

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, began at 2:30 p.m. in Room 235 on October 11, 2006, and the regularly scheduled night meeting began at 6:00 p.m. in the Lane Auditorium, County Office Building on McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

PRESENT: Mr. Ken C. Boyd, Mr. Lindsay G. Dorrier, Jr., Mr. Dennis S. Rooker, Mr. David Slutzky, Ms. Sally H. Thomas and Mr. David C. Wyant.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Robert W. Tucker, Jr., County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Carey, and Director of Planning, V. Wayne Cilimberg.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m., by the Chairman, Mr. Rooker.

---

Agenda Item No. 2a. Presentation: Web-Based GIS Application, Tex Weaver.

Mr. Tex Weaver, Manager, Office of Geographic Data Services, Community Development Department, addressed the Board. He said staff has worked on a GIS website for approximately one year, with the assistance of a consultant. They deployed the GIS web application internally in 2006 for County staff's use. Staff can simply type the word "intranet" and access the web site. He said the application was designed to save the County money by not having to buy multiple licenses for GIS information. The second benefit is that one database merges data such as real estate assessments, development tracking, etc. Through this system the common area is combined with interactive mapping. He pointed out a search function that allows a user to search the database by address, owner name, parcel number, subdivision name, and recent sales information. The Real Estate Department's database will soon be online as well as the Development Department's Tracking system.

Mr. Weaver noted that there are some navigation tools, including an advanced search function, a new address search function, and a location search. He said this information is available in one source that combines other existing databases, providing information on land use, Comprehensive Plan designations, school systems, environmental information, etc. He showed an example of making a query by subdivision and interacting with a map.

Ms. Thomas asked if the system also shows what is planned in a given area. Mr. Weaver said the Development Tracking System which is coming online soon will allow the user to interact with proposals and types of development occurring, as well as fire & rescue response areas, individual structure locations and addresses, contour data, etc. Conservation easements and other pertinent items pertaining to a particular property are flagged, including planned activities.

Mr. Rooker asked if planned roads and sidewalks were noted. Mr. Weaver said it is staff's intent to create a tool they can use to help make educational decisions that can also be used by the public. Staff can certainly add functionality.

Mr. Slutzky asked if there is a feedback loop so that citizens can inform staff as to what is missing or to ask questions. Mr. Weaver replied that through the "help" function and the "frequently asked questions" function, people can interact with staff.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Public Relations Manager, pointed out that there will be a user guide to help the public use the system. Mr. Tucker said staff is ready to get this system out to the public if the Board agrees the time is appropriate.

Ms. Thomas commented that a constituent of hers moved to Albemarle after being stalked in another locality, and was told the County did not have the technical capability to suppress her address. Mr. Weaver said there is nothing on this site that can't be found through information that is public – such as on Google.com, etc. He said having alternate identities helps separate a property from one's personal information.

Mr. Rooker said that he doesn't see how the County could keep that type of information out of a public information database. Mr. Weaver responded that technically it is possible to remove data elements.

Mr. Davis mentioned that Fairfax County made it impossible to search for a property by owner name, adding that Albemarle's new database is not much different than the real estate database that is currently part of the system. He added that all of this information is available through records at the Courthouse.

Mr. Weaver explained that when the development community submits a plat or plan, the Real Estate Division – which is charged with redrawing property boundaries on the tax maps – has a much higher degree of accuracy with the newer map base than "eyeballing" it as they used to do.

Mr. Davis said the data is only as good as the data put in, and in the County there are tax maps that might not accurately reflect acreage; as development happens and new surveys are done, that data is picked up accurately. There is a lot of information in the system that may not be reality, as far as boundaries, acreage and parcels.

Mr. Slutzky suggested having a scale standard for surveys so that the new information could be more easily absorbed. Mr. Davis said he thinks that is happening already.

Mr. Weaver said staff will start working with the Information Technology Department immediately to get this system completed in the hope of having it done by the end of the year.

---

Agenda Item No. 2b. Citizen Survey, Thomas M. Guterbock, Ph.D., Director of Center for Survey Research.

Mr. Tom Guterbock, University of Virginia Center for Survey Research, addressed the Board. He said that the Center did a Citizens' Survey in 2002, 2004 and 2006 to get views on the quality of life in Albemarle County, to evaluate County services, and to measure effectiveness. The most recent survey included a telephone survey of 787 residents of Albemarle, with a margin of error of +/- 3.6 percent. Many of the questions were new, and households without phones or with cell phones only were not included; questions were presented on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the most positive. The respondents rated the quality of life as 8.04 mean, up a little bit from 1994, with 73 percent of residents rating it an 8, 9 or 10. The survey asked where people had moved from, and over half came from areas outside of Virginia – 10 percent from Charlottesville, many from Fluvanna and Louisa, and 10 percent from Northern Virginia/Maryland.

Mr. Slutzky asked how many of those people had moved to Albemarle in the last two years. Mr. Guterbock replied around 20 percent.

Mr. Rooker added that people also move away, and pass away.

Mr. Guterbock reported that 40 percent of those surveyed moved here for employment reasons, 16 percent moved here for quality of life, some moved here for family reasons, and some for available facilities such as medical facilities/hospitals. The most important items, as indicated by about 400 surveyed citizens, were: quality of schools and education, rescue & fire services, water resources. Items that did not rank as high in terms of devoting County resources to were: promoting tourism (39 percent), cultural and entertainment, and learning opportunities for adults.

Mr. Guterbock indicated that 96 percent of citizens were satisfied overall with the services they get from local government, which is consistent with other years, and is actually 12 percent higher than in 1994 but the same as in 2004. He said the County is holding steady in satisfaction with services overall. He mentioned that the satisfaction "winners" were public safety, fire protection, emergency rescue, and how safe people feel in their areas of residence. He added that library services rated high in citizen satisfaction with County services, as did historical preservation (93 percent). He noted that 44 percent of those surveyed were dissatisfied with efforts to manage growth, public transportation, affordable housing, and affordable childcare. Recycling efforts also brought low marks for citizen satisfaction with County services.

Mr. Guterbock said 92 percent of citizens surveyed were satisfied with education services in the County. He also reported that nothing in the realm of citizen satisfaction has really gone down, and several items went up significantly – ease of using public transportation (up from 46 percent to 55 percent), economic growth (up from 70 percent to 77 percent), and water resources (71 percent to 79 percent).

Mr. Guterbock said that using a GAP analysis to see if rank of importance and satisfaction correspond, safety/fire protection and public facilities rank high in both so they match, but education ranks high in satisfaction but not in level of importance. Water resources ranked 17th in satisfaction, but Number 4 in priority. He added that fair property assessments ranked eighth in importance, but only 25th in satisfaction, and quality of life dealing with growth and development ranked ninth in importance but 23rd in satisfaction. He indicated that there is also a gap in infrastructure priority satisfaction.

Mr. Guterbock presented a "priority matrix," and illustrated where the County's strengths are – public safety, education, libraries, parks, and services to the elderly; priorities that the public thinks are important but are ranked low in citizen satisfaction – citizen input on the development process, water, concerns with the environment, the County's infrastructure, fairness of property tax assessments, and ability to maintain quality of life as the County grows. Managing growth and recycling rank medium in importance, but low in satisfaction.

Mr. Guterbock said 41 percent of citizens surveyed indicated they had contacted the County for some reason in the last year – primarily for police, finance, and community development – and 79 percent are satisfied with the County efforts to keep the public informed, with 78 percent of residents satisfied with their experience in making contact with the County. Regarding the County's growth policies of limiting development in the rural areas and directing growth into the urban ring, he said that number is holding steady, with about 70 percent thinking it is a good plan. Most of those surveyed want to keep the tax rates/service levels the same, and 85 percent indicated they are satisfied with the value they get for their tax dollars.

Mr. Rooker thanked Dr. Guterbock for the excellent survey.

Ms. Catlin stated that this survey is available on the Albemarle website.

(**Note:** The Board took a brief recess before convening to the joint meeting with the School Board.)

---

Agenda Item No. 3. JOINT MEETING WITH SCHOOL BOARD.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Sue Bell Friedman, Pamela Moynihan, Diantha McKeel, Barbara Massie Mouly, Jon Stokes, Steve Koleszar, and Brian Wheeler.

ABSENT: None.

STAFF PRESENT: Pam Moran, Superintendent, Kimberly Suyes, Director of Human Resources, Lorna Gerome, Manager of Compensation and Benefits, and Pam Carter, Loss Control Manager.

---

Agenda Item No. 3a. Total Compensation Report; budget development projections for FY '06-07 and proposed Wellness Initiatives.

Ms. Suyes addressed both Boards, stating that the adopted Compensation Strategy aims to attract and retain high-performing employees, reward performance, and maintain internal equity and external competitiveness. She noted that 30 organizations are focused on in the market, and the strategy is to target the base salary at 100 percent of the market median, and target benefits slightly above market levels. Regarding teacher compensation, the County has targeted the top quartile, and positions recruited nationally and regionally were targeted in a subset that took into account some cost-of-living considerations. There are four pieces to the strategy – survey the 30 organizations in the market, analyze the data to see where the County stands, look at WorldatWork projections, and then provide projections for scale and salary adjustments to the Boards.

Ms. Suyes said it is important that the County retain its competitiveness with scale. In the past year, there was a 2.5 percent scale adjustment and a 3.95 percent merit increase; for teachers there was a range of 3.65 percent to 11.5 percent. She explained that the range was used because those percentages had to be assigned at various steps rather than across-the-board. The classified scale started at 0.26 percent below market, and Albemarle County gave a 2.5 percent increase. Other markets gave a 3.0 percent increase making the County fall to 0.75 percent behind. With salary increases, she reported that the County started 0.30 percent below market and gave 3.95 percent but the market gave 4.0 percent, making the County fall to 0.35 percent below. She emphasized that the County is doing very well planning for the adjustments. The teacher strategy is to target the top quartile and that resulted in better results last year, but now with the “moving target,” Albemarle has fallen out of the top quartile.

Mr. Slutzky asked if there is a way to correlate salaries with the County's tax rate. Ms. Suyes said that data can be run; she thinks a cost-of-living factor would need to be included. In considering teacher salaries the goal was not met at 10, 15 and 20 years. WorldatWork salary increase data is projected 2.8 percent, with Albemarle recommending 3.65 percent for FY 2007-08.

Ms. Suyes explained that the Human Resources Department is recommending a 3.0 percent salary scale increase, and 4.0 percent for merit. In response to Mr. Slutzky's question about the accuracy of WorldatWork data, she said the benchmark has usually been on target, with the exception of the 9th to the 11th year. She said a 3.65 percent increase is recommended for teachers to include the step and scale and to continue to target \$1,000 above minimum and increase competitiveness in the top quartile. She added that they would also like to continue the lump sum longevity increase for employees at the 30-year step.

Ms. Suyes said regarding benefits, the strategy is to target slightly above market, adding that the County's medical plan is attractive with three options for employees. She said a 10 percent increase is anticipated for FY 2007-08. National averages are close to 12 or 13 percent. The County is looking at some major initiatives for health and wellness.

Ms. Suyes said the next issue is that of retiree health insurance. She presented information on the gap in benefits coverage for those employees who retire before age 60; the Board's contribution only goes for five years. She said market data does not support putting dollars toward additional retiree benefits; most organizations are actually looking at reducing those benefits. New accounting regulations mean there are cost implications involved and Human Resources is not recommending additional health insurance coverage for retirees.

Mr. Slutzky said the County has to weigh the competing objectives of attraction and retention of people already in the system versus taking care of the people who have been in the system. Ms. Suyes replied that the main priority of Human Resources is employee recruitment and retention. She would prefer that the County have a deferred compensation program with an employer match. She emphasized that Albemarle would be on the leading edge if they did that, as it is uncommon for the government/public sector to offer such a program.

Mr. Boyd said he believes those persons holding law enforcement positions should be considered differently, given the nature of those positions.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the State's LEO Office provides an additional \$900 each year for law enforcement retirees.

Mr. Boyd said when that was put in place, skyrocketing health costs were not considered.

Mr. Rooker said he is not interested in programs that encourage people to retire at age 50.

Mr. Boyd said the question is whether the County wants to encourage police officers to stay until they are age 60 or older. Ms. Suyes mentioned that police can retire earlier than that. Mr. Foley, Assistant County Executive, clarified that police officers can retire with 25 years of service at age 50 with full benefits. Ms. Suyes said Human Resources do not support doing it for one group of employees and not for all employees.

Mr. Rooker said the County targets benefits above market, and decisions shouldn't be made piecemeal to address the needs of individual groups.

Mr. Boyd said with Albemarle paying 10 or 12 percent above the median for benefits, there's a reason other markets are paying more for salaries. Ms. Suyes commented that she recently attended a Virginia Association of School Personnel conference, and learned that the private sector offers considerably higher benefit packages in comparison to the County's.

Mr. Boyd said regarding those localities in the market comparison pool, they may have made the decision to put more money into salaries than benefits. He thinks it is important to compare similar organizations. Ms. Suyes said the 30 market comparison organizations don't always want to contribute their data, and Human Resources have had difficulty getting it sometimes.

Mr. Rooker said that there is no reason to keep staff bringing forward more information when they have already recommended not providing benefits just to specific groups. He said it's almost "budget madness" to pull out individual groups and treat them differently.

Mr. Dorrier said the mortality study he shared with the other Board members shows police officers die sooner than other parts of the populations, and he thinks that means they should be entitled to greater support from the public sector.

Mr. Rooker said the study showed they had a higher mortality rate on the job, but not necessarily after they retired.

Ms. Suyes noted that using a \$45,000 salary, an unclassified employee such as a teacher would receive an annual \$33,439 upon retirement including VERIP; a classified employee would receive \$32,539; a public safety officer would receive \$39,415. She said the difference is that police officers are eligible for full retirement with 25 years of service instead of 30 years for other employees.

Mr. Dorrier said he doesn't feel it adequately covers the gap because of medical expenses, noting that the City provides that coverage. Ms. Suyes stated that they used to do that for all employees, but no longer do it for anyone, in response to national trends.

Mr. Dorrier **moved** to appropriate funds to compensate those Albemarle County police officers who retired within the past 10 years, to cover the gap in their insurance. Mr. Slutzky **seconded** the motion, which failed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Dorrier.

NAYS: Mr. Rooker, Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant and Mr. Boyd.

---

Mr. Boyd asked if the \$200,000 earmarked for this expense goes back into the Board's Reserve Fund. Mr. Tucker confirmed that it will.

Ms. Suyes reiterated that the recommendation from Human Resources staff was for a three percent scale increase for classified employees, a four percent merit for classified employees, and a 3.65 percent increase for teachers. For benefits, staff still wants to budget for a 10 percent increase in benefit costs.

Ms. Suyes said that during the three-year review of the County employee structure, they look at an internal review of all positions, looking at compression and living wage issues, but compression has not been a significant concern.

Mr. Koleszar stated that compression has not been an issue because the scale is moved a little bit every year.

Mr. Wheeler asked when bus driver salaries were reviewed. Ms. Gerome responded that they were reviewed in 2005. Ms. Suyes said they have done extensive reviews on bus driver pay, and would be happy to share that with everyone.

Mr. Koleszar said he thinks the issue of absenteeism needs to be looked at. Ms. Suyes said there are many strategies to address that. She noted that Human Resources are looking at employee recognition as part of the Total Rewards program, which has been successful on the Local Government side. There has been a pay-for-performance program that has also been successful on the Local Government side, and school employees have now been trained on it.

Mr. Rooker asked how much has been budgeted for the employee recognition program. Ms. Gerome said that \$87 per employee has been allocated by department.

Mr. Rooker commented that it helps to know where you're getting your best return when making budget decisions. Ms. Suyes said that the skilled competency differentials are paid for value rather than merit.

---

Ms. Suyes introduced Ms. Pam Carter, resident nurse and the Manager of Health Care and Safety.

Ms. Carter said she has been an Occupational Health Nurse for 20 years. She was given the task of looking for a good comprehensive wellness program for employees. That initiative falls in line with cost containment; the program she has devised is a five-phase program. She said 80 percent of an organization's health care cost is targeted at 20 percent of employees, emphasizing that it is a lot cheaper to keep someone healthy than to treat them.

Ms. Carter explained that she is estimating 2,000 out of 3,000 employees will participate. A health-risk appraisal will be done on employees including a family history, current health factors, fasting lab work for blood glucose and cholesterol levels, height and weight, etc. Phase two involves summary data that shows where employees are on the scale and what they need to improve. Phase three is a wellness coaching program that involves a telephone meeting with an employee once a week to set goals and talk about challenges; she said it really works and addresses things such as smoking and diabetes. She reported that phase four includes things such as the mobile mammography units, flu shots, and subsidizing wellness memberships for employees where the County has group options. Phase five is evaluating needs and looking at compensation dollars, then reporting back to everyone involved on how the plan is going and if it might need to be changed.

Mr. Boyd asked about the \$227,000 allocated for this program. Ms. Suyes said Phase One would cost \$68,500; Phase Three would cost \$151,000; and Phase Four would cost \$8,000.

Mr. Dorrier asked if there is any incentive to get people to participate in the program. Ms. Carter responded that they are looking at that as part of Phase Five. Ms. Suyes commented that the County could probably save significant money by offering in-house care, instead of contracting out to other providers.

Mr. Rooker estimated total budgeted medical costs per employee at \$6,000 per employee totaling something like \$18 million. He said this \$227,000 is very small in comparison, and might reduce overall costs over the long-term.

Ms. McKeel asked if this program is for all employees. Ms. Suyes replied that it is.

Ms. McKeel asked about the mammography unit. Ms. Carter explained that that is run through the University of Virginia Hospital and is covered through insurance.

Ms. McKeel asked about the blood pressure machine costs, expressing concern that there is a committee choosing this. Ms. Carter responded that she is trying to use other organizations' data to see what has worked and what hasn't.

Mr. Rooker asked if money has already been budgeted. Mr. Tucker stated that it is already allocated in the Reserve Fund.

Ms. Suyes pointed out that the fire and rescue department in Dallas, Texas, just received an award for their health and wellness initiatives, and they are working with Albemarle County as partners. She said there has been a lot of grant money for health and wellness improvements, but there is no facility to handle 3,000 employees, so it is based instead on incentives.

Mr. Dorrier mentioned that a new YMCA building at PVCC is to be constructed in the next few years. Ms. Carter said that not everyone has the same way of exercising, so the key is providing options.

Mr. Slutzky suggested collaborating with the City to get better group rates.

Mr. Boyd said he thinks it is important to have a measuring tool to show that the program has been successful. He would like to see specific goals set especially as related to cost savings, and would like to see that information within a year.

Ms. Suyes said for a while, claims were running low, but right after that there were a few months with high claims. She noted that the Health Care Committee met and unanimously approved moving forward with this wellness initiative.

Mr. Slutzky **moved** to allocate the \$227,500 for the health and wellness initiative. Ms. Thomas **seconded** the motion. She commented that she began work on this type of initiative in 1979. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.  
NAYS: None.

---

Ms. McKeel **moved** to support the recommendations brought forward, numbers 1 through 7 as listed in the Executive Summary (set out below).

- 1) 3.0 percent increase in the classified salary scale.
- 2) 4.0 percent merit increase for classified staff.
- 3) Fund teacher increases to reach and/or maintain top quartile (including 3.65%) to be distributed along the scale.
- 4) Continuation of a longevity increase for teachers.
- 5) Anticipate a 10 percent increase in medical plan costs.
- 6) Anticipate a 5.0 percent increase in dental plan costs.
- 7) Approve \$227,500 for wellness initiatives to be funded out of health care reserves.

Mr. Wheeler **seconded** the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

---

Mr. Rooker said he had talked several times with Ms. Suyes about having a “benefits paycheck” one that shows what an employee receives in benefits in addition to salary. Ms. Suyes said that is part of the online system, and will eventually become a part of Access Albemarle.

Mr. Slutzky said that is different from providing a paper statement. Ms. Gerome said it can be printed on paper and given to employees.

Ms. Friedman commented that the School Board has also wanted that spelled out for employees.

---

Agenda Item No. 3b. Matters not listed on the Agenda.

Ms. Lorna Gerome said a “living wage” is an annual income amount designed so that an individual working full-time can meet some of their basic needs. She said the Economic Policy Institute looks at different categories of needs – housing, health care, transportation, child care – and has estimated that the living wage for this region is \$10.72 per hour. The Federal Living Wage Responsibility Act also looks at expenses and needs, and some of the cost-of-living in an area and they designated the living wage as \$9.62 per hour. She added that the University and the City of Charlottesville implemented \$9.37 per hour. It has gone up for the City to \$9.75 per hour and the University is planning on increasing theirs to \$9.75. She said the costs were preliminary costs, and staff applied a compression model to take the midpoint of the range with the living wage being a starting point.

Mr. Rooker asked how many people would be affected by moving to a living wage. Ms. Gerome replied that 250 employees would have a pay increase by moving to the \$9.75 per hour, with 89 of those currently below that level. She emphasized that to avoid compression, other employees would have to have their pay increased. She added that these costs don't include the cost of benefits such as FICA and VRS.

Mr. Boyd asked how benefits would be treated. He said there is a 30 percent benefits package used at organizations like the University. Ms. Gerome said the County would probably add 30 percent for benefits, but the numbers presented take into account that there will be some employer contribution to health. She noted that \$10.72 per hour is above two pay grades, and right now there is a 60 percent spread in salary structure and this would push the bottom steps much closer together.

Mr. Wheeler commented that the goal for the County should be self-sufficiency.

Ms. Friedman said the question is how to rectify the current strategy with a new one, and staff needs direction from both Boards on how they want to proceed. Ms. Suyes said prior to this strategy being put in place, people argued about the data being used, and the question now is how to work within this strategy that's market-based. She agreed with Ms. Friedman's suggestion to have the Boards come back with some options.

Mr. Rooker asked how long it would take to move this forward once the Boards developed suggestions. Ms. Suyes said she was not sure how long it would take to turn those into actual budget items.

Mr. Boyd commented that Albemarle was giving its part-time bus drivers full-time wages. Ms. Suyes said that was a retention strategy that seemed to work.

Ms. Moynihan said she would appreciate more information on how benefits would be factored in with the living wage, and would like to see some strategies for that.

Mr. Slutzky said he would like to start with the premise of determining whether the Boards support the concept of a living wage.

Ms. Thomas said she doubts any of the Board members could come up with the dollar figure right now.

Mr. Slutzky agreed, but added that staff should come back with a determination of the living wage standard.

Mr. Rooker replied that staff has already brought forward three numbers, with \$9.75 per hour being what Charlottesville and the University are using.

Mr. Wheeler commented that he would be quite disappointed if this wasn't included in the School's next budget.

Mr. Koleszar added that it's important to have a strategy for this now, so that in the next year or two it can be folded in without a lot of hassles.

Mr. Tucker suggested that instead of another meeting, that a representative from each Board meet with County staff and bring it back for budget submittal.

Ms. Suyes said it will slow down the process if they abandon their current strategy. There has to be an answer where we don't move to a non-market based driven strategy.

Mr. Slutzky agreed to serve as the Board liaison for the effort. Mr. Wheeler agreed to represent the School Board.

Ms. Thomas said the Boards need to set policy, with staff doing the technical work. She thinks the Board wants to pay the lowest-paid employees a living wage that is competitive in this community and also fits some kind of moral barometer and one which the Board can feel good about.

Mr. Slutzky said if the competitive market is not committed to paying a wage less than a living wage, in his mind that does not satisfy the objective.

Ms. Suyes confirmed that the Boards are directing staff to figure out a way to pay the lowest-paid employees a living wage and present a way to integrate it with the current strategy; and establish a market-based approach to target the lowest-paid employees.

Mr. Rooker said a market-based approach might be different.

Mr. Koleszar said he has a philosophical belief that there needs to be a living wage.

Ms. Friedman said there needs to be a determination first as to what that living wage is.

Mr. Rooker said the committee needs to come back with information on how to look at this from a market standpoint, what the best recommendation is for a living wage, and hopefully the Boards can make a decision at that time.

Ms. Thomas said she has an aversion to sending staff off to work because the Board can't make a decision.

Mr. Rooker said he would support the \$9.75 per hour wage recommendation, as that is a good indication of the market.

Mr. Slutzky said he would support the \$9.75 per hour for this budget cycle, but would also like to have a dialogue about what the standard for determining a living wage is.

Ms. Friedman said she thinks it is important to begin.

Mr. Boyd said he would support the \$9.75 per hour, but there are a lot of differences between the University and the County.

Mr. Slutzky **moved** to commit to a \$9.75 hourly wage in the upcoming budget cycle for the lowest paid full-time employee, and to reach out to the City and University to begin a dialogue to come up with a definition for "living wage." There was no second to the motion, but all Board members agreed that the \$9.75 per hour would be used as a planning tool for FY 2007-08 budget guidance.

Both Boards adjourned the joint meeting.

---

Agenda Item No. 4. Recess. At 5:32 p.m., the Board recessed.

Agenda Item No. 5. Reconvene. At 6:05 p.m., the meeting was called back to order by the Chairman, Mr. Rooker, in the Lane Auditorium.

---

Agenda Item No. 6. Pledge of Allegiance.  
Agenda Item No. 7. Moment of Silence.

---

Agenda Item No. 8. From the Public: Matters not listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Mr. Tom Loach addressed the Board, saying he noticed that the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority has received a grant to study water in Crozet and in Scottsville. One of the reasons given was because of a change in population in Crozet from 12,000 to 24,000. He stated that no one in Crozet has

acquiesced to the new higher number, nor has anyone on staff provided him with any rationale as to why that number is higher.

---

Ms. Nancy Hurrelbrinck, representing Charlottesville Peak Oil, addressed the Board. She reported that in the book *The Long Emergency* by James Howard Kunzler, he observed signs that global oil production is peaking and alternative energy sources cannot fill the gap. She said the book purports that without cheap oil, the U.S. economy will have to make a long and painful transition to re-localize manufacturing, agriculture and energy production. A major recession seems likely, complete with widespread unemployment, food shortages and housing foreclosures. She learned that there are two dozen books on the subject, which all point to the same conclusion. She said our lovely, cushy lifestyle can't last much longer. She emphasized that the sooner we prepare the better shape we will be in.

---

Mr. Ted Millich addressed the Board on behalf of Charlottesville Peak Oil. He stated that sustainable technologies are no panacea, but are merely one piece of the puzzle. He said oil is packed with energy and is easy to move, and nothing can replace its convenience. He stated that we may be lucky to replace one-fourth of that energy with alternatives, and the only solution is to reduce energy use. He said we can seize this opportunity to choose to do it. As leaders, he hopes the Board feels compelled to pursue this path.

---

Ms. Anne Mercer addressed the Board, also on behalf of Charlottesville Peak Oil. She reported that in Kinsale, Ireland, a man named Rob Hopkins led townspeople in an "Energy Descent Action Plan." The Kinsale group produced a vision of how life could be in an energy-depleted future and developed a timeline for achieving that vision by 2021. That Kinsale group has become the "gourmet capital of Ireland," and the production of food is being shifted into an organic food supply by that year, having it become more of the town's life – with community gardens, honey, fish, vegetables, etc.

---

Agenda Item No. 9. Consent Agenda Mr. Slutzky **moved** for approval of Items 9.1 through 9.4, and to accept the remaining items on the Consent Agenda for information. Mr. Dorrier **seconded** the motion, which passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.  
NAYS: None.

---

Item 9.1. Approval of Minutes: May 3, 2006.

Mr. Boyd had read the minutes of May 3, 2006, Pages 1 – 16, and found them to be in order as presented.

**By the recorded vote set out above, the minutes which had been read were approved.**

---

Item 9.2. FY 2007 Budget Appropriation.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that Code of Virginia §15.2-2507 stipulates that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the current fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget. However, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget or the sum of \$500,000, whichever is lesser, must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The total of this requested additional FY 2007 appropriation is \$100,000.00. It is anticipated that a budget amendment will be proposed in November, 2006 and these appropriations would be incorporated into it. This request involves the approval of one new FY 2007 appropriation (Appropriation No. 2007-026, \$100,000.00). The Department of Criminal Justice Services has awarded the Commission on Children and Families a grant in the amount of \$100,000. This grant will provide training and the implementation of the family functional therapy program. This will include staff training, manuals, and treatment services for the participants. There is no local match.) Staff recommends approval of the FY 2007 Appropriation No. 2007-026.

**By the recorded vote set out above, the Board approved of this budget amendment and Appropriation No. 2007-026, as set out in full below.**

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE  
APPROPRIATION NO. 2007-026  
DATE: 10/11/06  
EXPLANATION: JJDP Intervention Grant

TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	DESCRIPTION	SUB LEDGER		GENERAL LEDGER	
					CODE	AMOUNT	DEBIT	CREDIT
2	1572	24000	240500	Revenue - State	J2	100,000.00		
1	1572	53157	312105	Consulting	J1	45,700.00		
1	1572	53157	550100	Travel/Training	J1	15,300.00		
1	1572	53157	580000	Miscellaneous Expenses	J1	36,000.00		
1	1572	53157	600100	Supplies	J1	3,000.00		

1572	0501	Est. Revenue	100,000.00		
1572	0701	Appropriation		100,000.00	
			TOTAL	200,000.00	100,000.00

Item 9.3. 2006 Primary Road Improvement Priorities (Deferred from October 4, 2006).

**By the recorded vote set out above, the Board approved the following list as its 2006 Primary Road Improvement Priorities:**

**ALBEMARLE COUNTY RECOMMENDED PRIORITIES FOR SYIP,  
 FOR PRIMARY ROAD, TRANSIT AND ENHANCEMENT IMPROVEMENTS  
 (OCTOBER, 2006)**

The following are Albemarle County's priorities for each allocation of TEA-21 and each sub-allocation of the Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. Attachment A provides a more detailed explanation of the priority projects.

- I. Surface Transportation Program (STP Projects)  
 Undertake projects in The CHART–UnJam 2025 Regional Transportation Study (adopted May 3, 2004). These Include:
  1. Construct Meadow Creek Parkway from Route 250 Bypass to Rio Road, including the interchange at the Route 250 Bypass. The CTB should make every effort to provide adequate funding and resources to maintain the current construction schedule;
  2. Improvements to Route 29 North Corridor:
    - a. Funding of 29H250 Phase II Study, Option B design recommendations;
    - b. Widening improvements to Route 29 North--construct third lane on northbound and southbound lanes, from South Fork Rivanna River;
    - c. Construct Hillsdale Drive extension from Hydraulic Road to Greenbrier Drive in the City of Charlottesville; and
    - d. Construct Berkmar Drive extension.
  3. Widening of Route 20 south, from I-64 to Mill Creek Drive, including bike lanes and sidewalks.
  4. Improvements to Route 250:
    - a. Improve two intersections on Route 250 West: the Tilman Road Intersection (Route 676) and the Owensville Road intersection (Route 678). Otherwise, maintain the current two-lane road configuration from the Bypass to Yancey Mills;
    - b. Improve Route 250 East corridor as recommended in the Pantops Neighborhood Plan (improvements to interchange, pedestrian crossings, parallel road and new bridge/crossing at Rivanna River); and
    - c. Improve Route 250 West from Emmet Street to the Route 29/250 Bypass.
  5. Improve Route 240 in accord with the recommendations of the Crozet Master Plan:
    - a. Implement sidewalk plan (per Downtown Sidewalk and Parking Study and Crozet Master Plan);
    - b. Create bike lanes to and in downtown;
    - c. Construct Eastern Avenue, to include the Lickinghole Bridge and a railroad crossing; and
    - d. Construct Main Street east from Crozet Avenue.
  6. Widen Route 20 North, from Route 250 to Elks Drive/Fontaine Drive intersection, including bike lanes and sidewalks.
  7. Undertake improvements recommended in the Southern Urban Area B Study, including improvements to Fontaine Avenue and possible construction of Fontaine Ave. to Sunset Avenue connector road.
  8. Improve two intersections on Route 20 (Valley Street) in Scottsville: the Warren Street intersection and the Hardware Street intersection.
- II. Transit Improvements
  1. Regional Transit Authority - Funding for a consultant to explore establishing a regional transit authority with expanded service to Albemarle County and Charlottesville.
  2. Expand existing Service - Funding to expand existing transit service capacity for CTS, JAUNT, RideShare, including capital projects to enhance capital operations (such as bus pull-outs, etc.)
  3. Funding for Transit Operational Costs - Fully fund the State's existing formula share of transit operating costs or provide fuel subsidies in the face of rapidly escalating fuel costs.
  4. Inter-City Rail – Improve and increase inter-city rail service to Albemarle County. The County continues to support the funding and implementation of the TransDominion Express as a means to provide improved inter-city rail service within the State.

- III. Safety Improvements
  1. Construction of pedestrian walkways along primary roads in the County's Urban Neighborhoods and Development Areas as part of road widening/improvement projects. Absent major road improvements, the following roads are prioritized for improvement:
    - a. Route 240 in downtown Crozet;
    - b. Route 20 South from City limits to Mill Creek Drive extended;
    - c. Route 250 East in Pantops-extend from the existing sidewalks; and
    - d. Route 250 West from the City limits to the Farmington/Ednam entrance(s).
  2. Safety improvements in Crozet area including Route 240 underpass.
  3. Reconfigure intersection of Route 22 and Route 250. This project is included in the current SYIP. Provide adequate funding and resources to maintain the current construction schedule.
  4. Intersection improvements on Route 250 West at 1) Tilman Road and 2) Owensville Road (noted above).
  5. Develop functional plans, including possible an analysis of safety improvements for Route 22 and Route 231.
- IV. Enhancement Projects/Safe Routes to School Program
  1. Pedestrian Streetscape improvements in downtown Crozet.
  2. Beautification of entrance corridors.
  3. Construction of Bikeway, pedestrian, and greenway improvements as prioritized in the Jefferson Area Bicycle, Pedestrian and Greenways Plan and the County's Comprehensive Plan.
  4. Development of portions of the Rivanna River Greenway path system.
  5. Removal of non-conforming billboards.
- V. National Highway System (NHS)

The Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO Policy Board approved the NHS as proposed by VDOT in this area excluding the Route 29 Bypass.
- VI. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program

This does not apply to Albemarle County. The County is not in an area of non-attainment for ozone or carbon monoxide.

---

ATTACHMENT A

**ALBEMARLE COUNTY RECOMMENDED PRIORITIES FOR SYIP,  
FOR PRIMARY ROAD, TRANSIT AND ENHANCEMENT IMPROVEMENTS  
(OCTOBER, 2006)**

The following are Albemarle County's priorities for each allocation of TEA-21 and each sub-allocation of the Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. Attachment A provides a more detailed explanation of the priority projects.

I. Surface Transportation Program (STP)

Standard Projects:

The following projects, listed in priority order, are eligible for STP funds. The County supports these projects as referenced.

Undertake those projects in the Charlottesville Albemarle Regional Transportation Study (CHART) – UnJam 2025 (adopted May 3, 2004) eligible for the primary program in the sequence as called for in the February 2, 1992 joint resolution between the City, County and University and agreed to by VDOT. These include:

1. Meadow Creek Parkway from the Route 250 Bypass to Rio Road. The Parkway is the County's highest priority project after Route 29 North, and is of the utmost importance in order to maintain an adequate level of service on Route 29 and to improve the overall roadway system serving the urbanizing area north of the City. This project is being funded in the County's secondary program and has been approved by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) as a low speed parkway in the City of Charlottesville and the County. The County asks that this section be designed and built in accord with the County's design and alignment recommendations developed with the assistance of an independent consultant and endorsed by resolution of the County Board of Supervisors on June 20, 2001 (Attachment A) and approved by the CTB on December 18, 2001. This endorsed design and alignment emphasizes the parkway corridor's potential as a linear park and its relationship to the development of adjacent urban land. The linear park concept is intended to replace McIntire Park land lost due to the project and, at the same time, link McIntire Park to the Rivanna Trails Foundation trail along Meadow Creek and the County's urbanizing area along Rio Road. *The County requests that the CTB make every effort to provide adequate funding and resources to maintain the current construction schedule for this project.*

Meadow Creek Parkway/Route 250 Bypass Interchange. The County also supports the construction of the Meadow Creek Parkway interchange at the terminus of the Parkway with Route 250 in the City of Charlottesville. This interchange is essential to the safe and acceptable future traffic operation of this high volume intersection. The County is grateful for the \$27,000,000 earmarked in the latest Federal Transportation Bill for this interchange. It is recognized that this interchange project, and its funding, is a separate but related project from the Meadow Creek Parkway mainline project. *The County requests that the CTB make every effort to provide adequate funding and resources to maintain the current construction schedule for this project.*

Northern Free State Road (formerly Meadow Creek Parkway Phase II) is being funded in VDOT's Six Year Secondary Road Plan for the county. The County is now studying the concept/alignment of this road as part of the Places 29 Study, *an integrated land use and transportation master planning study for the Route 29 North corridor.*

2. Route 29 North. This highly urbanized area continues to grow and transportation system improvement needs continue to increase. The County, City, VDOT and the MPO have completed Phase I and Phase II of the 29H250 (US 29 – Hydraulic – 250 Bypass Intersection) Study. The County appreciates continued VDOT and Commonwealth Transportation Board support of initiatives in the U. S. 29 North corridor. The County, in coordination with the MPO, is currently utilizing VDOT, developer proffered and County general funds to study the concept/alignment of U. S. 29 North as part of a larger transportation network study for the County's Northern Development Areas from the City limits to the Greene County line. This study, a component of the County's Places 29 Study, will include a comprehensive and integrated evaluation of both transportation and land use issues and planning to establish a series of land use recommendations, transportation network improvements and a multi-modal approaches that will support the Northern Development Areas and the Route 29 Corridor.
  - a) The County requests that VDOT plan for the funding of the 29H250 Phase II Option B design recommendations, which emphasizes improving Route 29 to serve regional trips and changing the character of Hydraulic Rd. between Route 29 and the Route 250 Bypass.
  - b) The County requests funding for a third lane northbound and southbound on Route 29 from the South Fork Rivanna River to north of its intersection with Hollymead Drive. These improvements would tie into a third lane recently constructed in each direction along Route 29 as part of major land development projects at the Hollymead Town Center. There are significant peaks and valleys in Route 29 through this area that create an existing dangerous condition and this will only worsen as traffic increases as development occurs in this area in accord with the Comprehensive Plan. This section of road already experiences a high level of vehicle accidents, particularly in the area of Forest Lakes South. This new third lane section, and other road improvements in the area, was funded by the developer through zoning proffers related to the project's approval. Completion of this section would essentially complete the three phases of improvements to Route 29 from Hydraulic Road to Airport Road that were originally programmed in the Six-Year Plan in 1988. These and other Comprehensive Plan transportation system recommendations envision future development to be served by a transportation network that ultimately provides a complete system of urban streets and supports walking and biking and comprehensively links all land uses.

Other projects listed in CHART in the northern study area must be actively pursued and completed. These projects include:

- c) the Hillsdale Drive Extension Project;
- d) Berkmar Drive Extended.

Also, while funding has previously been dropped for Route 29 improvements north of the South Fork Rivanna River, transportation system improvements as identified by the County in its Comprehensive Plan are imperative to this area.

3. Complete preliminary engineering and undertake the widening of Route 20 South from I-64 to Mill Creek Drive. Incorporate sidewalks and bike lane facilities into these improvements. This is a curvy section of road in the County's Urban Area that serves the traffic from Monticello High School and has experienced several accidents with fatalities in recent years.
4. There are three areas of emphasis the County requests be addressed on Route 250:

- a) The County does request funding for the improvements of the Tilman Road intersection at Route 250 and the Owensville Road/Route 250 intersection (possible round-about at Owensville Road). Otherwise, the County recommends maintaining the present two-lane configuration of the corridor with any short term or spot improvements being as non-intrusive and consistent as possible with the special character of this scenic by-way.
  - b) VDOT has completed a similar study of Route 250 East from Free Bridge to the Fluvanna County line. This study's findings have been presented to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors. The County is considering the recommendations of this study as part of the Neighborhood Planning process "Pantops Urban Area Neighborhood Master Plan." This Pantops Plan focuses on creating a neighborhood plan that integrates land use and transportation planning to establish land use recommendations, transportation network improvements and multimodal approaches that will support neighborhood development. Draft recommendations include improvements to interchange, pedestrian crossings, parallel road and new bridge/crossing at Rivanna River.
  - c) Improve Route 250 west from Emmet Street to the Route 29/250 Bypass. This section is covered by the joint Ivy Road Design Study conducted by the City, County and University of Virginia and originally recognized for improvement in the Lewis Mountain Neighborhood/ University Heights (Area B) Study. The University of Virginia is currently constructing a new basketball arena and parking facilities in this area that will likely create additional traffic demands on Ivy Road. Any plans for the improvement of this section of Route 250 West need to be coordinated between the City, County and University.
5. Undertake improvements that will benefit/improve Route 240 in Crozet in accord with recommendations from the recently completed Crozet Master Plan.
- a) Implement sidewalk plan (per Downtown Sidewalk and Parking Study) and Crozet Master Plan.
  - b) Create bike lanes to and in downtown.
  - c) Construct Eastern Avenue, to include the Lickinghole Creek Bridge and a railroad crossing.
  - d) Construction of Main Street east from Crozet Avenue.
6. Undertake the widening of Route 20 North from north of Route 250 East to the Elks Drive/Fontana Drive intersection. Incorporate sidewalks and bike lane facilities into the west side improvements. The County has also listed these improvements under "Safety" priorities. To date, the County has constructed sidewalks on the east side of Route 20 from Route 250 to Fontana Drive.
7. Undertake improvements recommended in the Southern Urban Area B Study recently completed in coordination with the City of Charlottesville, County of Albemarle, and the University of Virginia. The Study recommends improvements to Fontaine Avenue and the construction of a new connector road between Fontaine Avenue and Sunset Avenue.
8. The Town of Scottsville has requested that VDOT improve Route 20 (Valley Street) at the intersection of both Warren Street and Hardware Street. VDOT had proposed these improvements in the 1970's, but the improvements were not completed. The improvements will enhance the safety of the traveling public in the Town.
- II. Transit Improvements
1. Regional Transit Authority - Funding for a consultant to explore establishing a regional transit authority with expanded service to Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville.
  2. Expand existing Service - Funding to expand existing transit service capacity for CTS, JAUNT, RideShare, including capital projects to enhance capital operations, (such as bus pull-outs, etc.)
  3. Funding for Transit Operational Costs - Fully fund the State's existing formula share of transit operating costs or provide fuel subsidies in the face of rapidly escalating fuel costs.
  4. Inter-City Rail – Improve and increase inter-city rail service to Albemarle County. The County continues to support the funding and implementation of the TransDominion Express as a means to provide improved inter-city rail service within the State.

III. Safety Improvements:

Several projects in the County seem to qualify under this 10% set-aside. They are, in priority order:

1. Construct pedestrian walkways along various primary routes within the County's Urban Neighborhoods. Absent the incorporation of such road walkways into full road widening/improvement projects, the following road sections are priorities for pedestrian walkways:
  - a) Route 240 in "downtown" Crozet;
  - b) Route 20 South from the City limits to Mill Creek Drive;
  - c) along Route 250 East in the Pantops area as an extension to existing sidewalks; and
  - d) along Route 250 West from the City limits to the Farmington entrance.
2. The County has placed a high priority on pedestrian improvements in the Crozet area. The County chose Crozet as the first community to be master planned based on the County's adopted Neighborhood Model. The County received TEA 21 funding in July 2004 for Phase I of the Crozet Streetscape Plan and continues to seek additional funding to undertake needed improvements (see Enhancement Project section). Another potentially eligible safety project is the improvement of the Route 240 underpass at the CSX Railroad tracks in Crozet (including pedestrian facility improvements).
3. Reconfigure intersection and install traffic signals at the intersection of Routes 22 and 250. This project is currently scheduled in the SYIP for construction. This project is included in the current SYIP. Provide adequate funding and resources to maintain the current construction schedule.
4. Improvements to Route 250 West in Ivy area to address existing traffic circulation problems at the Tillman Road intersection and the Owensville Road intersection (as noted in I.4.E, above), including access to developed properties in this area. Of particular concern is the Tillman Road intersection (Route 676), which serves school bus traffic and has poor sight distance. These improvements should be undertaken in accordance with recommendations approved by the Board of Supervisors in the Route 250 West Corridor Study.
5. Functional plans, including an analysis of possible safety improvements, for Routes 22 and 231. The County remains concerned with overall public safety as it relates to traffic created by large trucks along these road segments, and encourages VDOT to consider all appropriate measures to ensure that trucks travel safely along these roadways in the future. The County has repeatedly requested VDOT to restrict through trucks on Route 22 and Route 231.

IV. Enhancement Projects/Safe Routes to School Program:

This is a valuable funding source for which several projects appear to be eligible. Unfortunately funding for new projects is not available this year. The County urges that funds be made available for new pedestrian and bicycling projects. For the County, new projects, in priority order, are:

1. Pedestrian streetscape improvements in downtown Crozet. These streetscape improvements, which were included in an Enhancement Grant, submitted in January 2002, June 2003 and October 2004, include the relocation and burial of overhead utility wires, and construction of historically compatible sidewalks. The County received TEA 21 funding in July 2004 for Phase I and July 2005 for Phase II of the Crozet Streetscape Plan.
2. Beautification of entrance corridors (particularly Route 20, 29 and Route 250).
3. Construction of bikeway, pedestrian, and greenway facilities as prioritized in the Jefferson Area Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Greenways Plan.
4. Development of portions of the Rivanna River Greenway path system.
5. Removal of non-conforming billboards.

V. National Highway System (NHS)

The Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO Policy Board approved the NHS as proposed by VDOT in this area excluding the Route 29 Bypass. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has approved the NHS, which includes the existing Route 29, and the Route 29 Bypass. The County believes any projects that are included in the NHS should reflect the recommendations that result from the previously referenced transportation improvement study of the Route 29 North corridor area.

VI. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program

This does not apply to Albemarle County. The County is not in an area of non-attainment for ozone or carbon monoxide.

---

Item 9.4. Cancel November 8, 2006 Night Board meeting.

**By the recorded vote set out above, the Board cancelled its regular night meeting scheduled for November 8, 2006.**

---

Item 9.5. Crozet Population and Housing Estimates.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that the Community Development Department staff has prepared population and housing estimates for the County by Comprehensive Plan areas for internal use on a fairly regular basis since 1990. Dwelling unit (DU) counts, updated after a certificate of occupancy permit is issued, are calculated by querying the CityView development tracking system database. Totals are then tabulated by Comprehensive Plan areas. A multiplier (average persons per household by DU type) derived from U.S. Census data is applied to the various DU counts to determine an estimated population by Comprehensive Plan area.

In the past year, growth and development in Crozet has been a significant issue for Crozet residents and an important consideration for the Commission and Board of Supervisors in their decision-making process. In May, following review of independent research presented to staff by Crozet residents, a comprehensive review of Crozet data was undertaken to validate the number of DUs reported in the 2005 estimate. The review took place over several months and included a new assessment of building permit and certificate of occupancy activity, a GIS analysis comparing DU locations and land use types, a review of CityView database update/maintenance procedures and field verification. This review found certain inaccuracies in data as a result of the conversion to the new CityView development tracking software package and inaccurate housing counts due to housing conversions. These inaccuracies are accounted for in the 2005 Revised Estimate listed below. With these inaccuracies addressed, new DU counts based on certificate of occupancy permits were then calculated resulting in the new 2006 Estimate for Crozet. The results are as follows:

	<u>Dwelling Units</u>	<u>Population</u>
2005 Estimate:	1,451	3,605
2005 Revised Estimate:	1,660	4,305
2006 Estimate:	1,875	4,798

Based on this rather extensive analysis, staff has introduced many new quality checks to increase the accuracy of data that is entered and extracted from CityView and is planning to comprehensively review DU data for other comprehensive plan areas on a continuous basis coinciding with master planning initiatives.

**This is provided as an update for information purposes only.** Staff will begin using the new DU's for 2006 as the baseline in its tables tracking development activity in Crozet, the most current of which is attached (Attachment A)(on file).

**(Discussion:** Mr. Boyd said he would like to discuss the Crozet population housing estimate, and asked if unoccupied dwellings were also counted. Mr. Cilimberg explained that it's factored into the people per household multiplier that's used per dwelling unit. He said the additional by-right development would be what occurs outside of the rezoned areas, and perhaps that could be estimated through the GIS system.

Mr. Wyant asked about rezonings in the vicinity of Old Trail. Mr. Cilimberg said the first set of rezonings out of the 2,275 for Old Trail has three site development plans in process, and the total number is shown as presented. He added that Liberty Hall has 51 units planned, and Wickham Pond has 107 units planned.

Mr. Rooker noted that staff determined through existing Comprehensive Plan designations upper end density possibilities, and computed a potential number of households based upon the realization of the Crozet Master Plan and translated that into a potential population. Mr. Cilimberg confirmed that was the earlier tables. The new information includes the actual numbers in Crozet including the projects approved since the Master Plan was adopted in December, 2004. He said there are additional areas of potential by-right development in Crozet that are not in this list.

Mr. Rooker commented that none of the approvals since those numbers were presented have exceeded the upper end of the permitted density stipulated in the Crozet Master Plan. Mr. Tucker suggested including by-right figures in future numbers.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that there are two numbers – the by-right numbers and the numbers from rezonings that would still be in line with the numbers in the Master Plan.

Mr. Slutzky added that he would like to see the numbers from what has been approved, and how much it is below the maximum build-out.

Mr. Rooker commented that the estimate for the existing population today is 4,798 and that doesn't include the build-out from any of the rezonings.

Ms. Thomas said that is an 11.6 percent increase over the 2005 estimate.

Mr. Rooker said the 2005 estimate was 3,605, and that has been increased by 33 percent. Mr. Cilimberg responded that the original 2005 estimate was lower than the actual; a quality control check was done based on information from Crozet citizens, field checks, County records, etc. that caused an adjusted 2005 figure.

Mr. Rooker said that there is a difference of 493 units between 2005 and 2006. Mr. Cilimberg said there was a difference of 493 in population after the revision in 2005. He said that in water planning, they are looking ahead to 50 years – beyond the normal 20-year planning period. Mr. Tucker stated staff was looking at the 20-year approach, but the RWSA looked at the 50-year plan, so there was a discrepancy in the numbers. He said the water supply plan would be built on that 50-year number. That is what has been projected and proposed in terms of the Ragged Mountain Reservoir to meet the needs for that time period.

Mr. Rooker said growth in the area's population is based on an assumed percentage increase in population year to year over that 50-year period, whether it takes place in Crozet or somewhere else. He added that the only issue is whether Crozet would be connected to the urban water system so the 50-year water supply takes care of all the needs of the community, wherever the growth occurs.

Mr. Wyant said the boundaries of Crozet are fixed; only so much development can occur there.

Ms. Thomas said the question is on what basis the build-out might be more, as no one in Crozet has "endorsed" a higher population.

Mr. Rooker said the Rivanna Authority (RWSA) used the 12,000 population figure for Crozet, but the number is impacted by whether it would be connected to an urban system.

Ms. Thomas noted that she has become interested in air quality because scientists are finding that a lot of the nutrients affecting the Chesapeake Bay are coming from the air, not the ground and water, specifically from car exhaust emissions.)

---

Item 9.6. Copy of letter dated September 27, 2006, from John Shepherd, Manager of Zoning Administration, to Tara Boyd, re: Letter of Correction, OFFICIAL DETERMINATION OF PARCELS AND DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS -- Tax Map 122, Parcels 24 & 28 and Tax Map 123, Parcels 33 & 34 (Property of Murcielago LLC) Section 10.3.1, **received as information.**

---

Item 9.7. Copy of letter dated October 4, 2006, from John Shepherd, Manager of Zoning Administration, to Tara Boyd, re: OFFICIAL DETERMINATION OF PARCELS AND DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS -- Tax Map 114, Parcels 67, 67A, 67B, 67L & 67M Tax Map 123, Parcels 2 & 59 (Property of Murcielago LLC) Section 10.3.1, **received for information.**

---

Agenda Item No. 10. ZMA-2005-007. Haden Place (Signs #12,13).

Proposal: Rezone 6.69 acres from R-2 Residential (2 units/acre) to NMD Neighborhood Model District - residential (3-34 units/acre) mixed with commercial, service and industrial uses for 20 single-family homes and 14 townhomes.

Proffers: Yes.

Existing Comprehensive Plan Land Use/Density: Community of Crozet; CT-3 Urban Edge: single-family residential (net 3.5-6.5 units/acre) supporting uses such as religious institutions and schools and other small-scale non-residential uses.

Entrance Corridor: No.

Location: Between Haden (Rt 1209) & Killdeer Lanes (Rt 1215), south of Jarman's Gap Road.

Tax Map/Parcel: TM 55, Parcel 69 & TM 56, Parcel 9.

Magisterial District: White Hall.

(Notice of this public hearing was published in the Daily Progress on September 25 and October 2, 2006.)

Mr. Cilimberg reported that this proposal was submitted in May, 2005. The Commission had a work session over a year ago and provided guidance to the applicant – there was a need for consistency to the Crozet Master Plan regarding density and provision of affordable housing, road improvements and treatment of historic resources. He said the petition came back to the Commission in July, 2006 for a public hearing to request a change from R-2 Residential to Neighborhood Model; the existing by-right use would allow 13 single-family units and with bonus provisions up to 20 units. The proposal is for 20 single-family homes including six cottages and 14 townhouses for a density of 6.35 dwelling units per acre. He mentioned that this property lies in the CT-3 area of the Crozet Master Plan.

Mr. Cilimberg said that in their report to the Commission, staff noted favorable factors as: how the project addresses the principles of the Neighborhood Model; density as it relates to the Crozet Master Plan; and, the relationship of the property to two centers – one in "downtown" Crozet and one being the future Old Trail Village Center. He said the unfavorable factors noted were: the moderately-priced

housing did not meet the County's definition for affordable housing, and revisions were needed to the Code of Development, Application Plan and proffers. He said that on July 11, 2006, the Commission recommended approval to the Board noting areas of the petition that needed to be addressed: the expectation of an affordable housing proffer that would be modified to conform to the County's affordable housing policy in the Comprehensive Plan; technical changes that needed to be made to the Code of Development, Application Plan and proffers; cash proffers devoted to transportation improvements in Crozet; and, an interconnection provided and illustrated on the Application Plan from the proposed east-west connector road between Haden Lane and Killdeer Lane southward to Summerford Lane and Ballard Field.

Mr. Cilimberg reviewed the proffers and how they are being addressed. He said the two roads that would serve either side of this property – coming from Jarman's Gap Road – Haden Lane and Killdeer Lane – are both at this time substandard for any additional development. He said the applicant controls the land along Haden Lane on one side, and beyond that does not have ownership control. He said they have proffered to widen Haden Lane to a minimum width of 18 feet with shoulders and ditches to the extent allowable using existing right-of-way and to satisfy the requirements of the County Engineer. He added that the applicant's plan shows frontage improvements to create an urban cross-section on their side of Haden Lane.

Ms. Thomas asked about the clause that says "as the right-of-way allows," and if what the applicant is proposing can actually be done. Mr. Cilimberg said the County Engineer looked at it and believes the 18 feet for ditches and shoulders could be accommodated but until road plans are made he cannot be certain. He said the developer would improve the intersection, but any offsite sight distance outside of the right-of-way could not be addressed; Jarman's Gap improvements would help when done.

In response to Mr. Rooker's question about use of Haden Lane, Mr. Cilimberg confirmed that Haden Lane would be the access for the property until the Killdeer Lane intersection could be dealt with in an appropriate manner. He said the applicant has proffered doing urban section improvements to Killdeer, and has indicated that the County will not be requested for a building permit prior to construction or bonding of offsite stormwater drainage. They have shown where the integrated park and stormwater management facility will be and indicated that construction requirements will be met within 12 months for that.

Mr. Cilimberg said inter-parcel connectivity with Ballard Field and/or the realignment of Killdeer Lane has also been accommodated, explaining that they proffered to build to their property line for connection with Summerford Lane. He added that they have also proffered for a relocation of Killdeer through their property should it be desired, but some would be across property they do not own.

Mr. Rooker commented that the Old Trail developer didn't like the plan to come across that property. Mr. Cilimberg agreed, stating that the allowance for the curb in Killdeer was only being provided in the event that that was desired, but a more direct commitment is to the potential connection he indicated initially.

Mr. Slutzky said that is no assurance that connection would be made. Mr. Cilimberg replied that they have not proffered anything beyond their property line.

Ms. Thomas asked if the ability of Summerford Lane to handle traffic was evaluated by staff. Mr. Cilimberg said that should have been part of what the County Engineer looked at in his review, and he determined it to be adequate.

Mr. Rooker said the Board must assume that connection would not be made, and look at the outlet that is a sure bet. Mr. Cilimberg agreed, adding that properties that are possibilities for access do not belong to this developer.

Ms. Thomas said she has heard that the concern among Haden Lane residents is that no one would use Summerford Lane, and the concern among Summerford Lane is that everyone would use that road. Mr. Cilimberg said there are no data to show how that would play out.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that until Jarman's Gap Road is finished, the sole access for the development would be Haden Lane. Mr. Cilimberg added that Old Trail Road – formerly Western Avenue – is not in the State System at this time even though it has been built through.

Mr. Wyant commented that Haden Lane is a State-maintained road.

Mr. Cilimberg reported that cash proffers are provided at \$3,200 for each detached market rate unit and \$2,700 for each attached market rate unit, for a total of \$82,000. He said six affordable units for sale are being proffered, and additional affordable units should be calculated at 50 percent of the middle range. He said they used what staff had come up with for calculations – half of the difference between what's allowed at the medium range and what's allowed at the highest end-range to determine the number of units in the higher density. At the last meeting it was said that essentially equates to what people have to proffer in affordable units anyway and the real calculation for affordable units should be 50 percent of the middle range. The circumstances mentioned last month have been the same for both reviews, and now staff would like some direction from the Board on whether to use that or the 50 percent of mid-range.

Mr. Rooker commented that when the Board reviewed the protocol before, it was the understanding to use the 50 percent midpoint, but during review of the Wickham Pond petition there was a

discrepancy in how to arrive at the figure needed to receive the density bonus. He said the minutes of the discussion outlining the density bonus show a fairly clear intent by the Board to use the midpoint multiplier and they were making an exception for that review. Board members agreed that they had been informed that Haden Place was in the works during the Wickham Pond discussion.

Mr. Cilimberg responded that staff did not receive a clear direction, and that is why the Wickham Pond issue was uncertain. He said the applicant in this rezoning is proffering six affordable units, which would be 17 percent. He mentioned that staff had included a comparison of rezonings and cash proffers in the executive summary for this request in order to compare Haden Place to Wickham Pond II and Westhall V. He concluded that if the Board finds the affordable housing and density provisions acceptable, and agrees that the proffers sufficiently address the impacts of the project, staff and the Commission recommend approval of ZMA-2005-007 subject to the current proffers, amended Code of Development, and amended General Development Plan.

With no further questions for the staff, Mr. Rooker asked the applicant to speak.

The applicant, Mr. Wendell Gibson, addressed the Board. He said he has been building in the County for 12 years. As a small builder, it is hard for him to compete with the large-scale developers. He tried to contact the Beights Development Group to discuss interconnectivity and got no response. He said Beights wanted him to purchase the property that would give him a cut-through, but he did not want to spend that kind of money. He said he has proffered affordable detached units and has kept them in line with other developments in the area such as Old Trail.

Mr. Kelly Strickler of Dominion Development Resources addressed the Board, saying he was present for the applicant. He said the development was approved as a by-right development for 13 single-family detached homes, but Mr. Gibson wanted to build homes similar to those in Parkside Village. He emphasized that Beights Development was not cooperative when contacted about making the connection, and said the property has a potential for five connections in different directions for the 34 units. He said there is not sufficient sight distance at the end of Killdeer Lane because of a retaining wall, but that would be rectified when the Jarman's Gap improvements are made.

Mr. Strickler said they are improving Haden Lane to VDOT standards. The County Engineer, Mr. Kelsey, has walked both roads in the development. The plan deals with the vertical curve as well as widening Haden Lane from 15 feet to 18 feet to accommodate 280 vehicle trips per day. Eventually, he said the development would have multiple points of access. The Commission was happy with the initial proposed density of 40 units, but the 80 percent rule for net development has been accommodated so the number has been reduced. He said there are five different housing types in the development, and showed on a map where the houses would be located on the property. He emphasized that they are going from 20 market-rate houses with four affordable houses to 22 market-rate houses with 12 affordable houses. He said there are four or five culverts on Haden Lane and Killdeer Lane that would need to be relocated, and some mailboxes that would need to be moved back, but most of that topography is flat and the rights-of-way are 30 feet with an 18-foot pavement that would accommodate every bit of traffic the development would generate.

Mr. Wyant asked for clarification of the roads and rights-of-way. Mr. Strickler explained that there is a parking lane inside the property line, a green strip, and a sidewalk, and two feet behind that is the proposed new property line –there are substantial right-of-way dedications throughout this project. He added that there would be a 30-foot right-of-way, and 18-foot road width and a ditch, but the sidewalk would only go to the property line.

Ms. Thomas said Haden Lane adds up to 40 feet, but if it's not, it would be difficult to accommodate the ditch lines, shoulders and other things proposed. She said sidewalks are being created to a certain point, but then there would be no sidewalks from the edge of this proposal to Jarman's Gap Road. Mr. Strickler said they have agreed to do whatever they can to the existing right-of-way, as the applicant doesn't own the next property.

Mr. Gibson said his goal is to build the products then try to get young professional people who could serve the community to move in. He wants to make his homes affordable for them.

Mr. Rooker said North Pointe has a requirement to build their affordable housing on a staggered schedule so it is built as each set of market-rate units is built.

Mr. Wyant said he supports the phasing in of affordable units.

Mr. Strickler said the detached housing units on Killdeer Lane and Haden Lane would require approval of a subdivision plat and plans for roads and stormwater management. Phase II will be the townhouses and cottages and they will be built together. In order to do the cottages first, it would take a lot more time and it doesn't quite make as much sense from a business point of view.

At this time, Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Kevin Markee, a resident of Haden Lane, addressed the Board. He said he sent an e-mail to the Board about this development. He thinks this is a wonderful plan, but he thinks putting it into action without the improvements to the road connections at Jarman's Gap Road with Killdeer Lane and Haden Lane is a mistake. He goes to Charlottesville every day from Haden Lane, and he won't go through Old Trail because it takes too long and is too slow. He said improvements at the corner of Haden Lane and

Jarman's Gap Road will still be constrained by an abutment to a bridge over Powell's Creek and a telephone pole on the other side.

Mr. Tom Loach pointed out that the matrix in the Crozet Master Plan shows the number of homes for that area has already been used up, plus 100 percent more. He said everyone has been waiting for Jarman's Gap Road to be improved, and he listed the developments that have gone in under the assumption the road would be improved. He said as soon as there is money for the Jarman's Gap Road project the Board can come back and put its plan into action.

Mr. Jeff Werner, representing the Piedmont Environment Council, addressed the Board. He applauded Mr. Strickler for his efforts to put five units on an acre. He said developers in other counties have actually stopped short of reaching certain numbers to avoid having to put in the next tier of affordable housing units, so he appreciates the Board's consideration of staggering how they are built.

Ms. Mary Rice addressed the Board. She said the population in the Crozet growth area as of August was 4,800 people with 1,875 dwelling units with Certificates of Occupancy. To that number, you must add 3,315 – the total dwelling units that have been finally or preliminarily approved, for a total of 5,224 existing and potential dwelling units. Using the multiplier of 2.55 for those homes ends up with 13,321 people – if not one by-right unit is built and no additional rezonings occur. She said the infrastructure mentioned in the Crozet Master Plan is based on a population of 12,000. The community would already be past that number with the units already approved. She emphasized that while there is no way to tell how fast they will be built, the maximum numbers must be used in planning for infrastructure. She said Crozet is a "cautionary tale" for the rest of the County, as giving developers the full green-light for development will result in double-digit growth rates, and the money for infrastructure is not available.

Ms. Barbara Westbrook of Crozet addressed the Board. She presented some pictures of roads in the area, including Haden Lane, adding that its intersection with Jarman's Gap is "really bad for most of these roads." She hopes the construction traffic would be kept off of the Killdeer Lane entrance during construction, saying people can use Western Avenue but may not be aware that it goes through. She said there are a lot of cars coming through Hillsborough to get to either Route 250 or I-64, and maybe Western Avenue could be better utilized. She asked Mr. Juan Wade about installation of a sign indicating this road could be used, and he indicated the process for doing so.

Mr. Strickler commented that Mr. Gibson builds approximately 30 homes per year in the area. He wants to build homes in the growth area that are more affordable than those in many other new developments. He acknowledged that there are a lot of parcels which have been rezoned so are available in the growth area. That is what the Master Plan was trying to accomplish. He said the Board should keep some flexibility to allow growth where it's needed and discourage it where it's not.

**(Note: The Board took a brief recess, then reconvened.)**

Mr. Slutzky said that in the future he would like to see a phasing of affordable housing in the proffers, and would like to give that signal to staff now. Mr. Davis said the requirement with Old Trail and North Pointe was that they designate affordable building lots in each section as development goes along. They get a credit if more lots are put in, but none of the proffers have actually required construction on lots – just that they be distributed and designated in the different sections.

Mr. Boyd asked if any affordable housing units have been built since this initiative was started. Mr. Cilimberg said it is early in the actual rezoning process to determine how the timing is working for affordable housing.

Mr. Rooker asked about the Western Avenue situation mentioned earlier, specifically the sign. Mr. Davis said it is a public right-of-way, but it will be privately-maintained until it is taken into the State System. Mr. Cilimberg agreed to have staff follow up on installation of a sign indicating the road goes all the way through.

Mr. Wyant said the timing has not been favorable because Jarman's Gap Road has not been improved, and the development pattern in the Crozet Master Plan anticipated it would be by now. He said the Crozet Citizens' Advisory Committee has identified that issue in its discussions.

Mr. Cilimberg said a lot of what's being done in Old Trail is by-right, and the requirements are not in the ordinance to have that road built to the standard in the Crozet Master Plan for by-right development.

Mr. Rooker commented that this is a lot like Wickham Pond on a small scale, and the plan is nicely done. He said the units are being offered at a lower price point than the competition. The problem is with lack of sufficient infrastructure, especially since the Jarman's Gap Road improvements have been moved back. A second point is that this development is being proposed at a higher density than that recommended in the Crozet Master Plan unless the bonus factor is used. Using the approach that staff has been using for the density bonus every rezoning would qualify for a 50 percent higher density than called for in the Master Plan. He emphasized that the infrastructure is just not there, and there are not adequate contributions for it.

Mr. Dorrier said this developer is trying to provide affordable housing, but he is coming to the conclusion the Crozet Master Plan needs to be revised to deal with the problem of lack of infrastructure. He does not think the Board can keep piling on new development in Crozet without the infrastructure.

Mr. Slutzky said he is sympathetic with the developer trying to get access to other developments. Mr. Gibson and Mr. Strickler have demonstrated where connections could go. While he agrees there is inadequate infrastructure, it still needs to be addressed in appropriate ways, rather than denying a good Neighborhood Model project inside a designated growth area. He said staff pointed out in their report that if these same units were developed in the rural area, the Board would end up with no proffers. He feels good Neighborhood Model projects in a designated growth area need to be approved until growth is shut down in the rural area, and he supports the project.

Ms. Thomas said she has found some decisions to be agonizing. She is glad to see the density proposed, she likes the price points, and the adjacent price points. But she is also concerned about the lack of a connection to Summerford Lane, and the gap in the sidewalk connection to Jarman's Gap Road. If the County doesn't say no at some point, the message is never going to get through to the State that localities are being greatly impacted by their inability to act.

Mr. Boyd said he does not know any way the infrastructure problem can be solved now, and Jarman's Gap Road would likely not be at the top of a list. He feels the applicant has gone to a great deal of expense to build a project like this, which has affordable units and market rate units that are also reasonably priced.

Mr. Wyant asked if the plan follows the Crozet Master Plan recommendations. Mr. Cilimberg said the property is located in a CT-3 area, one that is recommended at a density within the bonus provision if the staff's interpretation of how that applies is used.

Mr. Wyant said he likes the density of the project and the affordable housing proposed, but he cannot vote for approval at this time because of the lack of offsite improvements.

Mr. Slutzky said he thinks the Board needs to let the development community understand what it expects in the future. If the Board says "no" to this proposal in a growth area, then he thinks it is clear that the applicant will be building his 30 units in the rural area.

Mr. Rooker said that is Mr. Slutzky's conclusion. He does not necessarily agree with that conclusion. There are 7,000 units already approved in the growth area, which is almost a 15-year supply of units, and there are a number of additional units "in the pipeline." With that kind of supply available, he does not buy the argument that everybody who can't get a unit approved in the growth area today will run out to the rural area tomorrow.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the Board is saying it will declare a moratorium on approvals of otherwise acceptable development in the growth areas until the infrastructure situation is resolved. What is the development community supposed to expect?

Mr. Boyd said he thinks this is a unique situation, as this development has only one point of access (a very poor one), even though there is potential for other connections.

Mr. Wyant agreed that it would put a lot of burden on Haden Lane, and he doesn't think it can be built in the 30-foot right of way.

Mr. Slutzky said if this is based on site-specific shortcomings.

Mr. Boyd said that is definitely the case, and perhaps the applicant could defer the matter until the access point issue is resolved.

Mr. Wyant said he has a problem with Haden Lane, and also with its intersection at Jarman's Gap Road.

Ms. Thomas said she considers in her deliberation what would happen with the property if it were built by-right, adding that she will approve a project to get the amenities and proffers just because it's better than a by-right without any additional offerings. She stated that in this case, a by-right development wouldn't be "terrible" as the 13 houses allowed would generate less traffic and impact to infrastructure.

Mr. Rooker said there are already 3,000 approved units in Crozet. The question is how far in front of infrastructure is development at a density higher than that recommended in the Crozet Master Plan approved. He thinks there are things peculiar to this development that might make it worse than in other cases – the inadequate road leading out to Jarman's Gap Road, the inability to make the other connections, etc. He thinks the Board has to send a message that small cash proffers – in this case \$3,200 per unit – are not acceptable. He said Greene County uses \$5,600; Loudoun uses \$47,000; and, Fairfax is \$70,000. To suggest that \$3,200 is an adequate number in Albemarle County to compensate for the impact on infrastructure is illogical to him.

Mr. Slutzky responded that he doesn't want to set the bar so high those developments are pushed into the rural areas or into a by-right situation.

Mr. Rooker said transportation problems and inadequate funding are acute, and these projects simply do not have the infrastructure needed to support them.

Board members suggested the applicant seek an indefinite deferral so connectivity issues could be addressed. Mr. Davis said an indefinite deferral might not be the best option, as plans can change.

Mr. Rooker said the developer could put in a contingency stating he would not apply for occupancy permits prior to the time improvements to Jarman's Gap Road are completed. He could proffer more for infrastructure, or proffer a different density, etc. He said Board members do not seem to be supportive of this request for different reasons.

Mr. Davis pointed out that inadequate public facilities alone is not a basis for denying a rezoning request, but the Board has stated factors beyond that, and has discretion to approve or deny this application. He cautioned them in laying out reasons. He said it would not be prudent to focus solely on lack of infrastructure. He also said this item would not have to be voted on tonight.

(**Note:** The Board took a recess at 7:45 p.m., and reconvened at 7:52 p.m. After Agenda Item No. 11, the Board resumed its discussion of this petition.)

---

Agenda Item No. 11. Reconsideration of Downtown Scottsville Streetscape Plan Funding Request.

Mr. Tucker said the Town has requested that the Board fund half of its initial request for \$502,000, as a previous vote on their full request failed by a 3-3 vote. He said the Town will come up with other sources for the remaining half of the cost.

Mr. Dorrier said he met with Mayor Phipps and Mr. Hogan, who have until October 22 to provide evidence of funding. They are working to identify those sources. He said the drop in oil prices may affect the project contractor's fee.

Ms. Thomas emphasized that if the County puts up one-half, she thinks it needs to be for the plan presented, and the motion needs to be worded so it is expected the project will be shown to the Board.

Mr. Dorrier said the Town has not indicated it wants to cut it back on the project.

Mr. Boyd said the motion could be worded to say the County would match half up to \$250,000.

Mr. Dorrier **moved** for approval of matching funds up to \$250,000 for use by the Town of Scottsville for its streetscape project, and that no changes be made to dilute the value of the project or significantly change the placement of lines underground and other major points of the project – including trees, tree replacement, storm drainage, and placement of underground utilities.

Mr. Boyd suggested changing the motion to state the Board approves up to \$251,065.14 in matching funds to accomplish the project substantially as presented to the Board.

Mr. Davis said the motion is actually to approve an appropriation of up to \$251,065.14 to match an amount presented by Scottsville to complete the project materially in the fashion that was previously presented to the Board.

Mr. Wyant **seconded** the motion, which passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.

NAYS: None.

---

At this time, the Board resumed its consideration of Agenda Item No. 10, ZMA-2005-007, Haden Place.

Mr. Gibson addressed the Board and asked what it would take for the Board to approve the development other than the Jarman's Gap Road improvements.

Mr. Rooker said he doesn't want to answer hypothetical questions, but the request would need to answer some of the issues raised – contribution to infrastructure, timing, density, affordable housing units, etc.

Mr. Slutzky suggested the applicants speak with Board members informally about the Jarman's Gap Road improvements and other aspects of denial.

Mr. Wyant **moved** to accept the applicant's request for an indefinite deferral of ZMA-2005-007 Haden Place. Ms. Thomas **seconded** the motion, which passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.

NAYS: None.

---

Agenda Item No. 12. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters not listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Wyant reported that there is a vacant burned-out shell of a house on Commonwealth Drive and several neighbors have asked him about it. Mr. Davis said the County Building Official would need to determine what steps need to be taken.

---

Ms. Thomas reported that there is a TJPDC open house on October 20 and she encouraged Board members to drop by.

---

Ms. Thomas noted that the Virginia Outdoors Plan needs to get the County's officially adopted plan in November. If there are any County initiatives that could be officially adopted soon, they would stand a better chance of getting funded.

---

Ms. Thomas said the Planning District Commission will be recommending to this Board the appointment of an Albemarle County citizen member to the Rivanna River Basin Commission. She said they are looking for an "engineer," "farmer," or "commercial developer" for this vacancy.

---

Ms. Thomas said the ACE Committee will be coming in with a higher property value than the County's \$1.3 million would cover; this might not be a bad year to ask for more funds. She said the ACE program is beginning to be successful, applications have increased, and market value is going up.

---

Mr. Boyd asked staff to include the magisterial district, a map showing property location, and the amount of time it takes to make the determination, as part of the Official Determination letters.

---

Mr. Boyd noted that Mr. Tucker would become part of an ad-hoc committee on the Charlottesville Regional Chamber of Commerce, and asked that the Board put \$1,200 toward joining the Chamber.

Mr. Slutzky said he'd like a summary from staff on why the County should join.

Mr. Rooker commented that it should be advertised as an issue for public comment.

Mr. Boyd responded that he doesn't want to spend months and months on a \$1,200 expense.

Mr. Rooker replied that the issue is whether the Board is going to join private advocacy groups. They do wonderful work, but they come before this Board as advocates. He said the Board would be in a mode of taking a position on a group that it is a member of.

Mr. Boyd said the County has been getting a "free ride" on the Chamber Board with Mr. Tucker sitting as an ex-officio member.

Mr. Rooker reiterated that he would like to have a public hearing on the item.

Ms. Thomas stated that she thinks it should be addressed as an agenda item, not "sneaking it in the back door."

Mr. Boyd said that it's acceptable to him to have a public hearing on it, but he doesn't like the thought of "no-brainer" items like this having to take up a lot of time and effort.

Mr. Tucker said he would try to get it on the December agenda, but it might have to be in January.

---

Mr. Slutzky commented that there was an item in the newspaper today regarding timeliness of School Board meeting minutes. He thinks access to the minutes of County meetings should be provided in a timely manner. He would like to see a one-month turnaround on the Board's minutes.

Ms. Thomas said that has been a concern of hers for a while. Mr. Tucker noted that minute preparation has improved greatly over time. Mr. Davis said the length of a meeting contributes significantly to the time it takes to do the composition. Ms. Carey said for each meeting hour, transcription can take four or more hours.

Mr. Rooker said some doctor's offices outsource such work to outside companies; he believes the turnaround might be quicker.

---

Mr. Boyd said he would like to withdraw the Chamber of Commerce initiative presented earlier as it might put them in an undesirable spotlight.

Mr. Slutzky said he would like to talk with people from the Chamber and then bring this back for discussion again.

---

Mr. Rooker reported that at the TJPDC legislative luncheons there will be one topic focused on. He indicated that the topic for the next luncheon would concern a request for impact fee legislation.

---

Mr. Rooker said he has found that there is a three page summary of the traffic study for Biscuit Run. It would be helpful if Board members could get that summary to begin looking at it.

---

Mr. Boyd asked if Mr. Tucker should still be participating on the Chamber. Mr. Tucker responded that it was not his decision to leave the Chamber, it was theirs.

Mr. Slutzky and Mr. Dorrier indicated that they are both individual members of the Chamber.

Mr. Tucker explained that in the 1970s the Board decided to discontinue their formal membership in the Chamber because they did not feel it was appropriate to be a member of an advocacy group.

Mr. Boyd said the Albemarle School Board belongs.

---

Agenda Item No. 13. Adjourn.

At 9:25 p.m., with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

---

Chairman

Approved by the Board of County Supervisors
---

Date: 02/07/2007
------------------

Initials: EWC
---------------