Mr. Benish said that the person would be carrying the work forward as an advocate through which they have had an opportunity to comment on. He said that if the Commission wants its comments to be infused at their earliest level, they would be on the left side of the process, closer to where the government agencies would be making their requests.

Mr. Bivins agreed, and added that this should take place to the extent that it is helpful. He recognized that part of what the Commission is asking for is to hear requests from many different players, and to be able to provide their input and priorities into the Boards' pieces of the process. Mr. Bivins said that he doesn't have anything to say at the Boards' joint work session in November, but that he is looking to help shape the outcome and wants to be involved in the conversation to the extent that it's appropriate and acceptable earlier in the conversation rather than later.

Mr. Dotson asked if it was accurate to say that at the red arrow on the flow chart, there would be a Planning Commission spokesperson there to speak up and present the Commission's priorities, if there was a need for such a presentation.

Mr. Bivins replied yes and clarified that he wants to be sure the Commission's priorities are "baked in" in the front end.

Ms. More said that she thought that is what they were getting at with the sharpened master plan role, which enhances staff's ability to have a comprehensive list of projects which the Commission has an opportunity to review at the very beginning. She said that the CACs would have input as well. Ms. More said that they would see the results later in the process.

Mr. Keller again suggested to the Commission to review and consider the annual report. He said that some of the commissioners had discussed this with Mr. Cilinberg and Andrew Gast-Bray, and in the report, there is a category called "Indicators of Progress" that is very specific and responding to the comprehensive plan. Mr. Keller said that if the Commission asked staff to add a component, such as "Planning Priorities for 20xx CIP," that comes to the Commission at the end of the fiscal year with the annual report, it would be helpful. He said that staff would come up with a priority list that is coming out of the comprehensive plan, which everyone in the community seems to support. Mr. Keller said that if the priority list would provide a discussion between the Commission and staff and could form the Commission's set of recommendations. He said that staff would package it how they best do as staff, and the Commission would review it.

Mr. Keller said that when the Commission approves the annual report, they are in effect approving priorities for the next year. He said that this fell apart in the past year with Andrew leaving, and that they borrowed on the previous years. Mr. Keller said that he has looked at the report in the past six months and believes it is an outstanding document, if it is maintained. He said that this would be an argument for maintaining it, as it would result in a product that staff could use annually to flow into the CIP process.

Ms. Allshouse asked when the annual report is presented to them.

Mr. Keller replied that Elaine Echol's report was presented in October of 2017.

Mr. Benish said that typically in the past, prior to the more enhanced report, the report would be

presented in the spring. He said that if it was to feed into the CIP process, it would have to be done in that timeframe.

Mr. Keller asked if this would more or less work.

Mr. Benish replied that it could.

Mr. Dotson said that Mr. Keller's idea was logical, but that he was concerned it would get lost as simply a CIP appendix in the annual report. He said that there was an advantage in having the report appear in both places, but that it would be kept as a separate document. Mr. Dotson said that if he was a Board member, and if the Planning Commission annual report was issued, if he would prioritize it to read.

Mr. Keller agreed that it needs to be a separate report, but that he thought the report could be an appendix each time, and then it is brought to the Commission to discuss it as they do normally. He said that it makes both reports connected in the way he believes everyone would want them to be.

Mr. Dotson said that he could see it being delivered as Part 1 and Part 2 or something to that effect.

Mr. Keller said that it is a draft that is then, one or two months later, taken up as a totally new piece, which is where the Planning Commission and staff form joint recommendations.

Mr. Dotson said that he would be fine with this and wondered if it was something staff needs to consider and get back with the Commission about to determine how it could work.

Mr. Benish agreed that this was the intent for the meeting, to determine what is important to the Commission so staff can determine how to implement it. He said that he heard several things from the Commission that were important that staff needs to consider and bring back. Mr. Benish said that with the annual report, they would have to take a closer look on the logistics of it, adding that he thought it would be feasible.

Ms. More said that this answered her question regarding the impacts on staff, noting that the intent is not to create double work for staff but that if the work is already being done to be captured in the report, it is almost as if it self-populates the list being pushed forward. She said that it is then about timing and how it aligns with the CIP process.

Mr. Benish said that for the purposes of the present conversation, the report seems feasible, and that staff can go back to see how they can make it work.

Ms. More clarified that she doesn't expect an answer immediately, and that she simply did not want to overload staff with requests. She again expressed the importance of having sharpened master plans as well as the timely review of the plans. Ms. More said that if they can keep the plans on schedule and get back on track, the Commission can move through the reviews faster. She said that going into the Crozet master plan, she knows there is a large amount of community engagement, but there are tweaks needed and these will take longer as it has been so long since the plan has been reviewed. Ms. More said that if they can stay on schedule, they can use staff's time more wisely to move more swiftly through the projects. She said that this is especially important when engaging the community, as there are new people coming into the process that will need background before they go into a review.

Ms. Spain said that the Commission needs to keep sight of the fact that not every part of the county has a master plan, and they are responsible for the comp plan for the whole county.

Ms. More said that this is why she was hoping to see the list of staff-nominated projects, which would include projects from the comp plan and not just the ones outlined in the implementation chapters of the master plans.

Mr. Benish said that one thing to consider is how comprehensive the Commission wants to see the CIP request. He said that Community Development can work on their submittals, but that there are other agencies that make requests as well. Mr. Benish said that there are some logistics behind this, whether the Commission wants the opportunity to comment on the full range of submittals, or only the ones directly and specifically related to the master plans. He said that the requests from other agencies are not in his control, and so there would be logistics for him as far as tying those requests in.

Mr. Benish said that staff would love to update the master plans, but that they are hard pressed to keep up with the ones they have with the work load they currently have, noting that they were eight years behind on the Pantops master plan.

Mr. Bivins pointed out that the plan is done now.

Mr. Benish said that Rio-29 was a small part of Places29 that was adopted in 2010, and that staff was doing the best they could. He said that to keep up the plans is an initiative in and of itself.

Ms. More said that with their preliminary meetings in Crozet, they have a sharp team working who has learned from the Pantops plan, and that with each master plan, the team is learning more about how to enhance the process.

Mr. Benish said that they would also be sharper about what is expected in a master plan.

Ms. More agreed.

Ms. Riley said that there were a number of side conversations before the process update began to discuss where the source of funding is for the master plans. She asked if with the role of sharpened master plans for the Planning Commission (which there was broad consensus on), it would be through operational funding or if it would be a CIP item.

Mr. Benish replied that his understanding was that it has almost always been through operational funding. He said that there have been times when staff has made requests for consultant assistance in certain circumstances, such as for Rio-29. Mr. Benish said that Ms. Allshouse is the best expert on this, and that she had made sure there was a commitment made to having master plan development be included in the operational budget. He said that he didn't want to confuse this in terms of CIP requests, which are implementations of specific CIP items. Mr. Benish said that those are requests they still have to make in the CIP.

Mr. Dotson said that Mr. Keller had made a good point that a number of the Commission's concerns reach into the CNA timeframe as well, and while the term "CIP" has been used in the conversation and that Ms. Allshouse's primary function is with the CIP, the Commission needs to keep in mind the 6-10 year (and longer) timeframes as they provide an added emphasis to the recent long-term School Division

recommendations.

Mr. Keller asked if Mr. Dotson wanted to provide a wrap-up on the topic.

Mr. Dotson expressed that they have given staff useful direction. He asked if perhaps Ms. Allshouse or Mr. Benish had any feedback or observations.

Mr. Benish said that he was given good direction, and Mr. Cilinberg was also taking notes. He said that what he heard was that Options 3, 5, 2, 4, and 6 are all important in various degrees and involve communication with agencies about the requests. Mr. Benish said that a good observation was that understanding past priorities and future priorities are important. He said that the emphasis was on keeping the master plans updated and giving the Planning Commission the opportunity to weigh in on staff's requests as far as how they use the plan, endorsing and supporting the requests. Mr. Benish said that Mr. Dotson's summary seemed to sum up the direction of the audit in Option 5, and that a representative definitely needed to stay on the Oversight/Advisory Committee.

Mr. Bivins said that having the two senior executives of the county in the room, if there was an appropriate way for the Commission to be an advocate for staff (not in the CIP budget, but in the traditional budget) for having them help with the master plans. He acknowledged that though they couldn't answer immediately, he would like to know if there was a way to request additional staff in the general budget.

Mr. Benish said that staff's role is to make sure they do the work in the most efficient and effective way possible with the staff they have. He said that this would always be the first priority, and then to define what the shortfalls are and what exactly is needed (whether it is additional staff or something else).

Mr. Bivins said that this is part of the Commission's role as advocates as well, to advocate for the department. He said that if there was an appropriate way to do that, he believes it is something the Commission should be able to set up on and do. Mr. Bivins likened the situation to rowing across the Atlantic with one arm (which is possible), but that he would rather have staff rowing with two arms.

Mr. Benish added that it is also a matter of the priorities to take care of and homing in on what is the most important thing to do.

Mr. Keller thanked the senior staff in the audience who cared to hear the Commission's response and how it might fit into the budget planning process. He thanked Mr. Dotson for his work as well. Mr. Keller said that the Commission looks forward to how this progresses as well as Ms. Allshouse's next visit in September.

Committee Reports

There were none provided.

New Business

Mr. Benish said that in regard to the August 7 Board of Supervisors meeting, the only item the Commission had seen on the agenda was ETA201700001 Homestays, which did get approved, meaning there was a new homestays ordinance ready to go to implementation.

Mr. Keller asked when this would be effective.

Mr. Herrick said that it was already effective.

Mr. Benish said that regarding the special use permit for Regent School that was potentially going to require an additional meeting was advertised and included in the packet for next week's meeting (with the need for an extra meeting averted).

Mr. Keller said that the agenda for next week seemed to include many items, it would involve one presentation, and the Commission would vote on each district.

Adjournment

At 8:05 p.m., the Commission adjourned to August 20, 2019 Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

David Benish, Interim Director of Planning

(Recorded and transcribed by Carolyn S. Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 09/03/2019
Initials: CSS