

**Albemarle County Planning Commission  
Final Minutes November 16, 2021**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, November 16, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Julian Bivins, Chair; Corey Clayborne; Rick Randolph; Daniel Bailey; and Tim Keller.

Members absent: Karen Firehock, Jennie More.

Other officials present were Charles Rapp, Director of Planning; Tori Kanellopoulos; Rachel Falkenstein; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

**Call to Order and Establish Quorum**

Mr. Bivins said the meeting began at 6:03 PM. He said it was an electronic meeting. He asked Ms. Shaffer to establish a quorum.

**Consent Agenda**

Mr. Bivins said there were no items on the consent agenda. He asked Ms. Shaffer if there was anyone signed up for matters not listed on the agenda.

**Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public**

Ms. Shaffer said there were two speakers signed up.

Mr. Neil Williamson introduced himself as president of the Free Enterprise Forum, a privately funded public policy organization focused on Central Virginia's local governments. He asked how long it should take to get a building permit and said in Albemarle County, it was currently taking over four months to get a building permit issued. He said the Community Development Department and Free Enterprise Forum agreed that was unacceptable. He stated that on Friday morning, their sources indicated there were over 300 residential and commercial permits sitting in the plans review queue alone. He said that this person did not have updates to share on them; however, they were not lost, just waiting.

He stated that these applications were properly filed with thousands of dollars in fees, which increased on July 1, and they were not actively being reviewed—they were waiting in Albemarle's permit pending purgatory between received and filed. He said they recognized these lowly building permits did not have the clever Economic Development Authority project code name like Night Rider, PACKET, or Daffodil, nor do they represent brand new residential developments with hundreds of units. He said that instead, these new construction projects, large and small, across Albemarle County, included new homes, fulfilling the comprehensive plan, additions to help Grandma age in place with her family, an extra bathroom to make mornings a little easier for growing families. He said these not-so-sexy projects represent not only millions of dollars in fees and related activity for Albemarle County, these delays impact project cost and these families' quality of life.

He said they had been engaged since the summer with Community Development Department staff and the Blue Ridge Homebuilder's Association to identify and address these concerns. He said they appreciated CDD's efforts and transparency with the issues they faced. He said they knew CDD staff was working across the County organization to tackle these challenges—but it was not getting better, it was getting worse. He stated they found it was critical that elected and appointed officials understand the vast scope of the problem and help find and fund a solution now. He said as an advisory body, the Free Enterprise Forum understood that the Planning Commission had a legal responsibility to review the Capital Improvement Plan on tonight's agenda, where new CDD software could potentially be funded. He said in addition, this body regularly weighed in on the Community Development Work Plan.

Mr. Williamson continued that considering this close coordination with Community Development, the Forum believed it was within the Planning Commission's purview to advocate for, one, dedication of significant additional resources and personnel to permit intake and review for Community Development. He said that the second was to invest now in a new software platform, perhaps via the CIP, to allow for efficient processing of all applications. He said that three was in the spirit of the Land Use Reform Committee (LURC), the Development Initiative Steering Committees (DISC I and II), to establish a broad-based committee, charged with reviewing and streamlining the development procedures to get permits and projects approved and completed in Albemarle County. He said that while this may seem kind of a larger scope than the Planning Commission's normal procedures, nothing could be more impactful. He said for them to get Albemarle County Community Development moving again.

Mr. Peter Krebs said he was from the Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC) and that tonight, the Commission would be hearing and speaking about the comprehensive plan and the CIP. He said they were actually closely related, and it was not bad to consider them both at the same time. He said that last night, the Charlottesville City Council approved its comprehensive plan. He said the two localities were definitely not the same, but there were likely to be some key common themes, such as climate action, housing, historic preservation, green infrastructure, transportation and mobility, and everything it takes to be a highly livable community. He said that included parks, greenways, and well-connected neighborhoods. He said PEC had worked with Albemarle County for the last 50 years on issues of this kind, and they were excited to be a part of this iteration as well. He said as he said to City Council last night, the CIP was where the values enumerated in the comprehensive plan were made manifest.

Mr. Krebs stated that when thinking about the CIP and the next five years, he hoped they all built upon some of the things that Albemarle had been doing extremely well lately. He said they made the commitment to improving resident quality of life through the creation of sidewalks, greenways, and other forms of connectivity. He said they had taken an approach to economic growth that rewarded local enterprises and fostered prosperity by helping local residents live healthy lives and unleashing their productivity. He said they had taken important first steps to open Biscuit Run with an initial mini phase slated for fall of 2022. He said between ACE and a handful of other programs, more than 100,000 acres of land had been protected for agriculture, forestry, and natural habitat. He said County staff had done a fabulous job of leveraging state transportation dollars, yielding a phenomenal return on their investment in them. He said as they thought about this upcoming budget, they should build on their recent wins. He said Albemarle County had a vision on how to be a terrific, great place to live. He said the comprehensive plan was the what

and the why, and the budget was the how. He thanked the Commission and said he looked forward to listening to the rest of the meeting.

## **Work Sessions**

### **CIP Fiscal Years 2020-2027**

Mr. Bivins thanked them for the observations and comments and said they would move into the first of their two work sessions that evening, which was the CIP for fiscal years 2020 to 2027.

Mr. Andy Bowman introduced himself as Andy Bowman, chief of budget in the Department of Finance and Budget. He said unfortunately, Ms. Kuwazama was unable to join them this evening, but he would be joined by Rosalyn Schmitt, chief operating officer of the school division. He said Ms. Schmitt, school staff, County staff, and he regularly partnered on a number of joint government and school budget issues, including the CIP. He said he was also joined that evening by Tia Mitchell, the senior budget analyst in her office. He said she primarily worked in the areas of the capital budget and the planning for that. He said their presentation was a streamlined version of one that staff had provided to the Board of Supervisors and School Board on October 20. He said he wanted to provide as much of that same information for a discussion heading into the FY23 budget development process so that the Planning Commission could see the same information as they start that process next week. He said that Ms. Firehock was not there that evening so they would be sure to get that information to her in advance.

Mr. Bowman said although he had streamlined it somewhat, this presentation would likely have a more financial orientation than a usual Planning Commission meeting. He said he had not modified this drastically because he wanted to make sure he provided the same thing to all the bodies involved in the CIP process. He noted that some of the Planning commissioners he had met before and some he had not. He said part of the reason was that last year, when they were putting together the FY23 budget, there was no CIP. He said the County was in the middle of the pandemic and there was a tremendous amount of uncertainty, and at that time it was decided to instead of focus on a long-range picture and focus on the impacts of the pandemic and what might be able to be unpaused from a number of projects that were paused at the start of the pandemic. He said this would be the first time they had discussed the CIP with the Planning Commission in a while, and as they got back into more routine long-range planning, that would continue in the future.

Mr. Bowman said he would begin by providing an overview of the County's financial position as it stands since the start of the pandemic. He said he would then speak to where they currently were as an organization with the capital program and how that informed their thinking into the future. He said beyond those broader concepts, he would then discuss the FY23–27 process in a little more detail, looking at the calendar, the role of the CIP Advisory Committee, and some of the initial assumptions in staff's approach to prepare for that committee's work. He said he and Ms. Schmitt would briefly provide some preliminary and summary information on some of the proposed capital projects that have been identified by the Board and School Board.

Mr. Bowman said they had some questions to prompt that discussion for the Planning Commission, which he would share in advance as a reference: "How does your awareness of the County's past, present, and future inform your thinking about the overall capital program?" both in terms of their process and their projects, and "What additional information will you be looking

for as the CIP Advisory Committee recommends and the Board of Supervisors adopts a FY 23-27 CIP?” as the Planning Commission heads into the spring to adopt a capital plan for the first time in two years. He said certainly as they followed up with Ms. Firehock and get her prepared for the advisory committee, they would include that feedback as well.

Mr. Bowman said first they would focus on financial planning, and 19 months ago as the pandemic was beginning, the County was nearing the end of the FY 21 budget development process. He said as the pandemic began, they went through a process wherein that entire budget had to be scrapped and redone in a matter of weeks. He said that to navigate that unprecedented uncertainty—not only of what the County’s revenues would be, but what the delivery of basic services would look like during the pandemic—the County adopted what was called a “3-6-6 approach” to financial management, which was shorthand for managing the last three months of FY20, looking at the first six months of FY21 and then at the last six months of FY 21, and as things improved or worsened along the way, they would adjust their planning as needed.

He said fortunately, every time they had been able to go to the Board of Supervisors and provide a quarterly interim report, that outlook had improved as the economy had recovered over the pandemic. He commented that the pandemic was still ongoing, and the economy had stabilized and recovered. He said that the Board and School Board had ensured the County’s financial foundation. He said the County was compliant with its financial policies, and the three AAA bond ratings had been reaffirmed in June 2021. He said initiatives were advanced as the County’s revenue numbers improved and became clearer.

Mr. Bowman moved to his next slide, entitled “Where are we now? Where are going?” He said he would discuss the County’s present and future together because he wanted to draw clear connections about how current circumstances are informing staff’s thinking about the FY23–27 CIP process. He said the first factor to consider was the impact of the global supply chain disruption and increased cost of raw materials. He said the County was not immune from these global factors and that some projects had received higher bids than when the projects were initially budgeted or had experienced schedule delays. He said the County had been working to ensure that budget figures and numbers were correct and realistic for project budget items that had not yet gone out to bid or had been under contract. He said the state approved requirements the previous year regarding energy efficiency, which were in line with the County’s climate action goals. He noted that projects needed to be developed to meet these new state standards.

Mr. Bowman said that while managing in the interim, the County had flexibility due to a \$4 million capital budget stabilization reserve that the Board of Supervisors had created for FY22. He said that the capital program was already underway before any work began on the FY23–27 plan. He said the capital budget was \$147 million for 65 capital projects. He said \$147 million is not a meaningful number by itself, so he would provide a few data points for more context. He explained that \$91 million had been appropriated for capital projects in the past 11 months between what had been unpaused in January, such as the expansion of Crozet Elementary, as well as what had been included in the budget adopted on July 1, such as the next phase of the downtown courts renovation project. He said much of the \$147 million was relatively new funding, but the remainder was underway in different phases of development. He said that some of the construction would extend beyond FY22 because of the nature of capital projects.

Mr. Bowman said that the work needed to implement the current projects had to be considered when addressing the next five-year planning process. He said that staff had analyzed data for the

past eight years, and though the nature of capital projects varied year to year, they found that the current rate of execution was around \$35 million a year. He said the budget processes and systems needed to be aligned heading into the next fiscal year. He said his third point was that there would be an updated comprehensive plan and strategic plan within the next five years. He said the School Board had adopted an updated strategic plan over the summer of 2021, and the Board had extended the strategic plan to the end of FY23 on October 13.

Mr. Bowman stated that the County staff thought about the transition to the updated comprehensive plan and strategic plan in two ways. He said that first, the intent of the CIP would not be to develop projects where all financial operational capacity would be committed before a strategic plan and comprehensive plan had been updated. He said there were community needs that could be planned for during the five-year period, but those had to be balanced with the outyears and the unknown so that there would be flexibility to respond to the changes. He said that for example, they may have a portion of the outyears just with an undesignated reserve amount for priority strategic community projects, knowing that while they had a lot more certainty than they did a year ago in the pandemic, and there still was much unknown, particularly in years three through five.

Mr. Bowman said this approach was also used to recognize that there were community conversations taking place. He said the Board of Supervisors heard from regional jail facility assessment in October that they had implications in the future. He said part of this approach was to be a little more flexible in the outyears and get ahead of those community conversations and the County's regional partners. He said he expected there was a question that may be on the Planning Commission's mind now: "If they were less defined in the outyears, when would they update that?"

Mr. Bowman said those who had been with the County a while may recall that prior to the pandemic, the County would often be in a pattern of every year going through CIP review, where one year, there would be a full look at the five years of the CIP, and then the following year, there may be more refined and minor adjustments. He said given the approach they were describing, at the different times in the pandemic, they felt it would be appropriate to provide a five-year update as best they could, maintain that flexibility, and maybe a year from now when they were looking at FY24 –28, to take a fresh look at those five years.

Mr. Bowman said he had presented a lot of concepts in the last two slides and would summarize them in terms of present and future. He said they were updating their current project cost from reality of current market conditions and supply chain issues. He apologized and said he had forgotten a fourth item. He said the other thing they were considering currently was that both with the Board and the School Board, long-term priorities existed in the operating budget as well. He said as they were developing a capital process with the CIP Advisory Committee, there would also be working with the Board of Supervisors around long-range policy discussions to position themselves and their operating budget and make sure those two plans worked together to make one cohesive long-range financial plan.

He said to summarize those four points, first was the reality of project cost and being updated for current market conditions; second, in this five-year period, they were going to consider the starting needs of the institution projects reflecting the current efforts underway of the \$147 million capital budget; and third, they were going to emphasize flexibility in the outyears, knowing they were in the middle of the comprehensive and strategic plan updates. He said that did not mean they would

have funding out there, but there would be a little less to find than they would see in a typical year. He said finally, they would be considering the capital decisions in the context over operating budget and their total financial picture of the Board.

Mr. Bowman said they would move on from high-level concepts to a more nuts-and-bolts approach about the work that would be ahead in the coming weeks and into the budget process. He said though they were talking to the Planning Commission here on November 16<sup>th</sup>, there was a lot of work already underway. He said the school division had a long-range space planning committee and started a little ahead of this process. He said they had received a report from that committee in September and worked through a proposal that was considered as part of this long-term capital planning process, and they had a discussion with the joint boards in October to get some of their input into the process and some of the concepts were being worked there. He said in November and December would be the CIP Advisory Committee and also the work sessions with the Board of Supervisors on operating five-year planning, and how those plans would inform each other. He said from there, they would pick up in February with a release of the school's draft funded request, County Executive's recommended budget, and then all of the public processes and work sessions that take place through the spring, ultimately leading to the adoption of the budget and the CIP in May.

Mr. Bowman said he would next focus on the role of the CIP Advisory Committee. He said that was a committee comprised of two Board members, two School Board members, one Planning commissioner, and one community representative. He said they were charged with a few things, firstly to review and evaluate a proposal that was recommended by staff as a starting point, then the CIP committee would make a recommendation and modify that starting point. He said they were to ensure that the proposal was aligned with the County's financial policies, established principles, and guidelines. He said they would next make a recommendation to the County Executive for his consideration and preparation of the recommended FY23 capital budget, and the FY23–27 CIP. He said there would also be a report out to the Board, staff, and Planning Commission as well that would accompany that recommendation, so it would be more than just the dollars and cents of the projects.

Mr. Bowman said that the work of the CIP Advisory Committee was within a similar framework to what they had in last year's process, which was very focused on a short timeframe of FY21 and 22, and this would have a longer timeframe. He said the prioritization of their projects would begin as it did in most years, with funding the County's obligations and its maintenance and replacement programs before they considered additional projects. He said that was not automatic funding, and for maintenance and replacement requests, staff performed its due diligence to scrub those numbers to ensure they were in line with standards and the ability to execute the other concepts they had talked about this evening.

He said before that, they would get into four criteria, the first of which was the alignment with the County's strategic plan priorities and the new reality due to the pandemic. He said last year, there were projects that focused on broadband, and the importance of that priority became even more evident in the pandemic and was elevated as a priority when they went through last year's budget process. He said that second, they would be looking at the ability to execute a project. He said this was a lens that considered that existing \$147 million capital budget, the other barriers they had to implement to proposed projects and how and when they would be able to proceed. He said third was to look at the ongoing operating cost impacts, which connected to having a single coherent financial picture where their capital plan was talking to their operating plan. He said there

were going to be some capital investments, there was going to be a pretty wide range of day-to-day costs, and they wanted to make sure as they were constructing or opening a new facility that they would be able to operate them.

Mr. Bowman stated that finally, there would be an equity statement for projects, which was not a mathematical score or high, medium, low assessment or other criteria, but they would perhaps look at a similar matrix in terms of ranking programs and projects. He said the Department of Finance and Budget had been partnering with the County's Office of Equity and Inclusion to assist County departments to be able to better incorporate a perspective equity lens when considering service changes at the start of the budget process—whether that be a capital project or an operating program. Mr. Bowman said a lot of this had grown out of the County's adoption of its new value of community. He clarified that while he said it was new, it had been a while since it had been adopted in recent history.

He said focusing on some fundamental questions, such as how changes to services or programs reduce existing disparities or enhance quality of life and wellbeing or access to services, and whether particular groups are more impacted by those programs, with impact meaning positive or negative, and if there were project impacts, if there were things the County could do to offset those. He said this was a discussion the Board had throughout working on the cigarette tax and how that would be implemented, considering the equity impacts in terms of who benefitted or carried the burden of that program and what the County could do to mitigate that. He said this would be taking some of that process and discussion and making it a more regular part of the County's business as future proposals were evaluated.

Mr. Bowman said that the next of the assumptions that the CIP Advisory Committee would be working with was that revenue sources would be explored in the context of the total five-year financial plan. He said some of that would go into discussions they would have with the Board of Supervisors in November and December. He said there was recent enabling authority provided by the state. He said he mentioned the cigarette tax as one that the Board was pursuing, and the Board of Supervisors had also expressed interest in October about pursuing a plastic bag tax, which would have funding related to other environmental programs that, while still in early stages of development with the Board, was revenue that could factor into future planning. He said they had the impact of the summer 2021 bond refinancing. He said the County's AAA ratings were upheld. He said given the current market, they were able to issue a large amount of ARPA proceeds at very low rates that would create capacity that did not exist in the plan prior to the pandemic.

Mr. Bowman stated that they also looked at ARPA funding and how other opportunities may be leveraged to support the County's priorities. He said a good example of that would be broadband, where the Board of Supervisors set aside around \$4.5 million of ARPA funding to leverage additional funding from the state to meet broadband needs in the community, and there would be more information from the state in the coming months. He said they would also continue to monitor the capital bond market environment and the County's authority to issue bonds. He said these were all revenue options out there that could create capacity. He said that as they had discussed with the Board, their initial scenario assumed that there would be no changes to the real estate tax rate for operating or capital costs in FY 23–27.

Mr. Bowman said this was a starting point in recognizing that much had changed from prior years, and there were other options available that could be pursued, even with their current resources,

to make things happen. He said that as they had placed an increased emphasis in the Office of Budget and Management on looking at capital projects and what might be possible as projects come, whether it be over budget or under budget, they were looking from a management perspective of how to create additional capacity for the CIP Advisory Committee and the Board to work with.

Mr. Bowman said that in summary, they had spent the past two years using the 3-6-6 budget management approach, and they were now in a place where they were able to establish and maintain a strong financial foundation. He said they had been able to adjust their plans as they went along, and they were implementing a capital program of \$147 million. He said they were going to head into a capital process through FY23–27 and the CIP Advisory Committee would recommend a plan for the County Executive’s consideration; the Board would adopt a plan for the first time since FY20 due to the pandemic. He said the plan would reflect current efforts of projects underway, emphasize flexibility, recognizing their guiding documents for priorities were in the middle of process updates. He stated they were also going to be considering not just the capital program but how the operating program worked as well. He said with that, he would touch on some projects that had been identified by the Board of Supervisors for consideration.

Mr. Bowman said on March 29, at the end of the FY22 budget process, when the American Rescue Plan was announced, before they knew all the details, they met with the Board of Supervisors to understand within the strategic plan the other priorities they had identified and what items were on the top of their list of priorities. He said they shared this again with the Board last month, and he would not discuss all of these projects in detail because they were not necessarily all capital projects. He said in the spring, the Board was able to provide funding to phase two of the Rio Road Corridor Plan Study, and that was the third bullet on this slide. He said the fourth one, broadband infrastructure, would hopefully be financed through ARPA funding in combination with state funding, so there would be no impact to the capital budget. He said this was an example of other resources being used to deliver on these projects.

Mr. Bowman said other items on this list would be likely familiar to the Planning Commission. He listed some of these, which included older neighborhood infrastructure such as sidewalks and multi-modal connectivity, transportation leveraging program with SmartScale projects and the Eastern Avenue Bridge, parks and recreation infrastructure amenities such as the current in Biscuit Run, and there was a long-term master plan to build out that park to provide for community needs. He said these were just examples of projects, and there would be other staff-identified priority projects that they were working through as well. He said they could come back to this if there were questions in the future, but he wanted to turn it over to Ms. Schmitt to talk through the work of the school division and where they had been for the last couple of months.

Ms. Rosalyn Schmitt said that the School Board had recently updated their strategic plan. She said before she presented the list of recommended projects from the school division, she would provide an overview of how it fit within their strategic vision. She said after a rigorous community and stakeholder engagement process, the School Board had recently adopted a strategic plan, which had helped guide the process and priorities when thinking about the CIP. She said the strategic plan, entitled “Learning for All,” included a vision that their learners were engaged in authentic, challenging, and relevant learning experiences, becoming lifelong contributors and leaders in their dynamic and diverse society. She said the specific goals and objectives related to capital priorities were listed on the slide. She said getting the right resources to educators and students for their teaching and learning was key to their success. She continued that they believed



the project criteria as developed by the long-range planning advisory committee, on the righthand side of the slide, were in close alignment with their vision and mission.

Ms. Schmitt said using their defined project criteria, the listed projects were recommended. She said it was a needs-based request that addressed key themes of equity and investment in existing facilities as well as new investments needed to support the long-term capacity needs of their growing County. She said the price tag may seem large; however, it was built upon the accumulating capital needs of the school division over many years. She said adequate capacity continued to be a need for the school division, which was supported by the 10-year enrollment projections and reinforced by both the recently completed development and student yield analysis and 30-year population forecast.

Ms. Schmitt stated that for over 15 years, the school division had been in a practice of expanding existing facilities and, when necessary, deploying mobile classroom units in the interim. She said as these schools all reached a saturation point where expansion was no longer practical, there was a recommended strategy for land acquisition and the construction of new facilities. She said for the first time in a long time, there would be several new schools listed. She said they also recommended investments into school renovations at all levels to bring incremental updates division-wide and in alignment with the strategic plan, ensuring that each student had access to high-quality learning environments. She said there should be a reliable elevator service to ensure safety and access at all times. She said the importance of a healthy environment and having reliable technology infrastructure reflected urgent and necessary investments as highlighted by the Covid-19 pandemic, so it recommended a new investment in indoor air quality systems and construction of a data center. She said a detailed justification for each of these projects was included in the 2021 Long-Range Planning Advisory Committee Report.

Mr. Bowman thanked Ms. Schmitt and said they would now open this to Planning Commission discussion. He said there were two questions that were presented in the beginning, and he wanted to hear from the Planning Commission in terms of how their awareness of the County's past, present, and future informed their thinking about the overall capital program, in terms of process and projects, and what additional information they would be looking for as the CIP Advisory Committee recommended and the Board adopted a FY23–27 CIP.

Mr. Bivins said that the commissioners were somewhat silent on these issues, and staff had given them a good bit of information. He said he would like to hear about, out of the funding methods that were unpaused this year, how much or what types of projects they might see have an impact on their own community development, so they had a sense of Mr. Rapp and his colleagues to have the resources that line up with the ongoing strategic plan and some of the items that had come up thus far.

Mr. Bowman said that was timely, because staff and Mr. Rapp had met several times over the past few weeks about transportation and future plans. He said they were looking at what they called the "transportation leveraging program," which included a combination of state matching funds and other multi-modal projects. He said he was trying to establish where the timeline was for those future priorities identified by the Planning Commission and the Board to make sure they position themselves to draw on those state matches as they could and support the interconnectivity in other areas. He said if Mr. Rapp or Ms. Mitchell wanted to add to anything he said, that was certainly one of the areas of strategic priority to the Board of Supervisors, and they called them non-strategic priorities. He said funding was included as part of the work the CIP

Advisory Committee did, and that would certainly be part of the committee's discussions as part of this process as well.

Mr. Bivins said that they were told at some point there were lots of system updates that were going to take place in general around the County's business, and he was wondering if those would be funded from here or funded other ways. He said it would be particularly helpful to know about their own Community Development's software needs, and just in general about the County's.

Mr. Bowman responded that currently, this was a Community Development issue, but it was also a County-wide issue. He said those things touch every County department, and they touch every citizen who tries to interact with the County in a virtual way. He said they have a process of probably three or four years for looking at their systems and how they were integrated or not. He said they were working with the IT department, Community Development, Human Resources, and Finance and Budget staff to figure out a plan for what an end-to-end process looked like in the timing of all those phases to be implemented through the next few years to modernize the County's core systems.

He said they could improve system access and data access between systems, reevaluate manual systems, and create systems that were faster for staff to train and learn on, which could have corresponding effects on recruitment and retention. He said that would be a core part of the CIP, and the CIP Advisory Committee would look at that. He said that also tied to their theme of the operating budget because technology had an infrastructure side and an ongoing maintenance side to implement that. He said they were trying to look at it from all angles to ensure both plans were cohesive, and that would be a consideration in this year's process.

Mr. Bivins asked if they would not be seeing anything soon and if they would see this sometime next year.

Mr. Bowman replied that the groundwork was happening right now, and this was credited to the Board of Supervisors for the last couple of years. He said they had funding managed through their Project Management Office, which had been renamed the Performance and Strategic Planning Office, where they had project managers to handle those in ways the County had not done historically. He said although the funding would not take place until July 1, 2023, a lot of the groundwork and business process analysis necessary for that to be successful and to buy a system was currently underway.

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. Bowman to go back to a slide that said that the County had appropriated \$91 million since January 2021. He said his question was asked what percentage of those funds was provided through ARPA versus the percentage that actually came out of Albemarle County-generated funds.

Mr. Bowman said of that \$91 million, currently none of it was related to the American Rescue Plan Act. He said the reason for that was because the County adopted its budget in early May, and though ARPA was announced in late March or so, the details of when the County would receive funding were not until mid-May, when they received around \$10 million or so in initial funding. He said part of the plan was to set the stage with the Board of Supervisors. He said one of the differences in ARPA funding was that they had just gone through an exhaustive process with the Coronavirus Aid Recovery Economic Security Act. He said they had a very tight timeline to spend that funding when it was provided in spring of 2020 to be expended by the end of 2021.

He stated that the framework they discussed with the Board of Supervisors was that they knew from the ARPA timeline that they would have multiple years to spend that funding, so they had a moment to take a timeout and pause with the strategic aspects and not rush. He said they certainly wanted to get that into the community and support it, but also to have the time to be deliberate and take the opportunity to have matching funds with the state funding. He said what was not in the \$91 million was the County's \$20 million of ARPA funding, a portion of which the Board had said was allocated in the current fiscal year to support programs that were around more human services functions, and the bulk of that funding was intended to be looked at for the FY23–27 budget process.

Mr. Randolph said certainly when looking at the FY21 budget, he recalled that the Board had an active discussion about the potential need to phase in a property tax increase over the course of the next four or five fiscal years. He said this was in 2019, but they were in FY20 in the budget. He said looking at the FY21–25 budgets, he recalled there was active discussion about a need to augment resources to address the yawning needs within the CIP—not only from the school division side of the ledger, but from general government. He said he just wanted to express some concern about a slide where they had submitted a kind of *cerberus paribus*, all things being equal, that there would not be an increase in property taxes.

He said if there were limited funds coming out of the ARPA source, and there were an even more dramatic set of school division capital needs, combined with the goals and objectives of the Board to address inequities out there in terms of sidewalks and conveniences for pedestrians, it was unclear where those funds would come from. He said that \$36 million was the last authorization by the taxpayers for a bond issue, and \$36 million would not begin to come close to addressing the needs in the capital plan as he saw it. He said attached to that was the concern that interest rates may be going up in the very near future, and the window of opportunity for bonding authorization looked like it was narrowing dramatically. He said he had one more question about transit shelters, then he would cede the floor to other members of the Commission.

Mr. Bowman thanked Mr. Randolph for that feedback. He said two slides he had taken out were ones they had discussed with the Board and School Board related to this change in tax rate, in terms of where they were two years ago and where they were now. He said he did not have those slides, but he could speak conceptually to where they were currently. He said it was a starting point, and the CIP Advisory Committee and Board of Supervisors could take it in a different direction, but Mr. Randolph was correct in that they had planned back in the winter of 2019 prior to the pandemic and contemplated an additional penny a that would be in effect from FY21 through FY25. He said when the FY21 budget was recommended by the County Executive, there was not that additional penny included, and it was essentially delayed a year. He said before any action was taken on that, the pandemic started, and all the budgets were redone in a matter of weeks because everything had changed. He said that was why they could not simply go back to that plan as a starting point.

Mr. Bowman said they looked at project schedules and lead times, and there were a lot to execute. He said one of the things they were seeing already were school projects over the summer with tight delivery windows, and if materials did not arrive, there were some projects that had to be moved a year. He said when thinking about these projects being borrowed heavily, it tied into the cash and debt analysis of when the funds needed to be available and when the project needed to be completed. He said they would have more capacity than they did in the winter 2019 session

because of the refinancing that took place, which Mr. Randolph had alluded to with the lower-than-average interest rates. He said he believed they were below 2%, which was far lower than what the County had seen historically. He said there would be capacity available there as well. He said there were options with revenues that the state had granted in the past two years that could also be explored.

Mr. Bowman stated that he would share information they gave to the Board on November 3 that he did not include in this presentation, such as the very dramatic change in their economy in the fourth quarter. He said if they were to look at what happened in the first three quarters of FY21, there would be a year-over-year revenue growth of about 2.6%. He said typically, what would be seen if there were no pandemic, the fourth quarter would be within a percent or so of the 2.6% figure. He said the actual observed revenue growth in the fourth quarter was plus 7%, which was an unprecedented change. He said as that was happening, based on how they allocated funding to capital, school division, and local government, there would be some additional funding available in the local base. He said what was seen in the local data was that those trends would continue into 2022.

Mr. Bowman stated that the Board of Supervisors was given a preview on November 3, and as part of the Board's long-range planning on November 17, he would discuss data they were seeing and how things were changing, and then there would be a budget amendment coming before the Board in December. He said part of this was that there were changes seen in the local economy that had not been seen before, and some flexibility in their financing that did not exist, so part of the thinking was not that taxpayers would not be considered in the future but ensuring the due diligence to explore other options in that capacity that they had gained. He said that they could certainly disagree with that approach, but that was the rationale presented in terms of why there was a different approach to what was considered in the winter of 2019.

Mr. Randolph commented that he noticed that transit shelters were listed as a desirable entity to be supported by the CIP budget, and the Planning Commission had reviewed several redevelopment projects and special use projects where transit was discussed. He said the developer was urged to provide transit stops, but he believed that there was not support from the County or Board of Supervisors to provide transit stops. He said that rather than be part of the CIP budget, the developers should have a hand in funding those—especially when the projects were on a public transit route. He said it was not the role of local government to provide that post-facto. He said that it was appropriate to request and expect transit shelters alongside the requests for bike lanes and sidewalks from developers.

Mr. Bowman said that Mr. Randolph's point was well taken. He said there were state programs that could provide funding to put the transit stops in place, adding that the County was undergoing transit planning studies, and those studies could affect the future.

Mr. Keller said that in the past, there was a "budget 101" presented at the beginning. He said that citizens listened to the presentations, so it would be helpful to have a succinct discussion about the different components of input and output to the County budget so that the CIP would be contextualized. He said that it had been helpful in the past to show the duration of the projects rather than just the dollar amounts. He said that ongoing and large expenditures, such as the northern high school and courts improvements, were presented with projected durations. He said the Planning Commission used to receive a presentation each year before the budget process began that discussed the staff hopes for budget items for Community Development and Planning

and how those were broken down into which were ongoing budget funded and which had to be pushed out to the CIP. He said that there were discussions with the previous planning director about not funding small area plans from the CIP.

Mr. Bowman said the presentation was a good, general overview. He said that there was a lot more to consider, and it should be considered up front. He said it was important to have a sense of what would be funded outside of the CIP process. He said he would follow up on Mr. Randolph's point about increased property taxes. He said that there had been interesting discussions when there was concern about revenue about how the pieces would fit into the budget. He asked if it could be assumed that the reason staff was not suggesting real estate tax increases was because it was anticipated that the assessment value of properties would increase significantly, especially with inflation.

Mr. Bowman thanked Mr. Keller for the feedback about a budget 101 and said that new Board members would receive that education during onboarding. He said that beyond the plan before the Commission, there were other high-level budget questions in terms of where the money came and went and other basic mechanics. He said he appreciated the feedback to show the projects over time, and that could be achieved. He said the CIP Advisory Committee had recommended, and it was then adopted, that studies would no longer be funded from the CIP. He said that funding had been set aside to move forward projects such as the Rivanna Corridor Study and the Rio Corridor study. He said the County Assessor would update the reassessment discussion to the Board of Supervisors on December 15. He said it was assumed at the time of the 2022 budget adoption that there would be a reassessment of an additional +1.75% compared to 2021. He said there were signs for a higher reassessment, but it was too early to be sure, and he did not have an exact number.

Mr. Keller thanked Mr. Bowman.

Mr. Clayborne said it was good to meet Mr. Bowman. He asked to see the slide for the school CIP proposal and said he did not know what was included in the school renovations. He asked if there was coordination to complete renovation projects at the same time, such as installing HVAC systems and redoing windows and roofs at the same time. He asked if the numbers reflected any coordination with ARPA funding or other funds.

Ms. Schmitt said it was important to note that the projects used to be called "below-the-line" projects, and they did not include the maintenance replacement projects. She said there was a comprehensive maintenance replacement program that included maintenance for windows, roofs, and mechanical equipment. She said coordination between those projects was attempted where it made sense. She said that the indoor air quality project had the opportunity to receive matching funds from ARPA.

Mr. Clayborne thanked Ms. Schmitt for her answer. He asked to confirm that it would be a separate maintenance budget that would fund specific projects.

Ms. Schmitt said that was correct.

Mr. Clayborne asked what level of priority was placed on utility projects. He said he saw a bullet list of how projects were prioritized, and he was curious how much went to site readiness.

Mr. Bowman said that there was around \$2 million in a public-private partnership fund for the CIP. He said the fund was related to the \$147 million. He said that separate from the CIP, there was an economic development fund maintained to handle issues with site readiness, state and federal funds, and provide opportunities for performance agreements.

Mr. Clayborne said that was helpful. He asked if accessibility and public safety projects were included in the equity portion because he did not see any.

Mr. Bowman asked if Mr. Clayborne meant pedestrian safety.

Mr. Clayborne said he was considering fire stations or police stations.

Mr. Bowman said the largest cost for public safety was the maintenance replacement program. He said that through the comprehensive plan, there had been a 20-year path to build stations around the urban area, and there were no new stations planned. He added that there were other long-term goals for public safety.

Mr. Clayborne asked if ADA upgrades were tied in with equity.

Mr. Bowman said that retrofitting facilities and ADA compliance would be considered part of that, and it was part of the maintenance replacement budget.

Mr. Bailey said he was curious how the broadband infrastructure support from the federal government impacted the County's funding. He asked if the CIP could be supplemented with federal dollars for broadband.

Mr. Bowman responded that there was usually a delay as funding made its way through the state governments and agencies, based on experience with the CARES and ARPA funding, and there were no details at the time. He said there was \$4.5 million from ARPA funding, and he hoped there would be a dollar-for-dollar match from the state.

Mr. Bailey said that the FCC had published a broadband map, and judgment was based on areas with one or fewer providers. He said that the areas with one or fewer providers often received prioritization for federal funding. He said it would be interesting to see the cross reference with the County from a GIS perspective.

Mr. Carrazana said he appreciated the discussion about the school improvements, five-year plan, and priorities. He said there were other priorities outlined—water, sewage, and transit—and asked if there was the same level of detail in terms of costs associated with those. He said the Crozet Master Plan was recently approved and included several infrastructure needs. He said asked if the same rigor was applied to the master plans and CIP that was applied to the schools. He asked where the County was with getting the detail on the infrastructure needs.

Mr. Rapp explained that many of the projects in the master plans were dependent upon grant funding cycles. He said that those projects included sidewalk, trail, and road improvements, among other infrastructure improvements. He said that the first phase of planning the projects included identifying them in the small area plans and corridor studies. He continued that the next phase would vet the projects through engineering studies or additional ways to identify costs and funding mechanisms. He said that once the funding mechanisms and costs were identified, then

the project could be brought to Mr. Bowman's team to discuss how to best fund the project—either through County funds, a state grant, a federal grant, or other sources. He said it took some time to work through the details of the projects to ensure that once funds were committed, the projects would be implemented. He said that projects were not as simple as drawing a line on a map where a sidewalk should go, and there were several variables that needed to be considered for each project.

Mr. Carrazana said he appreciated Mr. Rapp's response, and perhaps his reference to Crozet was incorrect. He continued that there had been infrastructure issues in the County for years. He said that some of the issues were listed, from sewer to water to transit. He wondered if the County was able to get the same level of detail in terms of costs prioritization for those projects as was seen with the School Board. He said that the School Board's needs for new schools and upgraded infrastructure were real, but there were other important projects to address—broadband issues, sidewalk issues, and ADA issues. He asked if there was more detail that was available in a comprehensive CIP and if the data was available or could be made available.

Mr. Bowman responded that the data was available. He said that as the projects went through the advisory committee, there would be estimates and timelines, among other details, provided. He said that those details could be shared with the whole Planning Commission. He said that he was thinking about what his team could present to help the Planning Commission provide input during the FY24–28 CIP process. He thanked Mr. Carrazana for his statement.

Mr. Bivins said that part of the conversation had focused on what had happened to the funding appropriated from the current and previous administrations. He asked if Mr. Bowman or a group of people in the County were prepared to receive and utilize funds from the Build Back Better plan. He said that his colleagues and Mr. Rapp had mentioned that there were projects that aligned with that philosophy.

Mr. Bowman said that when ARPA funding was announced in the spring, an analyst's position was restructured to be focused full time on federal planning. He said that at the time, CARES funding was wrapping up and ARPA funding had begun, and it was unsure what other funding resources would be available. He said that the analyst was in touch with the national, regional, and state organizations.

Mr. Bivins said that it would be helpful for Mr. Bowman to have a detailed conversation at a later date with the Planning Commission about how the CIP integrated with what was presented, which would be helpful as they began to think about the larger issues surrounding the comprehensive plan. He said it would also be helpful to the community. He said that the Planning Commission often heard about school capacity issues when there were large projects being considered. He said that he sat on an unrelated advisory committee for the School Board, and he has said at those meetings that it would be helpful if the School Board would say publicly what the plan for capacity was. He said that the County's expectations for housing capacity were partly contingent on if the community knew that there would be space for the children to learn. He said that a lot of misconceptions about school capacity were brought up during project reviews. He said that if a School Board member was able to correct those misconceptions, many of the problems among the community would be ameliorated.

Ms. Schmitt said that the most comprehensive document was the long-range planning report. She said that the plan was dependent on funding, and the struggle of the School Board was that the plans did not guarantee that the capacity would increase in the following years.

Mr. Bivins said that the School Board's public affairs liaison should go to the community and the press and explain what the plans were. He said that the feedback the Planning Commission received felt uninformed of the plans for the school's capacity. He said he would not open the hearing for public comment and would leave the public comment to be addressed at the Board of Supervisors meeting. He said that he assumed that Mr. Bowman had ways to receive public feedback. He believed that the Commission had provided several requests for more details about projects in terms of the connections to areas of concern and resources for Community Development. He said getting responses would allow the backlog of permits to be lessened and for big projects to be handled effectively and efficiently.

Mr. Bowman thanked the Commission. He said that the discussion and feedback was helpful for the short-term and long-term. He said that if there was more interest in the County budget process or financial policies, he and his staff were available to discuss the process on a fundamental level outside of the regular meeting times.

Mr. Bivins thanked Mr. Bowman.

### **Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance Update**

Mr. Bivins introduced the next work session, the comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance update.

Mr. Rapp said that he would introduce the topic. He said that there were no specific presentation materials and that it was early on in the planning stages, but it had been a while since the Planning Commission received an update on the projects. He said that since the last work session, the scope and an engagement approach of the comprehensive plan had been discussed with the Board of Supervisors. He said that there was zoning ordinance work underway and that more would come with the comprehensive plan update.

Ms. Tori Kanellopoulos said she would share slides and would be joined by Rachel Falkenstein.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that there would first be an update on the comprehensive plan, followed by an explanation of the goals and rationale for the update. She continued that the next part of the presentation would cover the updated phasing plan for the project scope and timeline and the phase 1 engagement plan for collaboration between community members, County staff, the Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained that the comprehensive plan established Albemarle County's long-range vision that guided growth, development, and change for the next 20 years. She said it assisted County staff, committees, boards, and the Board of Supervisors when developing public policies related to private land use activities and use of resources in Albemarle. She said it served as the basis for land development regulations and decisions such as rezoning and special use permits, capital improvements, County programs, and the distribution of County dollars to programs and agencies. She said that the plan divided Albemarle County into designated development areas, which were approximately 5% of the County or 35 square miles. She said



that rural areas were approximately 95% of the County or 695 square miles. She said that the intent was to focus development in the urban areas to create quality living areas, avoid sprawl, improve access to services, and protect the rural areas. She continued that each development area had its own master plan.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the County staff presented a draft phasing plan and project budget estimate to the Board of Supervisors during the February 3, 2021 and March 17, 2021 work sessions. She said that the Board had expressed the desire for a more streamlined process to allow concurrent work on the comprehensive plan and other high-priority projects. She said that the County staff presented a revised draft phasing plan to the Planning Commission at a work session on April 13, 2021. She said that the Commission had expressed support for a concurrent comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance update.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the Board had held two work sessions to review updated comprehensive plan materials. She said at an October 6, 2021 work session, the Board expressed support for concurrent comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance updates. She said at a November 03, 2021 work session, the Board adopted a resolution of intent for the comprehensive plan update that included the updated phasing plan and phase 1 engagement plan. She said that the Board requested more information on the working group, and more information about the group would be discussed later.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that it would be helpful to share details about the rationale for the comprehensive plan update and why an update was appropriate. She said that since the 2015 comprehensive plan update, the County had undertaken substantial planning and policy initiatives, and those efforts were not integrated into the existing comprehensive plan. She said an example was that the Board of Supervisors had prioritized a strategic plan in the Fall of 2018, which included climate action planning, economic development, infrastructure planning, revitalization of aging neighborhoods, and expanded broadband access—all relevant to the comprehensive plan. She said that several planning and policy efforts had been adopted by the Board since 2015. She said that those included the Economic Development Office's Project ENABLE, the Climate Action Plan, and Housing Albemarle. She said that the Office of Equity and Inclusion was created in 2018 to further the County's commitment to provide the highest level of public service and enhance the quality of life for all residents. She said that "community" was subsequently added to the County's organizational values, which stated: "We expect diversity, equity, and inclusion to be integrated into how we live our mission."

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that Albemarle was a growing community, as demonstrated by the population growth over the previous decade and the number of residential units that had been constructed the previous five years. She that according to the U.S. Census Bureau, Albemarle County's population increased by 10% from 2010 to 2019. She continued that the growth was not uniform across the County. She said the Albemarle County Equity Profile, co-authored by the Office of Equity and Inclusion and the UVA Equity Center, showed that over 37% of Albemarle County households were ALICE—or Asset-Limited, Income-Constrained, Employed Households—and an additional 9% of households were living in poverty, according to 2018 data. She said that demand had increased for urban services and infrastructure, especially during the pandemic with demand for public parks and broadband access.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said she would discuss the content of the existing comprehensive plan and why an update was appropriate. She said an example was that the existing implementation

chapter included 70 priorities with no clear prioritization or order for completion. She said that the chapter included 80 indicators of progress intended to be tracked annually, but tracking the data was unsustainable. She continued that the number of indicators made it unclear what success looked like to community members. She said that the comprehensive plan included inconsistent and conflicting recommendations; examples were that different master plans had different land use categories, and master plan language conflicted with comprehensive plan language. She said that the inconsistencies made it difficult for the staff to evaluate development proposals and to consider the plan's content when making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the County was undertaking multimodal system planning with the Virginia Department of Transportation. She said it would allow urban street-types to be constructed such as the ones found in downtown Crozet and in the recently adopted standards outlined in the Rio/29 form-based code. She said that the state code provision required the coordination of transportation planning with land-use planning and provided an opportunity to integrate climate related initiatives.

Ms. Kanellopoulos stated that there was the opportunity to integrate the best practices that existed in the County's policies and plans. She said there was a variety of examples of successful and award-winning planning efforts. She said those included Minneapolis 2040, which addressed housing and affordability; Richmond 300, which focused on environmental justice, walkability, and economic growth through clear priorities; and Memphis 3.0, which focused on flexibility and enabling the growth of urban assets by reinvesting in areas of activity.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the comprehensive plan update was in support of the County's mission "to enhance the wellbeing and quality of life of all community members through the provision of the highest level of service consistent with the prudent use of public funds."

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the project goals were listed on her slide and highlighted the rationale for the update. She said that the first goal was to update the plan content to reflect County-wide strategic initiatives such as climate action planning, economic development, and multimodal transportation planning. She said that the second goal was to ensure that equity was integrated into the engagement process and plan content, consistent with the County's recently added "community" organizational value. She said that the third goal was to improve plan usability by articulating clearly prioritized goals, incorporating metrics for tracking progress, and applying a modern, streamlined document design.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the updated phasing plan incorporated the feedback from the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors and supported the project goals. She said that the phasing plan outlined the four phases and the general timeline. She said that the project started the 4th quarter of 2021 and was expected to conclude in the 2nd quarter of 2024. She said that the plan also included concurrent zoning ordinance updates.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the current phase was phase 1, growth management policy and framework. She said the phase included the review, evaluation, and update of the growth management policy, using lenses of equity, climate action, and capacity projections. She said that a capacity analysis for housing and economic development was underway to determine if there was capacity for the projected growth. She said that the phase would align the comprehensive plan with the County's updated values, identify the level of detail that should be included in the plan, and develop a framework approach. She said it was an opportunity to identify the content

and level of detail that should be included in the comprehensive plan, as well as what content should be included in other County plans, such as the climate action plan or economic development strategic plan. She said that the work in Phase 1 would provide a focused approach for the subsequent phases.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the second phase was policy review and framework design. She said that the goal was to identify major topics of the comprehensive plan, evaluate existing conditions for the topics, and update policy statements, goals, and frameworks through the lenses of equity and climate action. She said that anticipated topics included transportation, economic development, land use, resource planning, and rural area planning. She said that the topics could be adjusted based on work in phase 1 or feedback from the community. She said that phase 2 would include content from updated County plans and policies. She said community engagement would be conducted especially for topics that needed significant updates; for example, transportation would need more community engagement as the topic included the County's first multimodal systems plan.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that phase 3 was strategy development. She said that the County's action steps and implementation approach would be reviewed during phase 3. She said that action steps would be used to implement the policy goals for each major topic identified in phase 2. She said that the existing comprehensive plan refers to the action steps as "the strategies." She said that priorities and metrics for each topic area were to be identified to allow for clear tracking of progress and success.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that phase 4 was the final draft review, and the full document would be drafted during this phase based off the work from the previous phases. She said that efforts would be focused to find and eliminate inconsistencies in the plan. She said that the community and decision makers would be engaged on plan priorities. She said there would be a public hearing process with the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for final adoption of the plan. She said the hope was that after the four phases were completed, there would be an updated comprehensive plan that achieved project goals, reflected the County's strategic initiatives and priorities, integrated equity, and identified community priorities and metrics for tracking progress.

Ms. Rachel Falkenstein said that she would discuss how the phase 1 engagement plan was developed. She said that the approach for engagement planning was to scope engagement plans for each phase of work as the process evolved. She said this would allow reflection and responsiveness to community feedback on effective methods.

Ms. Falkenstein said she would discuss engagement goals that were crafted. She said that the first goal was to conduct outreach and collaborate with community members whose perspectives had not been historically represented in County processes, such as age, race, place, income, or other demographic factors. She said that the second goal was to develop and implement a transparent community engagement and decision-making process so that there was a clear understanding of how feedback was used. She said that the third goal was to provide consistent and varied opportunities for community input throughout the update process.

Ms. Falkenstein stated that best practices and examples from other localities were examined to inform the engagement approach. She said that the engagement approach of the Minneapolis 2040 plan was used as an example. She said that Minneapolis completed a comprehensive plan

update in 2019 and at the beginning of the process had developed engagement goals. She said the goals had allowed the planning to be intentional about the design of the engagement methods.

She said that the second planning effort researched was the Richmond 300 plan, which created an advisory council to shape and review the content of the comprehensive plan as well as to build awareness and encourage community participation. She said that the Richmond 300 plan had an application for community members to serve on the council, and members were selected based on community demographics such as age, ethnicity, race, and place of residence. She said the American Planning Association, a professional association for urban planners, had adopted a code of ethics that focused on how planners serve diverse groups and how to recommend planning activities that integrated historic contexts, equity, and social justice.

Ms. Falkenstein stated that the engagement approach for phase 1 involved four major components. She said that the flow chart to the left of the slide illustrated the main elements of the County's engagement approach. She said the approach included internal staff, working groups, broad public engagement, and legislative review. She said each group would be supported by in-person and online outreach and communication.

Ms. Falkenstein stated that the engagement plan called for the creation of a team of interdepartmental leaders. She said the purpose of the team would be to coordinate planning efforts across local government divisions and departments and to assist in gathering input on the existing comprehensive plan and draft content. She said that external partners, such as the City of Charlottesville and UVA, and service providers, such as Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority and Albemarle County Service Authority, would support the team. She said that neighborhood planning staff would prepare work products to include a background report with a summary of existing conditions and a history of the comprehensive plan. She said the background report would inform the process and serve as the foundation for educational materials. She said there would be case study and precedent research on growth management and best practices to produce a draft growth management policy.

Ms. Falkenstein reported that the working group was an 8-to-12-person group of community members who would advise County staff on plan recommendations and community engagement approaches, and support community outreach efforts by sharing information with community networks, their neighborhoods, and their communities. She said the working group would meet approximately once a month and would include staff-led training on fundamentals of urban planning and community development content before beginning discussion of potential recommendations with policy options. She stated that the goal of integrating these trainings was to ensure that all members had a shared understanding and background information to inform the subsequent discussions.

Ms. Falkenstein said that in alignment with the engagement goals for the process, County staff in Planning, the Office of Equity and Inclusion, and in Communications and Public Engagement would use the County demographic data and equity profile to design an application and a selection process that was representative and inclusive of the County. She said staff had access to workgroup resources from other localities, such as Richmond, as she spoke about earlier, and the design efforts where they had used similar approaches in their design of the committee. She noted that they were going back to the Board of Supervisors with information sharing about this selection process in an upcoming Board meeting in December.

Ms. Falkenstein said the next topic of their engagement would focus on community workshops, where the broad public engagement would come into play. She said they would provide a variety of opportunities for community members to participate in the planning process through several workshops. She said these would provide opportunities to learn about existing conditions in the County and planning practices and for members of the community to provide input on potential policies and conceptual plans and review draft policies and plans.

Ms. Falkenstein said the formats and methods for the community workshops would include a variety of different content, topics, and designs. She said there would be virtual and in-person events with presentations, videos, and activities. She said they also envisioned pop-ups and roadshows at various locations throughout the County, online and paper questionnaires, artist or collaborator-led engagement events, and in-person and virtual meetings for specific interests or populations depending on the topic, with ongoing evaluation of engagement processes.

Ms. Falkenstein said that their last topic, legislative review, included engagement work with the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. She said they would facilitate work sessions with both groups to review policy and planning options, existing conditions data, community engagement summaries, and draft planning concepts and policies. She stated that work sessions would be held with the Board at the start and end of each phase to review comprehensive plan content and scope of work for the upcoming phase. She said the Planning Commission would have more frequent work sessions, perhaps two or three per phase; they were planning at least two for phase one.

Ms. Falkenstein said that all aspects of internal and external engagement would be supported by a robust communications and outreach plan, including an online website hub that was consistently updated with plan progress, upcoming engagement opportunities, summaries of past events, and educational materials. She said County staff would also utilize existing County outreach and communications tools, including the County newsletter via email, the social media accounts, and the networks of their working group. She stated that materials and engagement opportunities would be provided in both English and Spanish, with translation services for other languages made available as was possible and needed. She said that additionally, County staff would be available for one-on-one discussions in community outreach at reoccurring pop-ups at various locations throughout the County.

Ms. Falkenstein said that she would finally discuss the rationale for this approach. She said it first integrated the new organizational value of “community,” which stated that they expect diversity, equity, and inclusion to be integrated into how they lived their mission. She said second was that their engagement plan aligned with existing staff capacity and resources that the Board had agreed to allocate to this project within the Community Development work program and budget. She stated that third, the Board had stated the desire for a strategic update to the comprehensive plan with a phased approach. She said based on the Board and Planning Commission feedback, they had designed an engagement plan that offered the appropriate level of engagement to support the stated goal of the comprehensive plan update and the engagement goals that previously shared and the engagement goals that focused on resources and staff efforts on achieving those goals.

Ms. Falkenstein said the next steps for this project were to refine the working group selection criteria and process as she had mentioned. She said that would be a consent agenda item to the Board in December for them to sign off on, and then they would begin outreach in trying to recruit

for the working group. She said they would continue working on their capacity analysis and background research. She said in December of 2021, they would do outreach on the working group and have a live application for members of the community to apply, and in January 2022 would be the public kickoff where they would begin the broad public engagement on the comprehensive plan update.

Ms. Falkenstein said that there was now an opportunity to ask any questions there may be or to share feedback, especially related to content they thought should be focused on in the update process itself.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. Falkenstein if she were looking for input from the commissioners on broad topics, and if so, if they could pause that for tonight to give them some time to think about that more rigorously, and then come back and wrestle with it. He said people probably had things they wanted, but he knew there were two commissioners absent who would absolutely cherish the opportunity to be engaged in that kind of thought process.

Ms. Falkenstein stated that it was meant as an information sharing for the Planning Commission, but she was also open to suggestions if any came to mind as they were sharing that. She said the phasing process itself in the phasing plan and the engagement plan had already been kind of endorsed by the Board, and they had directed them to begin work on it, so there was not much they could change on those big pieces right now. She said if there were details that came to mind that should be focused on, they were definitely open to hearing that, and they could come back at a later time, though they did have two work sessions planned for phase one to come back to as well.

Mr. Bivins thanked her for that clarity.

Mr. Clayborne thanked Ms. Falkenstein for her presentation. He asked how fresh voices would be brought onto the advisory committees to ensure that it was not the same people on everything.

Ms. Falkenstein said that was a good question. She said an answer had not yet been fully detailed, but the staff was in the process of meeting with a team from the Office of Equity and Inclusion and Communications and Public Engagement offices. She said she suspected there would be targeted outreach to communities, a community engagement van would show up in neighborhoods, and flyers would be distributed among other methods to get the word out.

Mr. Clayborne said he had forgotten about the van.

Mr. Randolph said he recalled that there were 52 meetings of the Planning Commission during the previous deliberation and development process of the comprehensive plan. He said that two years into that process, there was an election that resulted in many new members of the Board of Supervisors. He said that the Planning Commission had provided a finished product to the Board, and the Board had revised the comprehensive plan without significant consultation with the Planning Commission. He said that the Commission had reviewed the final plan, but he did not believe there was a lot of discussion.

He said that there was an election scheduled during the process for the current update to the comprehensive plan. He said he was concerned that in the case of the election of a new Board, the new Board would want to significantly revise the comprehensive plan. He said he wanted to

see provisions for opportunities for the Board to consult with the Planning Commission if the Board desired to make significant revisions to the comprehensive plan. He said that he felt there was disconnect between what the Planning Commission had believed to be the final project and what the final product was after the Board had revised it. He said he was not criticizing the Board, and he thought the plan was better from the involvement of the new supervisors. He continued that it was difficult as Planning commissioners to have drastic revisions and not be included in the process.

Mr. Keller said he remembered that time as Mr. Randolph had. He said that when he joined the Planning Commission, most of the work on the comprehensive plan had been completed. He said that the commissioners who had joined at the same time as the new Board members had little input into the plan update. He said he thought there was a lot of doublespeak about equity and inclusion. He said that the groups of people who had been excluded from County decision-making processes were different from those who self-selected for these roles. He said that in Charlottesville, there was a movement to have more diverse voices at the beginning of the planning processes. He said that as the projects got closer to finalization, the traditional voices that had been heard had felt excluded and started to have input. He said that he hoped the County would provide a way for all the voices to speak to one another from the beginning. He said he was not sure a large committee to represent everybody was the right approach. He said he did not have an answer to that problem.

Mr. Bivins thanked the commissioners for their comments. He asked that there be time built in for the commissioners and supervisors to sit together and discuss the plan now, not once the plan had been nearly finalized, so that the discussion can be had before an endpoint was reached. He said that the supervisors should be made aware of the request to have multiple discussions between the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. He said that he hoped that a working group could be created that avoided the tension that was experienced around the Crozet Master Plan. He said it should be made clear who the decisionmakers were and that the working group can offer opinions and observations, but the process was ultimately legislative, and the decisions of the working group would not necessarily be included in the final plan. He said it was important to set this tone to avoid a negative experience. He said he understood there would be a time to sit down and talk with staff about the County's plans.

Mr. Rapp said he believed those opportunities would present themselves. He said the discussion was at a high level, and there was a lot to share about the process, phases, and topics. He said policies would be reviewed in phase 1, such as the growth management policy. He said the approach would help keep the County on track to prevent revisions to the final product. He said if the policies and framework were agreed upon, then the community, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors could work together to produce a final product.

Mr. Bivins said there were no more questions, so Mr. Rapp could begin his presentation on zoning ordinances.

Mr. Rapp said that the zoning ordinances were undergoing a first phase called modernization. He said two ordinances had been brought to the Commission through resolutions of intent that dealt with density and waivers and special exceptions. He said two more were part of the category that examined land uses, and the land uses for each zoning category would be consolidated into a chart, and the uses would be simplified. He said that the current chart was 16 pages long with very specific uses outlined.

Mr. Rapp stated that the setbacks would be reexamined. He said that the setbacks were complicated, with multiple approaches in each zoning classification, and they should be made clearer for people applying the ordinances. He said those topics would come before the Commission soon. He said that development regulations such as landscaping, lighting, and road standards, would be worked through as they were approached in the comprehensive plan. He said a consultant would be hired to assist in examining the ordinances, and each topic would come before the Planning Commission for input.

Mr. Bivins said there were no comments, and that since Mr. Rapp was just providing an update, the meeting would keep moving. He asked if Ms. Falkenstein had gotten the feedback that she needed. Mr. Bivins thanked Mr. Rapp for his work.

### **Committee Reports**

Mr. Keller said he had updates from MPO Tech, stating that there was a needs assessment for transportation that was a joint House Bill 542 and 2021 that passed. He said there were people in various agencies working on the assessment, and there was a large transit equity component in the assessment. He said the findings would be presented to the legislature at the next legislative sessions. He said the fact that a former transportation secretary who had worked for Democrats and Republicans was in the governor elect's cabinet boded well for transportation. He said that it would be useful to have the Smart Scale rating changes explained to the Commission.

Mr. Keller said he understood under the new scoring that the County would not have received three of the projects it had received under Smart Scale. He said the projects would have likely been funded because of the additional revenue, but it was detrimental to the areas that did not have a large urban population. He said that besides changing criteria, shrinking the buffer may benefit pedestrian and bicycle ways, but it could have a detrimental impact on the funding because it looked at a smaller area and excluded potential points. He said there would be an interesting payback to rural areas in the next administration, and new members would be appointed to the transportation committee boards. He said that the new criteria would be approved while the administration was in place and would be the standards for the next Smart Scale round.

Mr. Rapp said that Mr. Chuck Proctor would be the person to speak on the topic.

Mr. Keller said it was a 20-minute presentation, and he assumed the Commission would have another 20 minutes of questions. He said there were staff shortages, so some of the studies were to be pushed out longer.

Mr. Randolph said he thought it was a good idea for Mr. Proctor to speak to the Commission and the Board of Supervisors at a joint meeting.

Mr. Bivins said that would be important. He said that the Commonwealth had focused on chokepoints in traffic, and the chokepoints lined up where the infrastructure had not kept pace with the population movements. He said that a presentation he heard stated that the Commonwealth would be funding the places where people were stuck in traffic. He said that none of the criteria made it seem like funding would be coming to the County, even though there was commerce through I-64 and I-81. He said that the recalibration of Smart Scale was about how people were stuck in cars.



Mr. Keller said that made sense, and the increased difficulty to get projects funded should be considered.

Mr. Bivins asked if there were more committee reports. He then introduced the next agenda item.

### **Old Business/New Business**

Mr. Bivins said there was new business. He asked if the Commission was meeting next week.

Mr. Rapp said that there were no public hearings scheduled at this time.

Mr. Bivins asked if any commissioner wanted to meet the next week. He asked to confirm that the Commission did not need to vote to not meet.

Mr. Herrick said that if there was no business to come before the Commission, then there was no need to meet.

Mr. Bivins said he did not have a calendar in front of him. He asked when the Commission should meet again.

Mr. Rapp said the next meeting was on December 07, 2021. He said there were three public hearings scheduled for that day. He there was another meeting on December 14. He said that there were already requests for January and February public hearings. He said that scheduling usually happened in January, but he might have to start earlier to accommodate the requests to work through the volume. He said he might propose possible January meeting dates at one of the December meetings before the 12-month calendar was finalized.

Mr. Bivins said that seemed fine.

Mr. Keller said that there was a statement made in the MPO Tech Committee about 1,700 new homes that would come before the Planning Commission. He said that was primarily three projects, and two of the projects fell under the category for significant VDOT review, implying the opportunity for developer concessions that might alleviate the transportation issues that existed or were exacerbated by the development. He said the County had had smaller projects where it had not been able to get impact fees from the developers. He said that the number of houses was over 2,000 when the Southwood development was added and did not include the North Pointe development. He said that for all the talk of no housing, it was a lot of units.

Mr. Rapp said there was quite a bit at the southern and northern ends of the County, and the amount on both ends was under review.

Mr. Keller asked if the number was closer to 4,000.

Mr. Rapp responded that he did not have the exact number. He said if some of the larger projects were added together, the number would be in the 3,000 range.

Mr. Keller said there was so much pressure to build. He asked if it would be helpful to share what developments were in the pipeline publicly.

Mr. Rapp said that most of the projects were rezonings, so they were not yet approved. He said that the projects had been submitted and were under review. He said there was a community meeting for Southwood coming up, and that had not been brought to the Commission. He said there were other rezonings in various phases. He said that was part of the backlog that the Commission would address over the next months.

Mr. Keller said that it would be interesting to show people the reality of the projects when people claimed that there was no development taking place. He said it did not have to be site specific. He said that he wanted to publicly announce what was in the pipeline for housing development.

Mr. Rapp said that could happen.

Mr. Bivins asked for additional business. He said that the Commission would not meet the following week. He said that they would meet again on December 7. He told everyone to be safe.

### **Adjournment**

The Planning Commission adjourned its meeting at 8:20 p.m.



---

Charles Rapp, Director of Planning

(Recorded by Carolyn S. Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission & Boards; transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 12/08/2021
Initials: CSS