

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 4, 2009, at 9:00 a.m., in the Lane Auditorium of the County Office Building on McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Robert W. Tucker, Jr., County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Jordan, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Meagan Hoy.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m., by the Chairman, Mr. Slutzky.

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

Agenda Item No. 4. Recognitions.

Mr. Slutzky read the following resolution into the record in recognition of Albemarle High School's sports program:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Albemarle High School Patriots is a Group III, Northwest Region high school located in Albemarle County competing in the Commonwealth District; and

WHEREAS, athletics is an integral part of a school's educational program. The goal of the Patriots is to provide positive experiences that will enhance and challenge its student-athletes physically, mentally, socially and emotionally. The Patriots strive to develop a high level of competition without losing sight of sportsmanship, personal responsibility, academic success and leadership while appreciating all of the values that come with being a member of your team; and

WHEREAS, under the able leadership of Coach Buz Male, the Boys 4x800 Meter Relay Team have laid the foundation for present and future successes; and

WHEREAS, the young men of the Albemarle High School Patriots Boys 4x800 Meter Relay Team have amassed an impressive record including winning the Virginia Tech Invitational, Millrose Border Clash, Virginia State AAA Indoor Track champions, broke the State Indoor Track Meet Record, placed the No. 1 fastest time in the Nation, placed the No. 5 all-time fastest time in history in Indoor Track and Field in the United States, and ran a time of 7:44.70, which is faster than the fastest time ever run indoors in Virginia; and

WHEREAS, with all these outstanding accomplishments, good character, good sportsmanship and athletic excellence are the tests of a true athlete.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby recognizes, commends and congratulates the Albemarle High School Patriots Boys 4x800 Meter Relay Team and Coach Buz Male in setting the high standard for excellence both on and off the track field:

**Garrett Bradley – Senior
Zach Vrhovac – Senior
Luck Noble – Senior
Anthony Kostelac – Junior**

At this time, the team members came forward and accepted the certificate of recognition.

Ms. Mallek noted that this team wants to attend some competitions so are accepting donations to help with their travel expenses.

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

Mr. Rooker reported that there is another significant sports success at Albemarle High School – the men's track team won the state championship – and he extended his congratulations. Despite the national economic crisis, he is very optimistic about this community and its prospects. Albemarle County has an intelligent and engaged citizenry and is recognized as a leader in protecting natural resources and the environment, as well as having a very efficient county government and the lowest effective tax rate of any county in the state with more than 90,000 people. The County is one of 40 counties in the country that has an AAA-bond rating, and a Social Services Department that received the Senate Productivity Award

as one of the most efficiently run organizations in the state – competing against both public and private organizations.

Mr. Rooker stated that Albemarle regularly has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country, and a talented and dedicated staff that delivers high-quality services to the public, with the last citizens' survey indicating that almost 93 percent of residents feel the services provided are satisfactory or highly satisfactory. He noted the terrific school system which is recognized nationally for its excellence, and the fact that Albemarle is one of the only counties in the state that has an effective affordable housing program and one of the few fully accredited police and sheriff's departments in the state, as well as delivery of excellent fire and rescue services through a blend of volunteer and paid staff. The park system has added over 1,800 acres of parks in the past eight years, and the County has implemented policies that resulted in 16 percent of the County's land being placed in conservation easements or parkland. Albemarle is recognized as one of the best counties in the country for use of technology.

Mr. Rooker said those are some of the reasons why over the past eight years this community has been named by more than 30 organizations as one of the best places in America to live. He feels lucky to live in this community and fortunate and honored to have served on this Board of Supervisors. Mr. Rooker announced his candidacy for reelection to the Board.

Ms. Mallek reported that there was a public meeting in Earlysville last night about the water supply plan with about 75 citizens in attendance. The next meeting will be held at Henley Middle School on March 9 at 6:30 p.m.

Ms. Thomas said she also has a meeting scheduled at Murray Elementary School and she apologized for the canceling of the Red Hill School meeting. She thanked fellow Board members for their handling of issues dealing with the water supply plan.

Mr. Slutzky thanked her for her work on the South Fork Rivanna River Task Force.

Agenda Item No. 6. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Mr. Jeff Werner of the Piedmont Environmental Council addressed the Board and said that the update on the Climate Protection Program is exciting stuff. These types of initiatives are what make the community such a great place to live.

Mr. Jeff Werner said in reference to the water supply plan he considers what it is going to cost him as a ratepayer. The water supply plan includes a pipeline at \$150.0 million, Moores Creek improvements at about \$50.0 million, building of the underground infrastructure at between \$100.0 and \$250.0 million. He said people need to be made aware of the adopted water supply plan cost analysis, as there is an assumption that implementing it will be more costly than a "plan B."

Rev. Ashley Abarca-Mitchell addressed the Board, stating that she is the Associate Pastor at First United Methodist Church in Charlottesville. She has struggled to find affordable rental housing in the area, and has heard of the struggles of many others. She arrived in the County in June, 2008 after serving four churches in Fluvanna County, but found that she and her husband did not qualify to be first-time homebuyers. The real estate company she worked with told her they did not work with rental units, and she was told to look on at Craigs List on the internet. She did an online search for rentals, but experienced many problems and was targeted for several scams. She and her husband had to pay more than expected by several hundred dollars, and had to increase their commute time by 30+ minutes. She emphasized that there are many resources available for homebuyers, but not for renters.

Mr. Tucker noted that Mr. Ron White and the Housing Committee would be focusing on this area with their work, as they have come to the same conclusion as that presented by Rev. Mitchell.

Mr. Slutzky and Ms. Mallek asked that Mr. Tucker provide the group's timeline for reporting their findings and recommendations.

Ms. Barbara Westbrook addressed the Board, stating that she is a member of the Crozet Citizens Advisory Council. She expressed her support for the new Crozet Library saying it is important to accelerate its construction as it will be a crucial part of Crozet. She suggested taking money out of other Crozet projects and assigning it to library construction. Downtown Crozet is losing businesses to the strip mall on Route 250, noting that at least four businesses in the last year have relocated from the downtown area to Route 250. She commented that there are some stonewalls and benches that were recently built near the railroad track at the north entrance to Crozet, and no one ever sits there. She suggested having the Crozet pictorial history reprinted and sold to residents.

Agenda Item No. 7. Consent Agenda. Mr. Boyd **moved** to approve Items 7.1 through 7.8 on the Consent Agenda and to accept the remaining items for information. Mr. Rooker **seconded** the motion, which passed by the following recorded vote:

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

Item 7.1. Approval of Minutes: April 2 and June 11, 2008, January 7 and January 14, 2009.

Mr. Boyd asked that his portion of the minutes of June 11, 2008 be pulled.

Ms. Thomas asked that the April 2, 2008 minutes be pulled.

Ms. Mallek asked that her portion of the minutes of June 11, 2008 be pulled.

Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Slutzky had read the minutes of January 7, 2009, and found them to be in order.

Mr. Rooker had read the minutes of January 14, 2009, and found them to be in order.

By the above recorded votes, the minutes of January 7, 2009 and January 14, 2009 were approved.

Item 7.2. Set public hearing to consider proposed ordinance to amend County Code Chapter 11, Section 11-105 to allow the charging of picnic shelter fees during the period that park entry fees are charged and to better clarify authority for setting park fees.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that in October of 2008, the Parks and Recreation Department conducted a study of fees charged for comparable facilities and services by Virginia State Parks and other local parks and recreation departments in Virginia. Based on the results of that study, the Director of Parks and Recreation determined that fees for picnic shelter reservations in the County should be increased from \$25 per day to \$50 per day and due to the extra service provided for picnic shelter reservations, the fee should be charged year-round.

Currently the County Code prohibits the charging of the picnic shelter reservation fee during the period that park entry fees are charged. In addition, in recent years the variety of activities and park uses has continued to increase. This requires flexibility in ability to assess new charges and adjust fees to increase revenues or recapture costs which may be specific to a park usage request. Some examples of new activities include triathlons, mountain bike races, television commercials, field and court reservations by private groups, etc. It has been the historic practice for the Board to establish park entry fees as required by the County Code and for staff to establish all other fees. The current County Code does not clearly designate authority for setting all other fees to staff.

The proposed ordinance retains the requirement for the Board to establish fees for entry and use of parks, recreation areas and swimming facilities under the County's jurisdiction and the public hearing requirement for all entry fee changes. In addition, the proposed ordinance clearly establishes authority for all other fees to be set by the County Executive or his designee. Finally, the proposed ordinance eliminates the prohibition against charging the picnic shelter fee during the period that park entry fees are also being charged and eliminates some verbiage. Staff recommends that the Board set a public hearing on the proposed ordinance for April 1, 2009.

By the recorded vote set out above, the Board set a public hearing for April 1, 2009, to consider proposed ordinance to amend County Code Chapter 11, Section 11-105 to allow the charging of picnic shelter fees during the period that park entry fees are charged and to better clarify authority for setting park fees.

Item 7.3. Proposed Revision to Personnel Policy P-23, Performance Review.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that Personnel Policy §P-23 establishes standards and procedures for employee performance reviews. The policy designates that "each classified employee who successfully completes the probationary period in a permanent position prior to May 1, shall receive an annual performance review by May 15 of each year." The policy was adopted in July, 1993. At that time, the merit increase amount was based on a formula which included an employee's performance evaluation rating and several other computations. The administration of this pooled system required that the evaluations be completed by May 15 to ensure the increase was effective on July 1. In FY 2005-2006, the merit pool system was replaced with a merit matrix which simplified the computation of merit raises.

Due to the simplified administration of the merit matrix, it is not necessary to receive evaluations by May 15. Additionally, the School Board Personnel policy states that teachers and administrative personnel will receive evaluations by June 1. Therefore, it is recommended that policy be revised so that Local Government classified employees will receive written annual evaluations by June 1. An identical amendment has been proposed for School Board classified employees. The School Board will consider approval of that policy amendment on February 26, 2009. There are no budget implications to adopting this amended Policy. Staff recommends adoption of the Resolution to Amend Personnel Policy §P-23.

By the recorded vote set out above, the Board adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the County of Albemarle Personnel Policy Manual has been adopted by the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, the proposed change to Personnel Policy §P-23, Performance Review, extends the date by which a permanent employee shall receive an annual performance review from May 15 to June 1 of each year; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors desires to adopt the revisions to Personnel Policy §P-23.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, hereby adopts Personnel Policy §P-23, Performance Review, of the County of Albemarle Personnel Policy Manual, as attached hereto on file) and incorporated herein, effective March 4, 2009.

§P-23

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
PERSONNEL POLICY
PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The Board believes that the primary purpose of a performance review is to inform employees about their abilities, contributions, and level of performance, and to offer constructive help as to how they might improve.

The Board endorses a regular system of performance reviews and recognizes that this system is designed to:

- A. Maintain or improve each employee's job satisfaction by showing an interest in his/her development.
- B. Serve as a systematic guide in planning further improvement in job performance.
- C. Assure a considered opinion of an employee's performance.
- D. Assist in determining and recording special talents, skills, and/or deficiencies.
- E. Provide an opportunity for each employee to discuss concerns about his/her job.
- F. Assemble data for use as a guide for such purposes as wage adjustments, promotions, training opportunities, disciplinary action, reassignment, and dismissal.

PROCEDURE FOR COMPLIANCE FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

- A. Probationary Terms – The probationary term is a six-month period of continuous employment in one position during which every new employee shall demonstrate his/her ability to perform the job. Police Officers who have no previous experience in Virginia Law Enforcement, and Communication Officers and Supervisors of the Emergency Operations center serve a twelve-month probationary period. If this performance is not satisfactory, the employee may be released without further obligation. During the probationary period, the supervisor will meet with the new employee at the end of the third and sixth month in order to provide input about the employee's progress. The probationary performance review must be of an overall satisfactory rating for an employee to become a permanent staff member.

At the supervisor's request made to the Director of Human Resources), an employee's probationary period may be extended if he misses 10 percent or more of the available work time, due to an illness or temporary disability, during the probationary period. This extension shall be for no more than the number of workdays the employee was absent.

Employees who are promoted into positions in higher pay ranges may be required, by the supervisor, to serve an additional probationary period. If unsuccessful in completing this probationary period, the employee will be considered for any vacancies that occur in his previous job classification.

Likewise, an employee who has moved voluntarily to a lower pay grade may be required by his supervisor to complete an additional probationary period. If unsuccessful in completing this subsequent probationary period, the employee will be considered for any vacancies for which he is qualified.

Employees who are promoted into positions in higher pay ranges, or who voluntarily move to positions in lower pay ranges, shall not be entitled, upon successful completion of a subsequent probationary period, to a salary increase at that time.

- B. Each permanent employee shall receive an annual performance review by June 1st of each year unless specific reasons are given to the employee, in writing, for an extension. The performance review will be conducted by the department head or designee. Reviews

of performance may be conducted on a more frequent basis when desirable. However, in no case will the review be held less frequently than once a year.

- C. Unsatisfactory Evaluation – A classified employee who receives an overall unsatisfactory evaluation will be re-evaluated in three months in order to assess progress shown by the employee. An employee who receives two consecutive overall ratings of unsatisfactory may be subject to dismissal. It shall remain the responsibility of the department head/designee to point out in writing specific areas of weakness and to suggest constructive ways to improve job performance.
- D. Performance reviews will be made on forms provided by the Human Resources Department, and a signed copy will be included in the employee's personnel file. A copy will also be given to the employee.

Amended: August 7, 1996; March 4, 2009

Item 7.4. Resolution of Intent to Amend the Entrance Corridor and Related Provisions in the Zoning Ordinance.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that the Board appointed the Development Review Task Force in March, 2006; the report of the Task Force was presented to the Board in May, 2007. One of the Task Force recommendations reads:

Improve ARB/PC/Board coordination and clarify the role of the ARB. Clarify the sequential review process to alleviate confusion for staff, applicants, the Commission and the Board and clarify the extent of review from the Commission and ARB expected by the Board, prior to Board review.

Joint meetings of the Board, the Commission and ARB were held on May 21 and September 10, 2008, to discuss issues related to this recommendation. Also discussed were more specific recommendations presented by staff on methods for streamlining the ARB review process. The ARB further discussed these issues at its October 20, 2008, and January 20, 2009, ARB meetings.

A Resolution of Intent (Attachment A to the Executive Summary) would initiate a zoning text amendment that would enable the following recommendations presented at the two joint Board/Commission/ARB meetings and subsequently discussed at additional ARB meetings. The proposed zoning text amendment would, among other things:

- Restate the purpose and intent of the entrance corridor regulations.
- Authorize the ARB to issue countywide certificates of appropriateness for certain classes of structures and improvements that are recurring (e.g., certain personal wireless service facilities), or have been determined through experience to have minimal visual impacts (e.g., structures 2000 feet or more from the entrance corridor street or "second tier" buildings). Countywide certificates would allow eligible proposed structures and improvements to be reviewed by staff to assure they satisfy the terms and conditions of the applicable countywide certificate, instead of requiring the owner from obtaining project-specific certificate of appropriateness from the ARB.
- Expand the list of development types exempt from the entrance corridor regulations. The list of exempt development types would be limited to those that have been determined through experience to have minimum visual impacts and those whose impacts may be temporary in nature, such as, temporary construction headquarters and temporary construction yards.
- Clarify and expand the requirements for submitting, reviewing and acting on an application for a certificate of appropriateness.
- Reorganize, provide more accurate and descriptive section headings and subheadings, and make other required changes to the entrance corridor regulations.

Adoption of the Zoning Text Amendment would enable the County to undertake some or all of the above recommendations, resulting in reduced staff time and costs associated with preparing staff reports and making presentations at ARB meetings. Staff recommends that the Board adopt the Resolution of Intent.

By the recorded vote set out above, the Board adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION OF INTENT

WHEREAS, Zoning Ordinance § 30.6 was adopted in 1990 for the purpose of implementing the enabling authority in Virginia Code § 15.2-2306A) by identifying those arterial streets and highways found to be significant routes of tourist access to designated historic landmarks, structures or districts within the County or in contiguous localities hereinafter, "entrance corridors"), requiring that the erection, reconstruction, alteration or restoration of structures, including signs, on parcels contiguous to those streets and highways, be architecturally compatible with those historic landmarks or structures, and establishing the substantive and procedural requirements for approving development by the Architectural Review Board within the entrance corridors; and

WHEREAS, the Development Review Task Force the "DRTF") was charged by the Board of Supervisors in 2006 to review and assess current legislative land use processes to identify needed improvements in efficiency, effectiveness, quality and public participation; and

WHEREAS, one of the DRTF's recommendations to the Board of Supervisors in 2007 was to clarify the extent of Architectural Review Board review expected by the Board of Supervisors and development proposals that would later be considered by the Board of Supervisors and as a result of that recommendation, the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Board have recently held two joint meetings to discuss issues pertaining to the DRTF's recommendation and, related thereto, discussed recommendations presented by County staff for streamlining the Architectural Review Board review process in Zoning Ordinance § 30.6; and

WHEREAS, in order to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and quality in Zoning Ordinance § 30.6's substantive and procedural requirements, Zoning Ordinance § 30.6 and related sections of the Zoning Ordinance should be amended to reorganize, revise and streamline applicable procedural requirements, to reorganize, revise and amend applicable substantive requirements, to further clarify the authority and the role of the Architectural Review Board to facilitate the exercise of its powers, and to make other changes deemed appropriate in order to better achieve the purpose of Zoning Ordinance § 30.6 and to address the recommendation of the DRTF.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT for purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good land development practices, the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts a resolution of intent to amend Zoning Ordinance §§ 3.1, 4.15, 30.6 and any other regulations of the Zoning Ordinance deemed appropriate to achieve the purposes described herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on the zoning text amendment proposed by this resolution of intent, and make its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, at the earliest possible date.

Item 7.5. CPA-2008-004. Economic Development Policy Update deferred from February 11, 2009).

It was noted in the Executive Summary that the Board held a public hearing on the proposed Economic Development Policy update on February 11, 2009. The Board requested edits to the proposed policy and deferred action to March 4, 2009. The revised policy has been forwarded to the Board for its review and adoption.

By the recorded vote set out above, the Board adopted the following amended Economic Development Policy as part of the Comprehensive Plan:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY

THE POLICY:

The purpose of this economic development policy is, first and foremost, to provide the local citizenry an improved standard of living and enhanced quality of life. Economic growth and vitality are required to sustain and enhance the human economic, cultural, and natural characteristics of our community. By creating and sustaining a high quality, diversified economic environment, citizens will enjoy improved job opportunities, competitive wages, work force development opportunities, and the community will enjoy a growing and diversified tax base. Within well-defined development areas, we will seek to designate opportunity sites to address future growth needs in a manner that will add to the strength of our community. We will engage with our resident and new enterprises seeking to expand their businesses. We will work to find appropriate development areas sites to accommodate this positive growth within the context of the Master Planning process and the Comprehensive Plan. We will work to encourage a mix of uses, and a balance of jobs and housing within our development areas, in keeping with our commitment to the Neighborhood model form of development. We will work with resident and new agricultural enterprises to, in an environmentally sustainable manner, maximize their productivity and tourism opportunities as a part of our overall strategy to preserve the rich agrarian tradition and texture of our rural areas. We recognize our position, along with the City of Charlottesville, as the center of the regional economy. We recognize the economic objectives of other localities in the region, while renewing our commitment to our own economic development within the framework of our growth management objectives.

We are like other university communities in that we have an above-average labor force participation rate and above-average number of part-time workers (both students and adults who prefer part-time work). The University of Virginia is a consistently strong employer and offers great potential for associated scientific research and development. Other major employers continue to provide employment stability and diversity. The renowned natural environment, Blue Ridge Mountain location, and historic resources of the area provide a growing tourist trade as well as an attractive place to do business.

Note: "Business" and "industry" are intended to be inclusive and interchangeable terms, meaning the commercial production and sale of goods or services.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND STRATEGIES:

GOAL: Maintain a strong and sustainable economy: 1) benefiting County citizens and existing businesses and providing diversified economic opportunities; 2) supportive of the County's Growth Management Policy and consistent with the other Comprehensive Plan goals; and, 3) taking into consideration the greater Charlottesville Metropolitan region.

OBJECTIVE I: Base economic development policy on planning efforts which support and enhance the strengths of the County.

STRATEGIES:

1. Protect through diligent growth management efforts the County's distinctive natural and man-made qualities to maintain its attractiveness as a place to live and work. Support those projects that meet the intent of the Neighborhood model form of development, i.e., offer a mix of uses and a balance of jobs-to-housing in our development areas.
2. Maintain the relationship of high quality schools and public services and an outstanding level of natural and cultural amenities to positive economic development, and maintain these attributes.
3. Increase the promotion of tourism focused on the rural, agrarian, and historical resources of the County, and which does not threaten or compromise those resources and to be consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.
4. Increase the promotion of local agricultural industry consistent with the goals, objectives and implementation strategies of the Comprehensive Plan, more specifically by:
 - Increasing support to local agricultural infrastructure such local food networks and programs (The agricultural infrastructure provides markets and supplies to farmers and significant economic activity to Albemarle County as a whole.);
 - Establishing a proactive rural-support program that provides assistance to the local agricultural community, and that includes an on-going dialogue with farm-industry stakeholders;
 - Supporting farmers by connecting those farmers with technical resources such as those provided by the Farm Bureau, PVCC, PEC and VA Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and to landowners interested in leasing farm land;
 - Incorporating outreach and education in public school programs;
 - Addressing the Comprehensive Plan, Rural Area Chapter recommendations for economic vitality; and
 - Participating in or commissioning a study of the impact of agriculture to Albemarle County's economy.
5. Recognize that the University of Virginia is a main driver of economic vitality and can provide important resources for business and industry. Work with the University, its associated entities and the City to take advantage of opportunities to benefit from this resource in innovative ways. In addition:
 - Working with the University and the City through the Three-Party Agreements process to encourage appropriate infill locations and environmental sensitivity in the planning and development of University facilities.
6. Recognize the importance and role of military intelligence as another type of economic driver to the local economy and the region, as well as an important resource for national security. Encourage base location and expansion to be consistent with County policies.
7. Maintain a contact point for information about the County, including the Business Development Facilitator who serves as the County's principal liaison with the business community for the purpose of encouraging development and businesses consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan.
8. Increase planning for the special needs, and utilize the talents, of the growing retired population attracted to this area, including "encore-career" seekers, a term used to describe work in the second half of life that combines continued income, greater meaning and social impact.
9. Increase support to initiatives that support employment of the local labor force, rather than heavy reliance on relocated workers.

10. Encourage all businesses to adopt environmentally sustainable measures and discourage business and industry which is not environmentally sustainable or friendly (such as high water users, polluters).
11. Increase diversity in business and industry which will accommodate a variety of skill/educational levels, and provide for a diversified tax base, in particular to reduce the tax burden borne by residential property owners.
12. Maintain data on County plans, zoning, sites, and policies, and make these available on request. Monitor and report to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors about the volume of economic development activity and how that activity is fitting with the Goals, Objectives and Strategies of the Comprehensive Plan.

OBJECTIVE II: Plan for land and infrastructure to accommodate future business and industrial growth.

STRATEGIES:

1. Assess the quality of areas designated for business and industry through analysis of the site size variety, topography, location, and availability of infrastructure in such areas, and compile an inventory of actual, useable land.
2. Designate areas for office, commercial and industrial development within the designated Development Areas that meet the development standards of the Comprehensive Plan and will provide sufficient land to meet community needs through the next Comprehensive Plan revision.
 - Ensure that land for business and light-industrial uses are consistent with the neighborhood model principles, which provide for ease of access for employees to housing, support services, and multi-modal transportation options.
3. Utilize the rezoning process and associated proffer allowances to address needs brought about by new development and to provide the community with assurances about future development activities.
4. Encourage infill development of business and industrial uses in Development Areas, including consideration of proactively rezoning land to allow for light-industrial uses as needs are identified through Master Plans and other efforts. Initiate zoning text amendments that further enable business and light-industrial uses of the appropriate zoning districts. Additional infill approaches should include:
 - Encouraging the provision of business and light-industrial development opportunities in non-residential and mixed-use projects in the development review and approval process; and
 - Encouraging proffers for assembling light-industrial land or funding to offset the cost of local light-industrial-user expansion where there is an impact from the project and it is necessary to mitigate the impacts.
5. Maintain and implement current infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, and community facilities) programs to support business and industrial development of designated development areas. Identify infrastructure improvements that better enable business and industrial development, in appropriate locations.
6. Continue to cooperate with other jurisdictions on regional transportation initiatives (trails, rail, road, transit, and air travel).
7. Continue to work with property owners in designated Development Areas to identify infrastructure needs, and promote good planning for development of such areas consistent with County growth management strategies.

OBJECTIVE III: Recognize the County's place in the regional economy.

STRATEGIES:

1. Maintain cooperation with the City of Charlottesville, Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC), Thomas Jefferson Partnership for Economic Development (TJPED), other jurisdictions in the region, the University of Virginia, and Piedmont Virginia Community College for:
 - Development of a coordinated economic data base;
 - Continuing discussion among the TJPDC jurisdictions about working and shopping patterns, wage levels, job stability, work force development needs, housing affordability, public services, tax burdens, and other topics which relate to the purposes of local and regional economic development policy;
 - Distribution of information about development opportunities in the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) to those who request it;

- Regional work force development;
 - Addressing linkages between housing and wages;
 - Evaluating local, regional, statewide, national, and worldwide economic trends to determine the current and future economic stability of, and growth opportunities for, different types of business and industry;
 - Initiatives such as the high school technology tour; and
 - Regional transportation initiatives (trails, rail, road, transit, and air travel).
2. Support mutual consultation on regional development projects along shared borders, and/or on projects of significance to more than one locality, possibly through a "Memorandum of Understanding."

OBJECTIVE IV: Consider fiscal impact as one indicator of positive economic development, along with environmental impact and standard of living impact.

STRATEGIES:

1. Maintain evaluation of the fiscal impacts of new business/industrial development.
2. Recognize that County residents place importance on job opportunities and economic growth, but not at the expense of the protection and preservation of water quality and quantity, natural resources, farmland, historic areas, and open space.
3. Recognize that the purpose of this economic development policy is to provide the local citizenry an improved standard of living, improved job and wage opportunities, and work force development opportunities, rather than to seek to stimulate further population growth.
4. Recognize, identify and quantify new benefits and costs (for business and citizens) imposed by any proposed ordinance or policy change prior to taking action on said policy or ordinance.

OBJECTIVE V: Increase local business development opportunities.

STRATEGIES:

1. Maintain support to existing businesses and industries through an open door policy of communication, and exchange of information and concerns.
2. Support and coordinate with existing entities that assist new small, locally-owned, local agricultural ventures, minority businesses and micro-enterprises in their start-up and early operation efforts.

OBJECTIVE VI: Increase work force development opportunities, to further career-ladder opportunity and higher wages.

STRATEGIES:

1. Recognize that the most fundamentally sound work force is one that has basic education and good work habits:
 - Increase support for initiatives that foster career-planning, decision-making and workplace readiness skills for the K-12 population, as measured by the number of participants in career-education activities;
 - Increase support for facilities to support residents seeking apprenticeship, industry licensure or certifications for high-demand and career-ladder jobs. Target populations would include disadvantaged, lower-income and "encore-career" seekers served by the VA Employment Commission;
 - Promote employee certification and licensure to the business community; and
 - Focus efforts on opportunities that increase wages to local residents.
2. Encourage and support continuing educational and training programs to prepare the local work force for the skill demands of current and future employers, including appropriate work habits and life skills.
 - Increase support (purchase of books, etc.) for Albemarle County residents to attend pre-employment training at career centers to include topics such as time-management, stress-management and customer service; and
 - Increase support for continuing education and training programs, ideally targeting incumbent-worker, career-ladder training.
3. Increase the use of information gathering strategies such as:
 - A regional, baseline workforce study to define and benchmark underemployment and "not-in-the-labor force" needs as well as employer needs; and

- A software database, such as Executive Pulse®, to help identify workforce training needs.
4. Monitor performance of the County's Strategic Plan and the Comprehensive Plan (education, housing, day care, transportation, etc.) to address barriers experienced by the local work force, particularly those with greatest needs.

Priority Action Measures:

To address issues identified in the 2007 updated data, the Policy's short-term priorities include the following strategies:

- Objective I. Strategy 4. Increasing the promotion of local agricultural industry consistent with the goals, objectives and implementation strategies of the Comprehensive Plan, such as the purchase of local products, establishing a rural-support program and continuing a dialogue with farm-industry stakeholders.
- Objective II. Strategy 4. Encourage infill development of business and industrial uses in Development Areas, including consideration of proactively rezoning to light-industrial uses as needs are identified through Master Plans and other efforts. Initiate zoning text amendments that further enable business and industrial uses of the appropriate zoning districts.
- Objective VI. Strategy 3. Increase the use of information gathering strategies such as:
 - A regional, baseline workforce study to define and benchmark the needs of "underemployed" and those not in the labor force (as defined by the VA Employment Commission) as well as employer needs; and
 - A software database, such as Executive Pulse®, to identify workforce training needs and promote workforce training opportunities.

Item 7.6. Fire/Rescue Volunteer Incentive Program (VIP).

It was noted in the Executive Summary that during the FY '09 budget process, the Board appropriated \$157,000 to fund the first phase of a Volunteer Incentive Program (VIP). This VIP funding was requested to help insure the success and sustainability of the current volunteer-based fire and emergency medical services (EMS) delivery system through a multi-layered incentive program.

Fiscal restraints prevent the VIP from proceeding as originally intended. Therefore, the Albemarle County Fire Rescue Advisory Board (ACFRAB) and staff recommend reallocating existing funds in support of a volunteer leadership development and training program, a key module identified in the original initiative. The ACFRAB and staff propose a change in the parameters of the program with a prioritization of expenditures focused on training and leadership development, allocating \$120,000 of the \$157,000 appropriated in FY '09 to be expended over a three-year period beginning FY '09. This strategy allows a component of the VIP to be implemented and helps to support the goal of insuring the success and sustainability of the emergency service system.

Through a majority vote, ACFRAB tasked the VIP committee to define parameters of the training and leadership development module and established a goal to have 75 percent of current and new officers participate in the program (about 66 of 88 volunteer officers). Currently, officers are required by Federal mandate to obtain certification in the national incident management system (NIMS - IS100 through IS800). In some cases, the lack of availability of local offerings has made it difficult for officers to obtain the training. Listed below are the results of the NIMS compliance matrix:

	IS700	IS100	IS200	IS800	IS300
Senior Management	14/20 = 70 %	13/20 = 65 %	11/20 = 55 %	8/20 = 40 %	3/20 = 15 %
Middle Management	11/14 = 79 %	8/14 = 57 %	7/14 = 50 %	6/14 = 43 %	
First Line Supervisors	35/54 = 65 %	28/54 = 52 %			
	60/88 = 68 %	49/88 = 56 %	18/34 = 53 %	14/34 = 41 %	3/20 = 15 %

Implementation of an Incident Management Training Program would allow for 100 percent compliance on federally mandated training by insuring adequate local offerings to obtain the training. In addition to the incident management training, focus groups of volunteer providers have identified additional human resource management and tactical decision-making training opportunities, neither of which is currently offered locally. Current statistics do not exist under these categories; however, the goal is to have 75 percent of current and new officers participate in the program.

Implementing the training and leadership module is a proactive measure to address a nationwide retention issue. According to the USFA, leadership is identified as a primary reason for system attrition nationwide. Over the past year, the Human Resources Department has conducted exit interviews of volunteers, but there are not yet enough responses for statistical significance. There is also no evidence to indicate that the County system is exempt from the national trend.

The VIP committee explored other strategies of implementing a modified incentive program, including utilizing the funds from other components such as tuition reimbursement and/or flexible spending

accounts. Utilizing existing funding for leadership development and training offers the most tangible return on investment, and has the least impact if faced with discontinuation. While it is understood that the VIP cannot be funded in its entirety, this proposal presents a fiscally responsible approach to continued support of the volunteer forces and maintenance of the County's above-average retention statistics.

Performance measures will include:

- number of class offerings;
- percentage of officers participating in the program stated goal of a participation rate of 75 percent of current and new officers); and
- exit interview data identifying trends in reasons personnel leave the system.

The revised VIP would have minimal workload impacts on existing staff through FY '12. Should the VIP continue beyond FY '12 or expand, staff would need to further analyze the program to determine the staffing and financial impact.

The ACFRAB and staff recommend approval of the proposed Volunteer Leadership and Development Program and the allocation of \$120,000 to fund the Program over a three-year period beginning in FY '09.

(**Discussion:** Mr. Boyd acknowledged the recruitment and retention efforts by the fire and rescue departments, and thanked them for their work.)

By the recorded vote set out above, the Board approved of the proposed Volunteer Leadership and Development Program and the allocation of \$120,000 to fund the Program over a three-year period beginning in FY '09 as recommended by staff and ACFRAB.)

Item 7.7. FY 2009 Appropriations.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that the Code of Virginia § 15.2-2507 stipulates that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget. However, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The total of this requested FY 2009 appropriation is \$305,300.00. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the cumulative appropriations will not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

This request involves the approval of two new FY 2009 appropriations as follows:

Appropriation No. 2009-050, \$ 296,000.00. Revenue Source: Federal Revenue \$296,000.00. In June 2004, the County was awarded a \$296,000.00 federal safety grant for pedestrian related safety improvements on Hillsdale Drive between Rio Road and Greenbrier Drive. The purpose of the grant was to identify safety improvements that could be done without major reconstruction. The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, the City of Charlottesville, and the County worked cooperatively to complete a safety study for Hillsdale Drive that perfectly matched the grant requirements. This study identified pedestrian improvements with the input from the public after several public meetings. The project will include 1,514 linear feet of new sidewalk starting on Greenbrier Drive and extending east on Hillsdale Drive ending at Mall Drive, three landscaped crosswalks with pedestrian signal systems at two of the crosswalks, and 1,700 linear feet of new sidewalk on Old Brook Road and 420 linear feet of sidewalk along the Fashion Square Mall on Rio Road. Bids for the construction phase of this project have been received and VDOT has authorized the County to proceed. The \$296,000.00 in grant funding, in addition to the \$312,000.00 in local funding previously appropriated, will cover the project costs including design, which has already been completed, and construction.

Appropriation No. 2009-051, \$9,300.00. Revenue Source: Local Revenue \$ 9,300.00. At its meeting on February 12, 2009, the School Board approved the following appropriations:

- Yancey Elementary School has been awarded a grant in the amount of \$300.00 from the Kids Care Clubs. These funds will be used to purchase materials and assist with field trip expenses for the Yancey Kids Care Club project titled "Party Pals". The students will be making birthday cards for guests of the Laurels of Charlottesville. The birthday cards will be personalized and sent each month. In June the club will visit the Laurels and meet some of the residents they sent birthday cards to.
- Baker Butler Elementary School has been awarded a grant in the amount of \$1,000.00 from the Virginia Education Association. These funds will be used to implement fifth grade teacher Jennifer Whitenack's project titled "Hardtack and Hardee's Tactics: Life as a Civil War Soldier". This project focuses on reconstructing the daily life of a soldier, personalizing the study of the Civil War and instilling interest in and understanding of the Civil War and the soldier's experience.
- Better Living, Inc. has awarded seven Albemarle County Public School teachers staff development stipends in the amount of \$1,000.00 each under the Golden Apple Award. Recipients include Amy Morris, Broadus Wood; Martha Massie, Cale; Tome Green,

Scottsville; Michael Allen, Sutherland Middle; Tom Stargell, Walton Middle; LeAnne Brubaker, Monticello High; and, Carlos Pezua, Murray High.

- Agnor Hurt Elementary School has been awarded a grant in the amount of \$1,000.00 from the Wal-Mart Foundation. These funds will be used to purchase physical education equipment that will place an emphasis on the importance of aerobic conditioning to prevent childhood obesity.

Staff recommends approval of the budget amendment in the amount of \$305,300.00 and the approval of Appropriation Nos. 2009-050 and No. 2009-051.

By the recorded vote set out above, the Board approved of the budget amendment in the amount of \$305,300.00 and approval of the following Resolutions of Appropriation:

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION NO. 2009-050
 DATE: 03-04-09
 EXPLANATION: Hillsdale Drive Sidewalk Improvement - Federal Safety Grant

TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	SUB LEDGER		GENERAL LEDGER	
					CODE	AMOUNT	DEBIT	CREDIT
2	9010	33030	330035	Federal Revenue-VDOT	J2	296,000.00		
1	9010	43100	950174	Hillsdale Drive Sidewalk	J1	296,000.00		
	9010		0501	Est. Revenue			296,000.00	
			0701	Appropriation				296,000.00
TOTAL						592,000.00	296,000.00	296,000.00

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION NO. 2009-051
 DATE: 03/04/09
 EXPLANATION: Education Donations and Programs - School Board Meeting - 02/12/2009

TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	SUB LEDGER		GENERAL LEDGER	
					CODE	AMOUNT	DEBIT	CREDIT
2	3104	18000	181258	Golden Apple Award	J2	7,000.00		
2	3104	18000	181276	Revenue-Misc Grants	J2	1,000.00		
2	3104	18000	189900	Revenue-Misc Grants	J2	1,300.00		
1	3104	60213	420100	Field Trips	J1	100.00		
1	3104	60213	601300	Ed & Rec Supplies	J1	200.00		
1	3104	60215	601300	Ed & Rec Supplies	J1	1,000.00		
1	3104	60217	601300	Ed & Rec Supplies	J1	1,000.00		
1	3104	61311	580500	Staff Development	J1	7,000.00		
	3104		0501	Est. Revenue			9,300.00	
			0701	Appropriation				9,300.00
TOTAL						18,600.00	9,300.00	9,300.00

Item 7.8. Resolution Endorsing Rail Preservation Application of Buckingham Branch Railroad Company.

(Discussion: Ms. Thomas said the Buckingham Branch railroad is becoming an increasingly important piece of the community, but the trains are causing long delays because they have to move slowly on the tracks in need of repair. She asked for a report from the railroads that includes updates on these projects.)

By the recorded vote set out above, the Board adopted the following Resolution:

RESOLUTION ENDORSING
 RAIL PRESERVATION APPLICATION OF
 BUCKINGHAM BRANCH RAILROAD COMPANY

WHEREAS, the Buckingham Branch Railroad desires to file an application with the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation for funding assistance for the projects; and

WHEREAS, Buckingham Branch Railroad has identified projects that are estimated to cost \$857,143.00; and

WHEREAS, the General Assembly, through enactment of the Rail Preservation Program, provides for funding for certain improvements and procurement of railways in the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Buckingham Branch Railroad is an important element of the County of Albemarle transportation system; and

WHEREAS, the Buckingham Branch Railroad is instrumental in the economic development of the area, and provides relief to the highway system by transporting freight, and provides an alternate means of transportation of commodities; and

WHEREAS, the County of Albemarle supports the project and the retention of the rail service; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth Transportation Board has established procedures for all allocation and distribution of the funds provided.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County of Albemarle Board of Supervisors does hereby request the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation to give priority consideration to the projects proposed by the Buckingham Branch Railroad; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy, of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the March 4, 2009 meeting and sent to Buckingham Branch Railroad.

Item 7.9. Environmental Regulations Applicable to Home Occupations.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that on December 3, 2008, the Board directed staff to provide information on the environmental regulations applicable to home occupations and the inspections conducted to insure compliance with applicable regulations.

Historically known as cottage industries, home occupations in Albemarle County are increasing in number as more people choose to work part-time or full-time from their homes. In Albemarle County, home occupations fall into two categories: Class A and Class B. A Class A Home Occupation is defined as an occupation conducted for profit in a dwelling unit for which no person other than members of the family residing on the premises may be engaged in the occupation. A Class B Home Occupation may be more intensive but unlike a Class A Home Occupation which is conducted for profit in a dwelling unit and a person and his family members residing on the premises may be engaged in the occupation, a Class B Home Occupation may also use accessory structures and employ up to two persons who are not family members.

Class A Home Occupation permits are approved administratively and are the more common of the two classifications. Over the past five years, Zoning and Current Development has received a yearly average of 337 applications for Class A Home Occupations. Class B Home Occupations require a special use permit issued by the Board and typically less than four applications are made a year.

All home occupations are subject to the performance standards delineated in Zoning Ordinance § 4.14. These standards pertain to use impacts such as noise, vibration, air and water pollution, radioactivity and electrical interference. If the home occupation involves a use with physical procedures, machinery and/or operations that might create impacts regulated under Zoning Ordinance § 4.14, the applicant is required to address the performance standards.

For most home occupations, a letter from the applicant demonstrating compliance with the performance standards in Zoning Ordinance § 4.14 is sufficient to allow the County Engineer to efficiently and inexpensively confirm compliance with the performance standards. As part of his review, the County Engineer assures that the applicant has provided all relevant information to allow him to determine compliance. In any given case, particularly those home occupations that may cause discharges into the environment, the County Engineer may require that the applicant submit a full certified engineer's report. A full certified engineer's report must address the performance standards, list all machines, processes, products and by-products, state the nature and expected levels of emissions or discharges to land, air and/or water, or liquid, solid or gaseous effluent and electrical impulses and noise under normal operations. The report must also specify treatment methods and mechanisms to be used to control the emissions or discharges.

Because of the high number of applications and the limited external impacts arising from the typical home occupation, Class A Home Occupation sites are not inspected prior to approval. Class B Home Occupation sites are routinely inspected as part of the special use permit review process.

Most discharges of solids, liquids and gases into the environment are regulated by the State, rather than by the County. With respect to solid and liquid discharges, septic systems are designed for domestic wastewater only. If a home occupation involves waste other than domestic wastewater, a means of disposal other than a septic system would be required. An applicant would have to address these discharges in an engineer's report and the County's approval of the home occupation would be conditioned upon an approved plan for disposing of the waste. Any unusual environmental issues for a Class B Home Occupation can be addressed by conditions of the special use permit.

Changing the procedure to require an inspection prior to home occupation approval would result in a staffing impact. At the current number of home occupation applications – an average of 337 a year - this would involve almost 0.5 FTE. Increasing the process or regulation of home occupations would also increase staffing impacts.

Staff recommends that the County continue its current approach to reviewing proposed home occupations' compliance with the performance standards delineated in Zoning Ordinance § 4.14. There are several aspects of the regulation of home occupations that warrant review, including the range and scope in the Rural Areas and the accommodation of live-work units in the Development Areas. These will be addressed comprehensively with a future zoning text amendment.

This report was received for information.

Item 7.10. Copy of letter dated February 9, 2009, from Francis H. MacCall, Senior Planner, to Charles P. Hudson, re: LOD20080028 – OFFICIAL DETERMINATION OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS – Tax Map 100, Parcel 20B, Tax Map 100, Parcel 21, Property of Charles P. Hudson or Laura Hudson) – Samuel Miller Magisterial District, **was received for information.**

Item 7.11. Copy of reports prepared by the Department of Community Development: 2008 Albemarle County Year End Certificate of Occupancy; 2008 Fourth Quarter Building Report; and, 2008 Year End Building Report, **were all received for information.**

Agenda Item No. 7a. Historical Overview of the Comprehensive Plan Video, David Benish.

Ms. Elaine Echols, Senior Planner, said staff has been working on this video for the last eight months in conjunction with Mr. Richard Adams – the co-producer and videographer. This is an educational video on comprehensive planning and how it affects decision-making in the County which will be put on the County's website for viewing. She then played the video.

Ms. Thomas indicated that she was asked to give a brief presentation, as part of the Chesapeake Bay Program, on Albemarle's efforts to protect water. She started with the Comprehensive Plan because often Federal agencies such as the EPA do not pay any attention to land use decisions that are made by local governments and have no appreciation for what that contributes to protection of the water. Particularly, that the County's growth management plan started as a water protection measure. She said the Chesapeake Bay Program has actually been talked into now including the efforts of local governments – all of these years, they have never been mentioned local governments in their report to Congress.

Agenda Item No. 8. Virginia Department of Forestry Annual Presentation, Nelson Shaw.

Mr. Nelson Shaw, Department of Forestry, said the agency was formed in 1914 with a primary mission of suppressing and preventing forest fires. Last year there were 28 fires, totaling about 107 acres, with February 10 having the most fires in Virginia's history. One fire occurring near the Albemarle/Nelson County line extended to the top of a mountain; last year the largest fire was 72 acres, with the County's average being 3.8 acres and most of the fires being about one-quarter acre. In each case they were able to determine the cause and responsible person(s), adding that they also enforce the 4:00 p.m. burn law.

Mr. Shaw said the Department visits schools – both public and private – they visited seven last year. Tree harvesting activity is down from previous years; normally they have 100 notifications, but last year it was down to 78. There were seven law enforcement actions last year for infractions such as a harvesting that yields potential pollution to waterways. They are given a period of ten days to improve those actions, and if the taken care of, the action is closed; if not taken care of it becomes a law enforcement action. There is a penalty for non-notification to the Forestry Department when harvesting.

Mr. Shaw said the Department celebrates Arbor Day, and did eight events last year working primarily with children and young adults. They also did 14 water protection projects on 68 acres; it takes a lot of linear feet to protect an acre – with six miles done last year. He mentioned that on March 22 the Rivanna Conservation Day will take place at Glenmore. He noted that Ms. Fernell was a pioneer in preserving riparian buffers; there have been five formal stewardship plans made in the County for 637 acres. There is a formal stewardship program by which a landowner can be nominated to be a certified forest stewardship landowner. Last year there were three areas of 86 acres for growing timber, and this spring there are seven areas for 440 acres – all in Albemarle County. There are informal plans for 29 tracts for 852 acres, with landowners who are interested in managing their property but not moving into formal stewardship. The government pays the landowner for various forestry practices, and there were 17 last year for 503 acres.

Ms. Thomas mentioned the pending requirement for participants in the Land Use Taxation Program to indicate that they have a forestry plan, and she asked how his office might be able to respond to a great increase in requirement for this kind of plan. Mr. Shaw said the landowner can also do a statement of intent for the land, rather than a forestry management plan, adding that those plans would have to come from the private sector.

Ms. Thomas asked him to review the wording of the revalidation form to ensure that the language is clear to the Department. She hopes they can look at the form and make sure that what it calls for is something they can offer.

Mr. Slutzky noted that the County is not requiring them to implement the plan as a condition of continued access.

Ms. Mallek added that the alternative to the plan is a commitment to use best management practices in their forestry management.

Ms. Thomas commented that best management practices are essentially an education program for landowners who might not know the right tools needed for their land.

Mr. Rooker asked if there is a model plan that people can follow. Mr. Shaw replied that there is not a model plan in place currently.

Ms. Mallek noted that there is a template that provides information, and perhaps that could be shared with the public.

Mr. Slutzky said he sits on the County's Ag/Forestry Committee along with Mr. Shaw, and perhaps they could convene a meeting and have that group discuss how to facilitate implementation of more stringent requirements. Mr. Shaw said the Department also does resource management of tracts – some by aerial operation, and some by hand. There is a lot of thinning going on now, primarily pine thinning. Last year there were eight areas comprising 911 acres – the most ever in Albemarle. He said Albemarle County could qualify as a Tree City USA community, and he thanked the Board members for their time.

Mr. Slutzky asked how the County would pursue such a designation. Mr. Shaw replied that there is an application process whereby a locality documents how much it spends per capita, and he offered to help with that process.

Ms. Mallek asked if the gypsy moth will be coming back this year or if it is still in remission. Mr. Shaw as far as he knows, it is still in check.

Ms. Mallek asked if the power supply for the Forestry Department's transmitter has been reset. She said that on February 10 hundreds of County residents went out to fight wild fires. Many of those fires were in the White Hall District and many residents were given only five-minute warnings that they might have to evacuate if the fires did not get under control. One of the challenges that day was that the transmitter was not able to function well because of a change in the generators. Once their cell phones lost power, it was difficult to get the bulldozers to where they were needed. Mr. Shaw said he does not know the specifics of that incident.

Mr. Shaw then presented a dogwood tree seedling to each Board member, saying this is an excellent time of the year to plant trees.

Agenda Item No. 9. Martha Jefferson Hospital - Presentation on New Hospital Construction.

Mr. Ron Cottrell, Vice President of Planning at Martha Jefferson, spoke. He introduced Ms. Barbara Elias and Ms. Sheila O'Donnell from Martha Jefferson and general contractors Mr. Jeff Maples and Mr. Kai Ellistead. He said that in 2000, it was found that their master plan needed to be updated based on the population growth in Albemarle and Charlottesville as well as surrounding counties. About 50 percent of MJH patients come from Albemarle and Charlottesville, with 45 percent coming from contiguous counties and the remaining five percent coming from other localities. They also analyzed health care demand trends, age demographics and population growth as well as what could be accommodated on the current MJH campus. It was determined they were not able to meet the health care needs of the region on their current campus; MJH has added spine surgery, bariatric surgery, retina surgery and other specialty services in recent years that has increased the demand on the facility.

Mr. Cottrell said the hospital looked at many different sites, but kept coming back to the Peter Jefferson Place location as it is just 2.5 miles from the current site, is conveniently accessible, and was already zoned for development. He added that the property owner – Mr. Worrell – indicated that he felt there would be no better use of the property than for a hospital.

Mr. Cottrell reported that the new hospital will be a state-of-the art facility with 520,000 square feet; it has been in the planning stage for over three years. He noted that general contractor M.A. Mortensen is the second-largest health care contractor in the country, adding that there is a growing body of evidence about quality of construction and how it is executed has a direct correlation with performance in the hospital once it's opened. One of the areas most impacted is infection control, and Mortensen was able to address that in their design. He added that MJH is not bound to always take the lowest bidder, but with \$115.0 million in work awarded so far 86 percent of that is from subcontractors who are within a one-hour drive of the hospital; \$40.0 million of that has been awarded to companies with Charlottesville addresses. He mentioned that MJH used Small Business, Women, and Minority-Owned Business criteria (SWAM), and 36 percent of the money is being spent with such companies.

Mr. Cottrell introduced Mr. Mike Matthews to present some photos of the site and a video of what the hospital will eventually look like.

Mr. Matthews presented an aerial photograph of the site. He said that MJH changed its master plan to build the hospital into the hillside. The site fits well with the Peter Jefferson Parkway connection to State Farm Boulevard which forms a parallel route to Route 250. He added that the site will contain over three miles of pedestrian trails. There will be 176 private room patient beds; building the hospital into the hillside has allowed open space to be doubled. He complimented County staff for all of their work on the project.

Mr. Matthews said 75,000 man-hours have been expended on the project without a single reportable accident, and the project has stayed on budget. He mentioned that there is about \$1.0 billion in construction activity in the community now, which has put tremendous pressure on the labor market; MJH is a couple of percentage points under its projected buyout. MJH has worked with surrounding neighbors, as well as Monticello, which provided input into how the site has developed. MJH has begun the process of planning how to physically move equipment, computers, staff, and ultimately patients to the new hospital. He then presented photos of the site and a timeline of construction progress, noting that there will be a rainwater-harvesting facility onsite to be used for irrigation and as an aesthetic amenity.

Mr. Matthews reported that there are about 100 workers onsite now, but the entire workforce of MJH will be thousands of people – with 300 to 400 on site during the peak shift; he added that there is a great sense of pride among those working on the building as they know it will be a facility that serves the community. He presented a video time lapse of the hospital's construction.

Ms. Thomas asked how Monticello reacted to the bulk and visual impact of the hospital site. Mr. Matthews replied that MJH has worked with them and the ARB, and they are both pleased with what is proposed for the building's composition – which is largely brick. Mr. Cottrell said MJH has a site planning team and a representative from Monticello was invited to participate, which resulted in a better product. He said they tried to use buff colors that would blend into the background, and the facility is mostly brick and stone.

Ms. Thomas asked if they had shown this information to Westminster Canterbury. Mr. Cottrell said they have not recently but will make an effort to do so soon.

Ms. Thomas noted that this project has a lot of raw dirt, and she asked how they are planning to deal with that. Mr. Matthews responded that they have worked closely with County staff on stormwater and erosion/sediment control plans; the project exceeds all requirements of the County. He said they have planted thousands of wetland plants in the drainage basin area that will begin to emerge when spring arrives.

Mr. Slutzky asked how many of the subcontractors are from minority-owned businesses. Mr. Cottrell replied that there are not many even though an effort was made to recruit those firms. He added that about 30 percent of the MJH workforce is Caucasian, with 70 percent being non-Caucasian.

In response to Mr. Dorrier's question about the number of rooms, Mr. Cottrell indicated there would be 176 private rooms, and this would actually increase the hospital's functional capacity. He also said the MJH occupancy rate is about 70 percent, which is not that far from what is considered fully occupied.

Mr. Boyd asked him to share the story of designing the average room. Mr. Cottrell explained that they put together a mock-up room in the basement of the existing hospital, went through many scenarios with different caregivers, and then made changes based on that experience. He said that was a tool that involved input from patient families as well as caregivers and patients themselves.

Mr. Tucker asked the total value of the property when completed. Mr. Cottrell replied that construction costs are \$203.0 million.

Mr. Tucker asked if the emergency responder system was considered in the construction of the building. Mr. Matthews replied that his team engaged with County personnel to understand the requirements, and the contractors have been collaborating with local EMS and other responders; OSHA has also been invited to the site.

Ms. Elias addressed the Board as the Director of the new Hospital. She explained that the hospital's computer system will have repeaters throughout the entire hospital enabling cell phone coverage and mobile device use.

Mr. Slutzky thanked all for this report.

Agenda Item No. 10. Board-to-Board, Monthly Communications Report from School Board, School Board Chairman.

Mr. Brian Wheeler, Chairman of the Albemarle County School Board, addressed the Board. He said that in an effort to improve efficiencies in the School Board office and to make the work of the School Board more transparent to the public, on February 6 they began using a paperless product known as "Electronic School Board." It will include all board agendas, documents, minutes and policies. Board members and the general public may view items related to a specific board meeting from any computer with an Internet connection. Paper copies will no longer be produced. The system also adds the function of searchable minutes, agendas, supporting documents and policies.

Mr. Wheeler said 20 Albemarle County high school students have been selected as finalists in the 2009 National Merit® Scholarship program. Nine Albemarle High school students received the distinction: John F. Elder, Roger Fan, Cameron K. Hill, Valentina S. Moshnikova, Amy L. Pugh, Ariel L. Schwartz, Caitlyn M. Suhler, Duncan C. Townsend, and Matthew E. Truwit. Western Albemarle High School produced seven finalists: Caroline Barnes, Joshua Dugan, Elizabeth Hexter, Joanna Moody, Samantha Rivkin, Wesley Swank, and Whitney Wenger. Katherine Downs, Patricia Fernandez, Stephen Lander, and Timothy Pianta were the four students from Monticello High school to each win a Certificate of Merit for the competition and progress to the finals for college scholarship opportunities. The students were selected for this prestigious honor out of nearly 1.5 million high school students in the United States who take the PSAT (Preliminary Scholastic Assessment Test) and NMSQT® (National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test) examinations each fall. This is the largest number of National Merit® finalists in Albemarle County Public Schools' history.

Mr. Wheeler said Governor Kaine announced in January the schools that received his Virginia Index of Performance Award for Educational Excellence. Three of the 162 schools announced were Albemarle County Schools. In addition, 14 Albemarle County Schools were commended by the Board of

Education, receiving either the VIP Excellence Award or VIP Competence to Excellence Award. The following schools earned the Governor's Award for Educational Excellence: Hollymead Elementary, Meriwether Lewis Elementary and Murray Elementary. The following schools earned the Board of Education's Excellence Award: Albemarle High, Baker-Butler Elementary, Broadus Wood Elementary, Brownsville Elementary, Cale Elementary, Crozet Elementary, Monticello High, Scottsville Elementary, Stone-Robinson Elementary, Stony Point Elementary, Western Albemarle High and Woodbrook Elementary. The following schools earned the Board of Education's Competence to Excellence Award: Red Hill Elementary and Murray High. Representatives from Hollymead, Murray and Meriwether Lewis Elementary Schools attended the awards ceremony with Governor Kaine on February 16.

Mr. Wheeler said the College Board announced in its fifth annual Advanced Placement Report to the Nation that Virginia students ranked third nationally in AP achievement for the second straight year. The report uses the percentage of students who score a three or higher on their AP test – considered a passing score – as the criteria. Of Virginia's 2008 public school graduates, 21.3 percent received a grade of three or better on at least one AP examination. Only two states, Maryland and New York, had higher percentages of seniors receiving grades of three or better. The national average for the class of 2008 was 15.2 percent. In Albemarle County Public Schools, 64 percent of students taking at least one AP exam earned a score of three or higher, far exceeding the state and national averages. In 2008, 28 percent of high school students were enrolled in at least one AP course, and of those 87.5 percent took the AP exam. Data for the percentage of students receiving a passing score at the individual high schools is as follows: Albemarle High, 62.4 percent with 370 test-takers, Monticello High, 45.3 percent with 267 test-takers, and Western Albemarle High, 82.3 percent with 305 test-takers.

Mr. Wheeler said the Math, Engineering and Science Academy (MESA), which will open in August, 2009 at Albemarle High School, is now accepting applications for 9th and 11th graders. MESA offers a four-year college preparatory program designed to lead to a career pathway in engineering. Students will work in a laboratory environment designed to provide authentic experiences in mathematics, engineering and science. Students who apply for the academy will be notified in April of their admission status. Students at MESA must attend Albemarle High School; the School Division has established a process for accepting students who reside in other high school districts to obtain a waiver to attend MESA. The academy will accept 25 to 30 9th graders and 25 to 30 11th graders for fall admission.

Mr. Wheeler added that one of the key staff members involved with the magnet school is creating a physics textbook that will be available online. Ms. Pam Moran, Superintendent, noted that this will provide physics teachers with an option beyond printed textbooks, which tend to be outdated by the time they are released.

Mr. Wheeler said the School Board has given directions to the School Division to continue with implementation of the Instructional Coaching Model reorganization. Under this model, division- and schools-based instructional support positions will be reorganized into five centrally managed coaching teams that will serve several elementary, middle or high schools. Each team will be managed by a Lead Instructional Coach, who will have supervisory, and compliance duties, and who will report to either the Director of Elementary or Director of Secondary Education. Instructional Coaches will be standard teaching contract positions and will work to help classroom teachers implement effective instructional strategies and the Division's Framework for Quality Learning across all schools. The reorganization accomplishes just over \$1.0 million in savings through reduction of 10 full-time equivalent positions, five at the central level, and five allocated among the Division's 26 schools. At this time, the Division is confident the employees who are affected by the reductions will be placed in alternate positions for which they are certified as positions become available through attrition. Hiring decisions for the Lead Coaches were announced in late February and are expected in early March for Instructional Coaches. Selected candidates will begin training and team building immediately in order to be prepared for full implementation for the '09-10 School Year.

Mr. Wheeler said the School Board has reviewed information regarding use of capital funds to enclose a swimming pool in the County. After reviewing the same materials that were provided to the Board of Supervisors, the School Board recommends to the Board of Supervisors that consideration of capital requests for swimming facilities occur through the appropriate CIP processes, insuring that projects of the greatest need receive the highest funding priority.

Mr. Wheeler reported that April 17 is the date for the next quarterly Supervisors/School Board luncheon. On March 15 there will be a drill team competition at Monticello high hosted by the Monticello High School Air Force Junior ROTC. At the Supervisor's budget public hearing, there was mention of this competition and a request for an offsite shooting competition; these are two different matters and both are being handled by staff.

Mr. Dorrier asked how the school system is getting word out to residents about its plans to examine the school needs of Scottsville, Red Hill and Yancey. Ms. Moran responded that the schools are working within the communities to communicate with families directly as well as making public announcements; they are rotating meetings from school to school. A committee comprised of people who represent parents of children currently enrolled in these schools along with community stakeholders and staff has been working to develop a background understanding of the critical issues.

Mr. Wheeler indicated that flyers will be sent home in students' backpacks - some schools have e-mail newsletter - and there was a school media release yesterday. He added that there is an automated phone system that could be used to announce the meetings, and it's been suggested that a telephone town hall meeting be held.

Mr. Dorrier emphasized the importance of having maximum participation. Dr. Moran said that one of the top recommendations that came out of the schools resource management study was to do an assessment of the small schools considering efficiency/effectiveness variables as well as community values. It costs more to operate small schools than moderately sized schools.

Mr. Boyd said he received an e-mail yesterday from a constituent asking about a 2.5 percent increase in teacher salaries. Dr. Moran and Mr. Rooker responded that the City Schools are providing that increase; it is not the County.

Mr. Boyd mentioned that a competitive swimming initiative has been in the CIP for a while – originally as \$1.25 million for the YMCA, then adjusted down to \$0.5 million at a recent meeting; Ms. McKeel and Mr. Stokes were at that meeting. It is not something that needs to be put in the CIP next fall; it is already a part of the CIP.

Mr. Wheeler said a proposal in Crozet was not in there, adding that the School Board did not evaluate any of the individual proposals. They felt that supporting swimmers who are students in high schools should be looked at holistically as part of the overall process.

Mr. Boyd mentioned that it was done by a committee set up by Parks & Recreation. Dr. Moran pointed out that the School Board members and the School staff that work on the CIP are seeing more and more requests from individual schools and community groups. The School Board feels that these projects need to compete with all other projects in a clear process.

Mr. Rooker commented that it is very important for a process to be set and followed.

Mr. Boyd noted that the swimming initiative has been through a committee process, and that process involved one of the schools' athletic directors.

Ms. Mallek said that person was not able to represent his high school because he was assigned to represent everyone, and that has left Western out of the loop.

Mr. Rooker said when there is a recommendation to expend substantial money on a capital project, it should go through the CIP Technical Committee for that recommendation.

Mr. Slutzky asked if that process was followed for the proposed \$200,000+ for turf fields. Mr. Wheeler replied that it was not, but that is a project where no School Division Funds are involved.

Mr. Boyd said the swimming initiative went through the process. It was brought before the CIP Technical Committee, and after review of the proposals it was suggested by staff that the County not approve the YMCA proposal which was only one of a few in the group received which also went through the same process.

Mr. Rooker said he was not speaking about that project; he emphasized that more capital project requests are coming in outside of the normal channels. There has to be a process in place so those projects are compared against other projects in a rationale way. The CIP Technical Committee is set up to do that evaluation.

Ms. Thomas said that Mr. Alan Sumpter, VDOT's Residency Administrator, had shared an e-mail saying roads that have less than 750 vehicle trips per day will not be maintained by the State – including mowing and plowing – and she wondered about the impact of that on school bus routes. She thinks the Supervisors and School Board should be having conversations about this. The local VDOT office is likely to become just a maintenance office and be downgraded from having any ability to shape anything at all. Dr. Moran replied that schools have started the process of looking at routes that are on the list to determine how they overlap with bus routes.

This report was received as information only.

Agenda Item No. 11b. Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, Tom Frederick.

Mr. Tom Frederick, Executive Director of the RWSA, said the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority Board of Directors has approved the hiring of three dam experts for the Ragged Mountain Dam project. A workshop is planned for next week to bring them together to interview Gannett Fleming and Schnabel Engineering, and then have some general discussion of the project. The goal is to try and determine what additional geotechnical and geophysical evaluations need to be performed at the site in order for them to develop an extensive set of conclusions. He is working on a draft statement of objectives for the panel to insure that the community's questions are addressed, and he asked Board members to send him e-mails with any other suggestions they may have.

Ms. Thomas commented that Mayor David Norris has talked about raising the height of the existing dam instead of building a new dam downstream. She asked if the team will be looking at the rock under the new dam location as well as at the existing dam area. Mr. Frederick said that will be covered by the panel's review. He emphasized that broader questions would be asked than before. Evaluation will not be limited to just the layout for the dam that was proposed by Gannett Fleming early in the preliminary design phase. That means that everything is on the table to talk about the existing dam location.

Mr. Boyd asked about the possible inability of the RWSA to meet the date for fixing the existing dam. Mr. Frederick explained that Dam Safety officials and the State Soil Board, which oversees the dam safety unit, approved a 12-month extension to the Ragged Mountain operating permit – meaning it can be operated through November, 2009 – but they were silent on the issue of the deadline. That means there has been no extension granted to the June, 2011 deadline to finish the dam, and once the panel has concluded and provided cost estimates, that schedule would need to be compared to that date. If it is not possible to meet that deadline then Rivanna will have to talk to the agencies. He emphasized that if the RWSA can move in a positive direction to get things done then that would be very encouraging to our negotiations.

Mr. Frederick said the Moores Creek enhanced nutrient removal upgrade project has total capital costs of between \$50.0 and \$55.0 million. It is the largest project the RWSA has attempted in its history. Bids will be opened on March 31. The project will provide the equipment and facilities necessary to enhance removal of nitrogen and phosphorus from wastewater, a large step forward in cleaning up the tidal areas of the James River in the Hopewell to Norfolk areas, as well as the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. Rooker asked if it is possible to obtain stimulus money for this project. Mr. Frederick said RWSA has applied for stimulus funding, and prior to that had obtained a WQIF grant for a portion of the project, with the contract tied to construction pricing and an estimated \$20.0 to \$22.0 million coming from the grant. They have also obtained a \$20.0 million State Revolving Fund low-interest loan from DEQ, noting that the EPA is giving stimulus money to states and letting allocate that money through existing programs with just a few changes. He mentioned that Virginia has been given about \$83.0 million for clean water (which is the wastewater side); DEQ is administering that through the same revolving program the RWSA has already received money from. He said the State is required to set aside half that money for loan forgiveness, which works similarly to a grant; the EPA wants states to give much higher priorities to communities that have a low median family income. That will help RWSA's chances of getting any money. Other stipulations include having projects shovel-ready and under construction within 12 months.

Mr. Frederick confirmed that his office has been meeting with Senator Periello's office staff, and they are excited about an RWSA project that is in the works - an engine-driven generator to be placed next to their digestion complex where bio-solids cook. He explained that the generator would produce electricity, tie it back to the plant electrical systems and provide a substantial amount of the electricity for the plant.

Ms. Mallek asked about the WQIF funds which the General Assembly has been playing around with. Mr. Frederick said the money is secure for now. The RWSA has been working through the Virginia Association of Municipal Wastewater Authorities and the Virginia Water and Waste Authorities Association, as well as VACo and VML to keep it intact. He emphasized that the Governor has supported the fund.

Mr. Frederick said the design for the Meadow Creek Interceptor has been completed with the exception of final quality control reviews and tweaking the design in response to right-of-way negotiations with property owners. There have been a few significant changes since December, reflecting meetings with neighborhood groups and citizens within the community on what they hope to get out of the project. RWSA proposed that after construction they will put back sewer safe trees on the edges of the easement area and a low-lying ground cover that is not wood-based. The landscaping plan has a menu of items to choose from in terms of design, and the goal is to prevent an abrupt change in the appearance between properties; it will be blended in better with Greenbrier Park.

Mr. Frederick explained that a section of the pipeline was able to be installed lower, but the pipe design has been tricky because of wetlands and rock levels. The pipeline is replacing an existing pipeline and there are a lot of County as well as City connections involved so moving it away from where it is now creates other issues. About 70 percent of the route is in the same location as the old pipe, but they have been able to lower a section of the pipe to appease concerns about aesthetics, noting that the lowering of the pipe and landscaping plan adds about \$440,000 to the cost of the project. He said there is a balancing act between what people desire and what is fair for the ratepayers to pay for. He noted that there is a place where you've got to negotiate the differences.

Mr. Frederick said right-of-way acquisition continues, with almost 50 percent already acquired but some offers from property owners are well off of early estimates of values; some formal appraisals will need to be done to rectify that and it may be difficult to always reach agreement. He feels it is the obligation of RWSA to work with people and address all reasonable concerns; they also have a responsibility to all of the ratepayers to avoid making deals that don't represent fair market value.

Ms. Mallek asked if using prescriptive easements is an option. Mr. Frederick responded that the RWSA Board has that power except with land that is owned by the City of Charlottesville.

Mr. Rooker said that there is no reason not to exercise that authority when it gets to the point of just arguing over price. There is a process where that can be determined.

Mr. Slutzky said it might be helpful to give a heads-up to magisterial representatives for landowners that may be having those concerns.

Mr. Rooker asked how much of the required land lies in the City and how much lies in the County. Mr. Frederick replied that three-fourths of the pipeline is within the City, the section from the Norfolk Southern Railroad east to the side of Rio Road is in the County.

Ms. Thomas asked if the RWSA had reached price agreements with the City for City-owned land. Mr. Frederick explained that attorneys between the two entities – Kurt Kruger and Craig Brown – are discussing the information that needs to be brought forward in order to present it to City Council, but no figure has been presented to Council at this point. He mentioned that in working with neighborhood groups it became apparent that the City expected to see substantial progress toward meeting the property owners' concerns, adding that he thinks the RWSA has made a good faith effort in that regard. He reiterated that the landscaping and pipeline-lowering costs added \$440,000 to the project.

Mr. Rooker said it seems the City should proceed with reasonable speed to settle their issues with the project. He does not think it's fair to the community for a jurisdiction to hold a project hostage.

Ms. Mallek added that is especially true when extra costs are going to come back to their ratepayers anyway.

Mr. Dorrier asked if bid requests had gone out yet. Mr. Frederick responded that the project will be advertised for bids in late April, with a June date to consider award of contract. That could be moved depending on right-of-way issues, as 100 percent of right-of-way needs to be acquired to avoid future problems and possible cost increases.

Mr. Rooker said Mr. Tucker is the County's representative on the RWSA Board, and he should indicate that the County wants to see the City move forward quickly with right-of-way acquisition. Mr. Tucker replied that he would be happy to convey that opinion, but it would probably be better coming from the Chair as it is a political matter.

Mr. Rooker said he does not think it should be a political thing. Mr. Tucker said he does not disagree.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that the jurisdictions have agreed to go forward with this project and have spent substantial amounts towards it.

Mr. Slutzky commented that he is not sure there is a political issue here, and he does not want the Board to create one.

Mr. Dorrier said delays are driving the project costs up.

Ms. Mallek added that it is not helpful to hold up the easements for the project in anticipation of the neighboring property owners getting everything they want.

Mr. Slutzky offered to speak with the Mayor and report back to the Board. Mr. Frederick said he strongly objects to the contention by some citizens that the Meadow Creek Interceptor does not need to be replaced and the belief that it is only being replaced to attract new growth. He explained that when he came to the RWSA about five years ago and started looking at the organization's strengths and weaknesses, he found that Rivanna had not done a very good job in addressing sewer infrastructure – capacity issues, maintenance and rehabilitation of existing systems, repair of leaks, etc. – and found there were some environmentally damaging issues that could occur during rain events. He said a core part of fixing the problem is balancing how much inflow and infiltration there is in the ACSA and City systems, and how much can be remedied through upgrading of the RWSA's transmission systems. He added that the RWSA has had extensive discussions with Mr. Gary Fern's staff and Ms. Judy Mueller's staff, and those conversations have been very cooperative at the staff level. He emphasized that it would be a poor environmental decision not to improve the interceptor.

Mr. Slutzky said he appreciated Mr. Frederick's professional judgment.

Mr. Rooker asked about the project's timeline. Mr. Frederick explained that they are trying to award a bid in June, with a 14-month construction period beginning in August. He added that the RWSA is proposing two contracts – with a small portion of the project planned to be built inside the VDOT roadway project that is already underway. He confirmed that 70 percent of the project is in the existing easement area, noting that the right-of-way agreements were signed in the 1950s. Legal counsel has reviewed those agreements and determined that they need to be amended in order to replace the existing pipe with a new pipeline. He added that a number of the instruments are being designed as amendments to an existing easement but it still requires negotiation.

Mr. Frederick noted that the Supervisors met with the other three boards yesterday afternoon and heard a report from the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir Task Force, commenting on the professional quality of the report.

Ms. Thomas said Dominion Resources has indicated there is a way to keep silt from entering the reservoir, and perhaps that tool is a forebay. She stated that she would hate to have the RWSA pay for consultants to do a study of a forebay and not have it deal with the particular type Dominion Resources has in mind. If it is a forebay, she would encourage someone to find out more about the idea so the study is not off base.

Mr. Boyd mentioned Mr. Jeff Werner's comment earlier about couching the cost of the dam and the 50-year water plan in terms of increases in rates to the average ratepayer. Mr. Frederick replied that it's imperative for organizations like the RWSA to have a long-range financial plan, and there is currently a pause in the dam design because of issues that need to be worked through that might impact the project cost. He thinks the right approach is to get the right revised cost figure from a team of experts and then

plug that figure into their model and run RWSA's long-term plan spreadsheets and provide the Supervisors with the results. He has submitted an operating budget to the Rivanna Board and it has been advertised for a public hearing on May 18. That budget is tight and operating expenses are proposed to decrease by 3.2 percent next year, with a total budget being \$60,000 less than last year – less than one percent. He added that there has been additional growth on the debt service side reflecting the current capital improvements program. He said there has been some reduction in consumption due to the economy, and the dry period of the last three years has kept inflow and infiltration down – as well as revenues.

Mr. Frederick reported that members of the RWSA Board asked for an update on the organization's strategic plan and that would be completed in the coming weeks. That plan takes into account current economic conditions as well as the visions and goals that were established during community meetings – with recycling and renewal resources being priorities. He feels the focus now should be on improving the Ivy Transfer Station as the facility there is antiquated and uses forced impaction equipment – which tends to have a lot of mechanical problems. He added that because this is an outdoor site a significant amount of labor is required to keep it clean and meet environmental responsibilities. The RWSA feels a covered facility with a bigger floor is needed, with the ability to load trucks from the top instead of the side. He mentioned that the new facility would provide better service to customers, and would have growth capacity as well as the ability to accept construction and demolition debris for the first time since 2001.

Mr. Frederick said the facility could accommodate commingled recycling, noting that there has been interest from private haulers about offering curbside service to County citizens, but they currently do not have a good place to take that material. He said this would also provide options to the County in terms of their recycling program.

Mr. Rooker asked if the revenue stream that might result from enhanced facilities would amortize the cost. Mr. Frederick said a lot of that would depend on the cost of fuel. He said the transfer services of trash, construction debris and commingled recycling could all be set up on a revenue-sustaining tipping fee basis.

Mr. Boyd said he recalled from earlier meetings with consultants that to get the volume needed for it to pay off would require collaboration between the City and the County. Mr. Frederick responded that the concept of a collaborative effort involved building a materials recovery facility in Charlottesville/Albemarle, which would accept commingled recycling and sort it into market-grade materials that could be shipped to a receiving facility to be reprocessed into new products. He said a transfer station would involve taking materials to a facility in Zion Crossroads, Richmond or some facility which provided the most competitive bid.

Mr. Boyd asked if the enhanced facilities would be for the City and the County, or just the County. Mr. Frederick said he would hope that taking that step would encourage City participation, but he is not sure of the City's intentions.

Ms. Mallek said other localities have been interested in partnering as they do not have the ability to have their own facilities. Mr. Frederick stated that currently material from other localities is not accepted, but that could be changed in the future if community leadership agreed.

Ms. Thomas said Ivy residents have not wanted the facility to be too large, but they do have more confidence now in the RWSA because of the organization's response to environmental issues such as the paint pit cleanup.

Ms. Mallek said it is possible to use the haulers' containers to reduce the trips citizens have to make to transport waste. Mr. Frederick mentioned that the RWSA staff has put a lot of time into its website, and he encouraged Board members to look at it.

This report was received as information only.

Agenda Item No. 11a. Albemarle County Service Authority Quarterly Update, Gary Fern.

Mr. Gary Fern, Executive Director, Albemarle County Service Authority, said they are undertaking their largest project – the North Fork Rivanna Regional Pump Station. About a year ago, consultants completed a study on the Camelot Wastewater Treatment Plant and found it to be at 100 percent capacity. The report noted that with modifications the flows could be increased to about 200,000 gallons per day; currently the facility handles about 120,000 gallons per day. The study also indicated that if the facility was going to stay in operation for another five years a significant amount of money would need to be spent on it. He mentioned that the Camelot STP serves Briarwood, Camelot, the GE facility, NGIC, and the North Fork Research Park. He said that in August 1992, the ACSA and RWSA entered into an agreement with some developers in the area saying that at 80 percent of the Camelot STP's capacity there would be a plan to take care of wastewater flow, and at 90 percent that plan would be implemented. He explained that with the RWSA, the ACSA began to look at separate equalization basins, some operational changes, and some additional pumps; those improvements are almost complete and will meet the deadline for the opening of the new NGIC facility.

Mr. Fern said it is time to begin looking at long-term goals in order to accommodate the development that is likely to occur in the area. He said Greeley & Hanson performed a study for the RWSA that considered three alternatives – increasing the size of the Camelot plant or building a new one;

a gravity sewer that would go from Camelot along the North Fork Rivanna River into the urban area; or a regional pump station that would take flow from the Camelot area into the existing collection system at the Moores Creek sewer treatment plant. He added that the ACSA hired Whitman, Requart & Associates from Richmond to begin a preliminary engineering report, which was completed last December. Their efforts and ACSA conversations with area developers indicated that there are only two years in which to get the pump station designed, constructed and completed in order to service the development in that area.

Mr. Rooker asked if the ACSA owns the right-of-way needed for the line. Mr. Fern replied that they are working on it currently. He explained that the Camelot pump station would be located at the treatment plant area and would pump wastewater from the north side of the River to the south side of the River to a regional station located in between Lewis & Clark Drive and the River. That station would pump the flow south of Airport Road into the ACSA collection system, and then flow into the Rivanna interceptors into the Moores Creek STP. He confirmed that the collection system is acceptable up to the year 2030, and that is what is being designed now. He said the North Pointe development proffers will make it better for the force main on the east side of Route 29 and "snake its way through that development."

Mr. Fern explained that the ACSA Board appropriated \$840,000 in December to move forward with final design, which is anticipated for completion later in 2009 with construction to begin in early 2010 and finished later that year. He said the project cost is about \$11.0 million. There have been discussions with developers about them fronting the money. With the current economic climate, it is likely the ACSA will issue bonds for that amount and look for connection charges within the drainage basin to cover the project cost.

Mr. Rooker said a multi-family portion of North Pointe is moving forward sooner than the rest of the development. He asked how that ties into the project. Mr. Fern responded that all of the flow from North Pointe was intended to be pumped to the south. The ACSA will have to look at how it can be handled in the current configuration – with the existing pump station that is used by the North Fork Research Park. Mr. Tucker said the northern part of North Pointe would flow in, but the other would flow down to the Hollymead Interceptor. Mr. Fern explained that the section that is going to be developed was intended to flow to the existing pump station that is serving the North Point Research Park. He noted that the entire project is either within existing development areas or proposed development areas based on the Places29 map. Mr. Tucker said residents cannot hook into the Crozet Interceptor – most of which is outside of the development area.

Ms. Thomas said that is because of this Board's policy; it is not based on engineering. Mr. Tucker agreed, but added that it is difficult with a force main to hook in.

Mr. Fern said the actual physical piping and pump stations are all within the development area, and the Camelot Pump Station can handle what is in the existing development area and what is in the proposed development area. He agreed to e-mail copies of the maps to the Board.

Mr. Fern reported that the ACSA is in the process of completing its strategic plan, which they began working on last year. The organization had never had a strategic plan, and now has both mission and vision statements, guiding principles, six goals, strategies and implementation tasks that they will present to the Board in March.

Ms. Mallek asked if irrigation will be a part of their rate study. Mr. Fern replied that it's a major topic, with consideration being given to whether the existing policy is continued or modified. He also reported that the ACSA has done a survey of Oak Hill Subdivision and found that it does not meet the low-to moderate-income criteria; there are 17 residences remaining to return the survey and that might change those figures.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the ACSA would address how to provide service to communities in the growth area that have been "left behind," even if grant money can't be secured for projects like that in Oak Hill. Mr. Fern responded that they are still addressing that question, with some information given to the Board, but there has been concern among Board members that the non-served neighborhoods won't qualify for a CDBG grant.

This report was received as information only.

Agenda Item No. 12. Bright Stars Annual Report, Charity Haines.

Ms. Charity Haines, Bright Start Program Coordinator, started her presentation by thanking Ms. Kathy Ralston and Dr. Pam Moran for writing the introductory letter to the report. She explained that Bright Stars is a Pre-K program for children who are four years old by September 30 of the year before they would enter kindergarten. Bright Stars is the local name for the Virginia Preschool Initiative grant, which Albemarle has received for 13 years. She said there are 11 classes in seven schools plus community-based placements, and each classroom has a certified teacher, a teaching assistant, and a family coordinator.

Ms. Haines said Fiscal Year 2007-08 was a very busy year with many changes and challenges for the program. They undertook some major initiatives, about six. She said Albemarle County was selected as one of ten sites in the Commonwealth to receive the Governor's Pre-school Pilot Grant. It was selected because it had a history of collaboration with other agencies and because this pre-school was a shared initiative of both the Schools and the Local Government. As one of ten sites Albemarle had the

opportunity to receive funding to purchase materials, fund a position, and increase the number of children served.

Ms. Haines said Bright Stars served 135 children, some within the County schools and others in community-based placements such as Bright Beginnings Preschool and First United Methodist Church. These two sites were selected because they operated in areas where there was no preschool program and because they met the standards required by the Governor's grant. They set up a second program at Cale Elementary School and then the offsite programs. The benefit of the offsite programs is that it allowed them to serve children without increasing capacity in the schools.

Ms. Haines reported that Bright Stars participated in a grant the schools received – the Inclusive Placement Opportunities for Preschoolers (IPOP) – for their early childhood education unit to further integrate special education preschoolers into regular general education classrooms. That required a major overhaul in four of the programs where there were four early childhood special education students with at-risk Bright Stars students, requiring teachers and staff to redesign their work and change their curriculum, as well as altering their approaches. This proved to be very successful; the children benefited greatly by being in those classes. She said that Bright Stars programs at Red Hill Elementary were combined with Title I to form one classroom and to share resources.

Ms. Haines said they developed a preschool network that brought together Head Start, Title I, Early Childhood Special Education, and Bright Stars, in an effort to provide more services to more children at a lower cost. They developed a website linked to the Social Services site and the Schools site, as well as piloting a preschool application shared by all public preschools so parents only have to fill out one application. They worked with James Madison University, Virginia Tech, Governor's Office, the local School System, the State Department of Education and the Social Services Department.

Ms. Haines said that locally Bright Stars met its outcomes and goals, and each year the program sees substantial growth in the children's progress between fall when they enter and spring when they leave. In the fall, around 20 percent meet the benchmarks for kindergarten skills but by the time they exit in June, 75 percent meet or exceed those benchmarks – including special education students, at-risk students, and ESL students. With assistance from the School's Office of Program Accountability, Research and Technology they were able to gather data showing that Bright Stars children are surpassing some disadvantaged groups and are not that far behind more advantaged groups. Bright Stars seems to be able to teach children how to "do school," meaning how to learn, how to persist in a task, how to ask for help, how to share, how to follow directions, how to take turns, etc.

Ms. Haines said that later this year Bright Stars hopes to bring back the first 10 graduates, who are seniors at Monticello High School now; she noted that there were originally 16 children in the class. That program has conducted its first Personal and Social Development Assessment. They found that in addition to content, the participants learned how to be a learner and operate in a classroom with other people. The 26 indicators in that assessment showed that children in the fall showed very few skills, but by spring that shifted significantly. She emphasized that the children and families in the program make progress which is sustained – that is shown by that data. The educational and economic benefits of the program gives ESL children and families a chance to become familiar with the school environment before kindergarten begins. Data supports the fact that the program helps reduce out of home placements to foster care and reduces the number of CPS cases that make it past the complaint stage to the investigation stage. Bright Stars allows the program to work preventatively with both the Schools and Social Services.

Ms. Haines brought forth a story of a student named "Julio," who lived in an area that was not served by a public preschool and entered through a Bright Beginnings site. She said he had issues that would have resulted in preschool suspension, but because of the work at the center and the family coordinator, they were able to keep him in that setting for the entire year. He is now in public kindergarten and is achieving.

Mr. Dorrier asked why the program cannot be replicated in the public arena throughout the state. Ms. Haines explained that these programs operate throughout the state via the Virginia Preschool Initiative Grant, but they only serve a small percentage of eligible children.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that it was Governor Kaine's intention to dramatically expand pre-K education throughout the State, but the financial situation has not allowed that to occur.

Mr. Boyd applauded Ms. Haines for the program and its success.

Ms. Mallek commented that it is wonderful to see the children bloom in all different stages of their development.

Ms. Thomas said she took part in a program once that showed students were not being treated with the same opportunities once they entered school, and she hopes that is not an issue for Bright Stars students. Ms. Haines replied that because family workers are an integral part of the teaching team and the school team, and because Bright Stars families can be served throughout the elementary school period, the relationships built at age 4 are able to be carried through. She noted that the family coordinators are advocates and case managers assisting families in setting goals so they can improve their employment, housing, medical and benefits situations.

This report was received for information only.

Agenda Item No. 13. Climate Change Protection Program Update, Sarah Temple.

Ms. Sarah Temple, Environmental Compliance Manager, said on December 5, 2007 the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted the U.S. Cool Counties Climate Stabilization Declaration committing to reduce the County's greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent by 2050. The County is following the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives' (ICLEI) Five Milestone approach in order to reach this goal. The Milestones include: 1) Conduct a baseline emissions inventory and forecast; 2) Adopt an emissions reduction target for the forecast year; 3) Develop a Local Action Plan; 4) Implement the policies and measures in the Local Action Plan; and, 5) Monitor and verify results. The General Services Department recently completed Milestone 1, which includes an inventory of all greenhouse gas emissions from all sectors in the County (residential, transportation, commercial, municipal waste) for the year 2000, the County's baseline year. The City of Charlottesville and the University of Virginia have also completed their baseline inventories, and officials from the three organizations have expressed an interest in collaborating in the Local Climate Action Planning Process.

Ms. Temple said the emissions baseline data was analyzed using the Clean Air and Climate Protection (CACP) software developed by ICLEI. According to the baseline analysis, the County emitted a total of 2,309,363 metric tons of equivalent carbon dioxide (eCO₂) in the year 2000, or 27.4 metric tons per capita. In 2006, total emissions were reduced to 1,780,476 eCO₂ metric tons, or 19.2 metric tons of eCO₂ per capita. The majority of the reduction in emissions can be attributed to the residential sector because many residents switched from propane to natural gas consumption between the years 2000 and 2006. If nothing else were done for the next 11 years, emissions would be 2.2 metric tons of equivalent carbon dioxide emissions.

Mr. Boyd asked what prompted the switch to natural gas. Mr. Tucker noted that there was an expansion of gas lines up Route 29 North, with natural gas service from the City expanding into the County. Ms. Temple said natural gas users increased from one percent in 2000 to four percent in 2006. She said that few houses now use coal. Residential is the largest piece of the inventory with 52.5 percent, followed by transportation and then commercial.

Mr. Slutzky noted that residential is about 40 percent nationally. Ms. Temple said residential has decreased, with transportation increasing and commercial and municipal staying the same. The County has pledged to reduce emissions by 80 percent by the year 2050, or an average of two-percent per year beginning in 2010. By the year 2020 the County must reduce emissions by 20 percent from its baseline emissions or to 1,847,490 metric tons of eCO₂ in order to meet this target.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that this project was started without any measurements available, and 2000 was picked as a baseline to align with the State, University, City, etc. He asked about the accuracy of the 2006 information. Ms. Temple replied that it has been checked several times and appears to be accurate, adding that it would be updated in 2008, 2010, 2012, and any discrepancies would be revealed at those times.

Mr. Rooker asked if there is a way to determine how many hybrid vehicles there are in the community as this report seems to presume that all vehicles have the same level of emissions. Ms. Temple said they used VDOT data on annual miles traveled in the County, and they did not break down car types.

Mr. Rooker expressed concern about this because transportation is roughly 50 percent of the total. He said that number would continue to grow regardless of vehicle type. Ms. Temple added that they use national averages as VDOT does not have enough detailed information.

Mr. Slutzky suggested using alternative data methods. The VDOT information could be used, but then also look at vehicle registrations by type as this would uncover alternative fuel vehicles.

Ms. Thomas mentioned an article she read in the *Atlantic Monthly* about the geographical changes that a depression would bring onto the country. It suggested that there is an increased trend toward urban centers instead of rural sprawl. She thinks there needs to be a way to break down vehicle miles into categories instead of just showing total miles traveled. She thinks it would be interesting to know if the County's development area/growth management policies actually lead to fewer miles driven in a year.

Mr. Slutzky mentioned that not many counties have a benchmark at all. Ms. Temple said that if the measures aimed at reducing greenhouse gases are implemented, the 1.8 million metric ton goal can likely be met. The next step is engaging in the local climate action planning process. The City, the County, and the University have all expressed a strong desire to work together on this initiative, and in February both localities signed resolutions supporting collaboration on issues of energy efficiency and climate protection. Environment staff from all three agencies is trying to form a Steering Committee to oversee and guide the process along, with representatives from the various sectors – agriculture, transportation, etc. – and a set of Focus Groups that will guide and implement the planning process. Because the Steering Committee should ideally represent the community as a whole, the County Executive, the City Manager and the Chief Operating Officer at UVA will appoint members to the Committee.

Ms. Temple explained that energy audits for homeowners or implementing a volunteer greener business program are examples of programs that could be part of the plan. There are implementing measures - replacing light bulbs in homes, installing low flow faucets - which could account for about one-tenth of the 20 percent for the 2020 goal.

Ms. Temple said the budgetary impact of this program will depend on the projects and programs included in the Local Climate Action Plan, which will likely not be completed until the end of calendar year 2009. While projects and programs aimed at lowering energy consumption and reducing greenhouse gas emissions can have an upfront cost, in general, these types of programs are designed to save stakeholders money over time. In anticipation of the Local Climate Action Planning Process, the General Services Department submitted a five-year CIP budget request in September, 2008 totaling \$1,016,000. It was not approved, but staff was able to find about \$293,000 in the maintenance CIP that could be dedicated toward internal energy efficiency initiatives. This cost represented the low-end of a range researched by staff wherein a dozen localities in the mid-Atlantic region reportedly either budgeted or spent, on average, between \$175,000 and \$1,860,000 in FY '08 alone toward climate protection initiatives. While this CIP budget request has not yet been approved, there are other funding opportunities.

Ms. Temple said the County is considered a "formula recipient" for the Federal Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant that has recently been increased to \$4.2 billion. If passed by both the House and Senate, as expected, it is estimated that the County would receive between \$200,000 and \$250,000 annually for five years to put toward climate protection and energy efficiency initiatives. In addition, the General Services Department has included roughly \$55,000 annually in its CIP budget for municipal energy efficiency projects, such as the solar thermal system installed at the County Office Building on Fifth Street in February. Lastly, the County, City and University are currently planning to submit a proposal for a Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA) grant. The SEEA will be awarding a southeastern locality \$500,000 to form an alliance based on the Cambridge, Massachusetts, model that helps commercial and residential users improve their energy efficiency. She said the Director of the Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy, Mr. Steve Wolz, has hired someone to help with this effort as he would like to see the grant awarded locally.

Ms. Temple said that as part of the Federal stimulus package Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grants will be available. Albemarle will receive funds because it is the tenth largest county in the State. Although no firm amount has been given, the estimate is for about \$700,000 in a lump sum to be used on a climate protection plan and for internal energy efficiency projects.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the ICLEI software can track specific changes in behavior, adding that it may be worthwhile to identify two or three categories that could provide the greatest yield. He thinks programs should be put in place quickly to take advantage of the stimulus money. Ms. Temple agreed, stating that she has begun working on ideas on which to use the money. She said the funds would be managed by the Department of Energy, and localities will have a year to come up with a plan.

Ms. Temple reported that as of February 1 the County has reached a 12.5 percent overall energy reduction in Local Government buildings, with \$107,000 in utility savings – not including the entire cost-benefit analysis. She showed a picture of the solar thermal system installed at the Fifth Street Office Building two weeks ago, noting that it supplements the natural gas used to heat the water there. Investment-grade energy audits were recently conducted in all buildings; they will help form the basis of a five-year plan for energy efficiency goals.

Mr. Slutzky said doing a fleet conversion to electric might yield significant savings. He asked if there is money in the budget that could be used to pay for the parts. Mr. George Shadman, Director of General Services, replied that his operational budget has been reduced by 4.7 percent, and finding even \$8,000 would be hard to do at this time. There have been questions about the differences in vehicle emissions, but prior to this initiative there was never a need to collect that kind of data. As the need to collect and use it arises, numbers will be sharpened. When the 2012 benchmark arrives, there will be more data than at present. He is looking at four vehicles slated for auction to see if they meet conversion criteria.

Mr. Slutzky said a number of localities in the state wanted to reduce the personal property tax rate on the category of alternative fuel vehicles, noting that DMV does not credit him for driving an all-electric truck.

Mr. Boyd said he would like to see expected outcomes for the expenses associated with this plan. Mr. Tucker said the Board has \$100,000 in a Reserve and there may be new revenue figures available for upcoming meetings and perhaps CIP opportunities as well. He noted that providing the University with a vehicle might present some legal implications.

Mr. Slutzky responded that the idea is for the University to convert the vehicle with parts provided by the County; the County would continue to own the vehicle.

This report was received as information.

Agenda Item No. 14. ~~Historical Overview of the Comprehensive Plan Video, David Benish,~~
(moved to Agenda Item No. 7a)

Agenda Item No. 15. Closed Meeting. At 12:46 p.m., Ms. Thomas **moved** that the Board go into closed session pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection (1) to consider appointments to boards, committees and commissions; under Subsection (1) to evaluate the performance of a county department which requires the discussion of the performance of a specific individual; under Subsection (7) to consult with legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice regarding regulations relating to providing public safety services; and under Subsection (7) to

consult with legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice regarding agreements necessary to implement a funding source for public safety services.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 16. Certified Closed Meeting. At 2:26 p.m., the Board reconvened into open session.

Ms. Thomas immediately **moved** that the Board certify by recorded vote that to the best of each Board member's knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed session were heard, discussed or considered in the closed session.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 17. Boards and Commissions: Vacancies/Appointments.

Ms. Mallek offered **motion** to:

Reappoint Ms. Chelsea Henderson to the Commission on Children and Families as the County youth representative with said term to expire on June 30, 2010.

Appoint Mr. David Oakland to the Housing Committee as the PHA (Piedmont Housing Alliance) representative with said term to expire on December 31, 2011.

Appoint Dr. Richard Lindsay to the Jefferson Area Board for Aging with said term to expire on March 31, 2011.

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

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

Mr. Slutzky said he was very proud to have appointed Mr. John Cannon to the Planning Commission and he had mixed feelings when he accepted Mr. Cannon's resignation when he said he would be moving to activities in Washington, D.C. He said Mr. Cannon provided extraordinary service to the community, and he is proud to have been associated with him. He then offered **motion** to appoint Mr. Don Franco as the Planning Commission member from the Rio District to fill Mr. Cannon's unexpired term – term to expire on December 31, 2009.

Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion, which passed by the following recorded vote:

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

Agenda Item No. 18a. VDOT Monthly Report.

Agenda Item No. 18b. Transportation Matters not listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Allan Sumpter, Residency Administrator, addressed the Board, stating that he met with representatives from Buckingham Branch Railroad this week. They have done some repairs to the abutment of the railroad bridge on Broomley Road; they are working with VDOT to determine the best method to work on the surface there. He noted that even if all the decking is replaced, the bridge will only be posted at the weight limit that was set when the agreement between the railroad and VDOT was made.

Mr. Rooker said if a large vehicle comes from the City side, it takes about 12 minutes longer because they cannot cross the bridge; however, no reasonable alternative has been found to that situation.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that even though repairs were made to Dry Bridge it still cannot accommodate fire trucks and school buses.

Mr. Sumpter reported that VDOT has been able to do some work on rural rustic road projects - they got stone in place for Walnut Level and have started on Old Green Mountain Road.

Mr. Sumpter said bids for the Advance Mills Bridge project have come in, and a local company has been identified as the low bidder – Fielder's Choice – but no award has been formalized as the bids are still under evaluation. The award is within range, and he is hopeful the process will continue to move along.

Mr. Sumpter said the contractor for the Meadow Creek Parkway will complete setting up staging areas and field offices and mobilizing equipment this month, with concrete barriers slated to go up crossing the railroad bridge on Rio Road this month and sheet-piling to begin on the northeast bridge abutment on the north side of the Meadow Creek Bridge site. Clearing will be done in the next few weeks.

Mr. Slutzky said residents in Dunlora have expressed concern about lawsuits and the impact the project may have on their entrance. Mr. Sumpter responded that the County portion of the project is moving forward regardless of the outcome of the litigation. Mr. Davis said a hearing date has not yet been agreed to, and it is unlikely the County portion will not proceed.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that the whole basis of that lawsuit has nothing to do with the County portion of the roadway.

Ms. Mallek asked about the right-of-way acquisition process for Jarmans Gap Road. Mr. Sumpter said VDOT is moving forward to get approval for the right-of-way stage.

Mr. Sumpter reminded the Board that there will be a public hearing on the Georgetown Road project on March 24, 2009, in the Albemarle High School cafeteria from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Sumpter reported that on February 19 the Highway Commissioner and members of VDOT's central office staff presented an update to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) on the VDOT blueprint. Much of that information has already been shared with the Board, and the presentations are posted on the CTB website as well. He said VDOT provides 16 major maintenance services such as emergency response, pavement/pothole repair, mowing and trimming; eight percent goes to emergency services/traffic control and 48 percent is used for paving. He emphasized that VDOT's first maintenance priority is related to the safety of the traveling public, with the second priority being preservation of the system – roads, pavement, bridges, and aesthetics, with construction upgrades being the last priority. He explained that this means VDOT works from the centerline of a road out toward the edges – taking care of pavement and potholes first. Roads are categorized in levels of service based on previous service demands, traffic counts, risk factors, etc.; the average daily traffic becomes a part of the category in which the road is placed.

Mr. Sumpter mentioned that traffic in Route 29 North is around 60,000 vehicles per day, with traffic counts on roads such as Route 250 and Route 20 being from 10,000 to 20,000 vehicles per day. Rio Road carries between 18,000 and 20,000 vehicles per day, and Garth Road carries almost 9,000 vehicles per day. Other roads, such as Route 712, Route 713, and Simmons Gap Road, have traffic counts below 1,000 vehicles per day. The lowest level of traffic is on White Mountain Road which carries between 50 and 60 vehicles per day, adding that unpaved roads fall into the lower categories; surface-treated roads would fall into category four.

Mr. Rooker asked how VDOT accounts for roads that have some stretches which are used frequently and some that are not used frequently. Mr. Sumpter replied that those discussions are ongoing, and no concrete policy has yet been established.

Mr. Sumpter said VDOT uses levels of service "A" through "E", with "A" being a new road and "D" being a road in severe stages of deterioration or disrepair. He said that many secondary roads are in level "D" of service with gravel roads being mostly in the "E" category.

Mr. Slutzky asked what happens when an entire road is deemed unusable because of one small section where there are issues. Mr. Sumpter said common sense would need to be used; what he is presenting today is just an overview of the broader perspective. Most of Albemarle's surfaced roads are at a level "B", with some potholes in the roadway at any given time. VDOT normally responds to those maintenance requests within four to 30 days with just annual maintenance provided on some gravel roads. He reiterated that the Highway Commissioner has said there will be taller grass in the future. Level of service "A" is the kind of mowing that was the custom in Virginia – mowing fence to fence many times every cycle. Under the new standards, on many of the roads in Category 1, they will be mowed fence to fence once every four years. The typical level of service on those roads will be "B" and "C" which means they will be mowing to the ditch line; on some of the lower category roads they will mow only for sight distance purposes.

Mr. Sumpter said there will be a public comment period during the Culpeper District's hearing scheduled for 6:00 p.m. on March 19 at the Dangle Technology Center in Culpeper. He explained that after comments are accepted and modifications made, the program will go to the Transportation Board for approval and implementation on July 1, 2009.

Mr. Rooker said public comments are essentially going to be talking into a barrel, as the funding situation has made this a *fait accompli*. He mentioned that Mr. Butch Davies sent a letter indicating there

will be no construction projects in the Culpeper District from the Federal stimulus package, and whatever money is received will go for paving projects and safety measures such as bridge repairs.

Mr. Jim Utterback, Culpeper District Administrator, said cuts to the Six-Year Road Plan, the reorganization of VDOT, and level of service designations are having an impact on the level of services in some rural areas – they are vastly different from those in more urbanized areas. It is important for Albemarle to make its opinions known at the hearing, including budget concerns.

Ms. Thomas asked if it would be possible to be flexible on the levels of service if roads have more need for treatment, such as those used by school buses or emergency equipment. Mr. Utterback said that is the type of input needed at the public meeting, as there is a lot of emphasis on assigning maintenance based solely on vehicle trip numbers. The Commissioner has worked for the last year or so to identify a priority road network – there are 18,000 to 20,000 miles in that category. The people who put that together considered access to emergency facilities and schools, so some of that has been addressed.

Mr. Boyd pointed out that Doctors Crossing is an example of a road that will now only be maintained annually under this plan. Mr. Utterback responded that this is not a done deal, but the maintenance budget is what it is. He agrees that Mr. Boyd's assumption about Doctors Crossing would likely be accurate. He said VDOT has serious questions about snow removal, and he encouraged Board members to share their concerns at the hearing.

Ms. Mallek said there have been several accidents on Advance Mills Road, even on the parts that have been scraped, as the shade tends to keep some of the ice on the road.

Ms. Mallek said in the event of inclement weather Heards Mountain Road has been used to determine whether school should be held.

Ms. Thomas felt it would be helpful to give VDOT a count of how many roads would be kept at a lower level of service so they are aware of the impact a change in their snow removal policy would have.

Mr. Slutzky said he thinks it would be better to bring up concerns over these issues when VDOT figures out how to allocate its resources.

Mr. John Davis, Director of Transportation for County schools, said Dr. Bruce Benson brought this to his attention earlier in the week. Staff has looked at some of the data and noted traffic accounts. They are aware that many roads serve not only students but some of the schools themselves. Perhaps some of these roads can be upgraded from a lower level of service to a mid-level. The Schools have a great database of information about where students live, as some busy roads have no students and some roads service many students. He mentioned that just in the past few weeks schools were closed for four days and there were three, two-hour delays because of road conditions.

Mr. Rooker asked if it would be possible for Mr. Davis to work into his database the location of fire and rescue stations in order to make a unified presentation of information, rather than having different information from the Schools.

Mr. Slutzky agreed that the entire focus should not be on students, and perhaps Mr. Tucker could have someone from his office work with the Schools.

Ms. Thomas said she thinks this will involve only a dozen or so roads that VDOT might chip around the edges of their policy. Mr. Tucker said staff can look at that from the emergency services side, and if two Board members and two School Board members attend the Culpeper hearing, they could go to the podium together and make one joint presentation.

Mr. Rooker said roads where there have been accidents during bad weather might merit enhanced maintenance. Mr. Sumpter said the maintenance budget also includes mowing, litter removal, brush clearing, etc., and some of these services will definitely be impacted.

Mr. Slutzky said Board members should make it clear to the public that VDOT is merely implementing the budget they have been handed by the General Assembly.

Ms. Mallek commented that landowners can mow their grass, but they cannot stripe the road.

Mr. Rooker asked about sidewalk maintenance plans. Mr. Sumpter said there are some issues with sidewalks, and their level of service would probably be a "C" or "D" – with some weeds and debris and lesser maintenance. When those issues become critical to safety, they will move up on the priority list.

Ms. Thomas thanked Mr. Sumpter for all of his work. She also mentioned the reflector "buttons" used on roads to add safety measures. Mr. Sumpter responded that he would share an e-mail with the Board which was sent to him by the Traffic Safety Department which lists some concerns about the safety impact of the reflectors since they can distract drivers.

Ms. Thomas asked if there is any way to increase the use of volunteers for programs such as Adopt-A-Highway. Mr. Sumpter replied that he has someone working on that.

Mr. Rooker said he finds reflectors to be helpful improvements for turn lanes and crosswalks. He thinks it makes a huge difference in terms of visibility. There should be more use of those for safety purposes.

Mr. Slutzky and Mr. Rooker complimented VDOT and Mr. Sumpter for their work, noting the difficult situation they are in.

Agenda Item No. 19. Crozet Library - Update on Status of, Joe Letteri.

Mr. Bill Letteri, Director of Facilities Development, addressed the Board on behalf of the Crozet Library Steering Committee, noting that they have been working toward a final plan. He introduced Mr. Ron Lilly, Project Manager, and members of the design team from Grimm and Parker – Mr. Todd Willoughby and Mr. Jim Boyd. He said the goals for the library were established through the master planning process, which involved the general public and the Board. The project was identified as a critical project and a focal point for downtown Crozet. It became apparent early on that there were many different perspectives, and forming the committee helped bring all of those to the table. County planning staff, the Friends of the Library group, PVCC representatives and Board members all provided technical advice for project management.

Mr. Letteri reported that they have articulated design principles for the project – enhancing and developing a sense of community identity for Crozet, making it a focal point and a destination place; bridging the gap between old and new; making the design sustainable and LEED certified; maintaining compatibility with the architecture of the community; keeping the project within budget; making the design practical; and keeping an attractive and versatile design that encourages attendance. The designs for the library have been shared with the Planning Department, Planning Commission, ARB, and public forums. One primary issue has been street presence as the building will face on both Crozet Avenue and Main Street; the design may not fit everyone's concept of an ideal design but will meet as many expectations as possible. Parking downtown will be maximized; the proposed plan provides three times the required parking.

Mr. Letteri explained that operational constraints dictated how the project evolved, as the current library is in a very small space. As the building expands to two floors, the main entrance will likely shift to the Crozet Avenue side; many people wanted that immediately. Some felt the façade is too contemporary, but there has been a lot of positive feedback about the floor plan design; there is an expansion potential on the lower level of the building. There has also been a lot of feedback encouraging a quicker timeline for construction.

Mr. Todd Willoughby said his firm did an initial site analysis in 2006 when the site was first selected. They considered the building's location downtown, noting that the building needs to address the two streets that comprise its corner position. They looked at opportunities to capture the views to the west and considered the steepness of the site from west to east. Streetscape grades required the entrance to the parking lot to be at a higher elevation which requires an early extension of the proposed Main Street construction of the streetscape plan. The sidewalk grades along Main Street are exceeding accessibility limits, with a 10 percent grade that makes it challenging to enter the building on the lower level. The only accessible entrance is off the parking lot level, and because there is no street parking that also restricts access to the lower level.

Mr. Willoughby reported that in August his company presented four schemes at a Steering Committee meeting; the first scheme was selected for further development – the library on one floor with a lower level and access off the parking lot area. Scheme two was a split-level scheme that was also selected for further development; the library would operate on two levels but would have an open floor plan for better staff monitoring capability. The third scheme was a plan with the main entrance on the Crozet Avenue level with the entire library being on that level; that plan would require significant excavation into the existing grades and a secondary entrance from the parking lot level. He said the third scheme was not selected to move forward as committee members cited concerns about access and delivery.

Mr. Willoughby said the fourth scheme was a true two-story building with over 10,000 square feet on two floors, but this plan was not selected due to staffing concerns; library personnel felt it would be difficult to manage the facility based on current staffing levels. The split-level scheme had been deselected by the time of the September 29 meeting when committee members agreed that a library function on one floor with a lower-level space was the way to proceed. He then presented some early sketches of the elevation studies they did along with section studies. These led to the design as it stands now, and as it was last presented to the Steering Committee and the Planning Commission. The site plan is fairly similar to the earlier schemes, with a one-floor upper level library and an accessible entrance off the parking lot – extending Main Street for vehicular access off to the east side of the site.

Mr. Willoughby explained that they are examining an "entrance canopy" element from Main Street to provide a visual presence for pedestrians. There would be a lower-level entrance to the building not connected to the upper level of the library. Delivery is a big challenge for the site. The lower-level delivery option was deemed by the committee to be the best option. The current floor plan is a roughly 18,000 square foot upper level library with a stair and elevator to access the lower floor (to be installed in the future when the need to expand arises). The current plan for the lower level is to have an entry lobby (a possible entrance off of Crozet Avenue just to the lobby space), with the future elevator and future stairs. There would be open areas on the lower level spaces which would could be tenant spaces once they

determine an occupant for that level. They are also looking at zoning the lower level so it could be bid on bid day for different excavation points, depending on their budget.

Mr. Willoughby said the Steering Committee is considering using bricks to maintain consistency with downtown Crozet, and the ARB recommended having less exposed glass and punched openings to keep it more in context with other buildings as well as reducing the roof height. There have been comments about the height and overall scale of the building, but his firm traditionally designs floor heights of 18 feet for library spaces due to lighting concerns and stack heights, as well as other library needs. The finished floor to ceiling space would be 14 feet, and the same would hold true for the downstairs space so the library could expand into that space the future.

Mr. Slutzky asked why a height of 18 feet is needed. Mr. Willoughby said several feet of structure and lighting would take up some of that space, and libraries typically have higher stacks with lighting placed above that. He confirmed that building costs are impacted by this larger size. The design now goes back to the Steering Committee for its comments; the Board and public will also have an opportunity to provide input. They hope to have the schematic design completed in the next few months with the cost estimate to follow shortly after that. It will also be presented to the Commission and ARB again, and after final presentations they would proceed to the design and development phase.

Mr. Boyd asked if extending Main Street is adding to the cost of the project. Mr. Willoughby responded that it would add cost, but he does not have full detailed cost estimates yet. Mr. Letteri pointed out that the streetscape component extended Main Street to a certain point, and there should be enough in that budget to accommodate the extension and the library entrance.

Mr. Boyd recalled that the original building plan was for 20,000 square feet, and this facility appears to be only 12,500.

Mr. Slutzky said he thought it was going to be a 20,000 square foot building with a 15,000 square foot library. It is a bigger project than that now.

Mr. Boyd said that is what he also thought, but now it appears to be a 10,000 square foot library, with 2,500 square feet underneath. Mr. Willoughby explained that the current plans for the lower level include a potential build-out or over-excavation of that level which could be done potentially on bid day as a bid alternate. That is where those extra square feet numbers are coming from.

Mr. Boyd asked the project cost now. Mr. Letteri responded that the committee understands its charge is to build a 15,000 square foot library, with additional funds from the Friends of the Library being allocated for the additional space to allow for future expansion. They have been working from day one with that aggregate amount of funds being what is available to make this project work. He confirmed that the figure is approximately \$9.8 million, including design, site work and construction. The building could be finished at 20,000 square feet, but the committee feels the library needs to open at 18,000 square feet with extra space on the lower level that could be shell space for up-fitting in the future.

Mr. Rooker said the original design was 10,000 square feet over 10,000 square feet, but that was deemed to be a difficult site layout to manage.

Ms. Thomas said she strongly encourages build-out of the lower level to provide a pedestrian-friendly Crozet Avenue entrance in the future.

Mr. Rooker commented that he also likes the visual element of directing traffic from Crozet Avenue to Main Street to an entrance that would be the canopy between the building cut-through and the parking lot.

Ms. Thomas added that the library wall needs to be made interesting as that will encourage pedestrians to walk there. Mr. Willoughby confirmed that the grade is 10 percent up from Main Street. He pointed out the location of an alley with the entry canopy off of Main Street, noting that the steep grade forced them to move the vehicular entrance further down Main Street.

Mr. Rooker said he observed the original design to be too modern and not a good fit for downtown Crozet, but what was presented today looked much more compatible. He commented that it's nice to have a lot of glass, but that makes it difficult to blend in with other buildings.

Ms. Thomas noted that from the inside of the building the glass will allow for wonderful views. Mr. Willoughby pointed out that they are still working on the façade design.

Mr. Slutzky asked how much square footage would be available in the lower level. Mr. Letteri responded that it could be anywhere from 2,000 to 7,000 square feet depending on how the site is excavated.

Mr. Slutzky said he understood the original approval to be for 20,000 square feet, with some space upstairs, and some space downstairs being rented out. He commented that this design is bigger, and is different from what was first presented.

Mr. Rooker stated that this building is proposed as 18,000 square feet with the option of approving additional excavation that would expand the downstairs space for an extra 5,000 square feet. He said this building is almost the exact same square footage as what was originally proposed.

Mr. Slutzky said as he did before he feels going with a larger building is a mistake.

Mr. Boyd said the Board approved a 20,000 square foot building in a bidding environment that's not as attractive as it is today, and if the building is going to be made larger because it would cost less to build it, it needs to come back to the Board for further discussion. Mr. Letteri emphasized that the main drivers of this project are the topography of the site and the functional needs of the library given its staffing level; those issues were not well understood at the outset. What has been arrived at is a balanced plan which is felt to be the best to fit that topography to meet operational needs while at the same time maintaining budget objectives.

Mr. Boyd said he understands that, but if the bids come in under budget, the project should be scaled back rather than expanded to use all the money.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that the lower level space might be used for something like school or local government storage.

Mr. Boyd asked about using the old Crozet School for storage as that is an empty building now. Mr. Letteri asked if the Board is amenable to further excavation or should that be minimized and just provide for the library.

Mr. Slutzky said a third option would be building a 15,000 square foot upper level and excavating the lower floor for 8,000 to 10,000 square feet with only half of that space being finished. Mr. Letteri responded that the committee looked at those options, but library operations dictated a different scheme.

Ms. Thomas reiterated that the library operates with a small staff per square foot ratio, which is very efficient; but librarians cannot duplicate themselves to be upstairs and downstairs at the same time and are concerned about not being able to oversee their books and equipment. It is the library's standards of security, along with attractiveness and that staffing ratio that dictates a one-story library. Someday they may have adequate staff for another floor, but 18,000 square feet is what the current population calls for. Mr. Willoughby said when they studied the 15,000 square foot model they determined that the entire library program would not fit into that space.

Mr. Slutzky replied that it's a 1,900 square foot facility now. Mr. Willoughby stated that a one-level structure requires 18,000 square feet on one level.

Mr. Rooker reiterated the possibility of leasing the lower level space as a cost-effective option.

Mr. Dorrier commented that for \$10.0 million, the County should be able to get the library it asked for.

Mr. Slutzky said he understands the need to have library operations on one floor, but he objects to an 18,000 square foot building which is too large for the need. If that size is built, he would agree that the additional space downstairs should be excavated. One reason for placing the library in the location chosen instead of in the old Crozet School was to give it a presence on the street; he expressed concern about not having an entrance from the street.

Mr. Rooker said eventually that entrance would be connected; Main Street is also planned to be a pedestrian walkway. The majority of users to the library would probably arrive by car and the planned entrance is very accessible to them. Mr. Letteri showed the schematic of the Crozet Avenue entrance.

Mr. Slutzky said he thinks it is important to make that entrance accessible to pedestrians. He wants to insure that the entrance draws people into the building from the street instead of directing them to a side entrance. This building turns its back to the street and that intersection was considered an important reason for putting a library in that location.

Ms. Thomas said she was disappointed to not have a grand entrance and an exit point, but over time she has begun to understand that the grade of Crozet Avenue is level at the alley at the library and would likely be the most logical pedestrian path between the facility and the bank, Mountainside, etc.

Mr. Rooker said if the project can be brought in at a lower cost, it will accelerate the ability to get into the CIP and construction date. He thinks the Board needs to be very cost sensitive at this time.

Mr. Slutzky asked if there is currently a cost per square foot estimate. Mr. Letteri replied that there is not one now, but one will be forthcoming. He feels the design that is evolving is affordable and within budget. It is as practical and as sensible as can be in terms of detail and features. He emphasized the importance of finalizing the schematic before taking it out for an estimate of construction costs, adding that they would be doing value engineering to insure it is the most practical design for its function.

Mr. Slutzky said he has heard concerns about the cost of having a fireplace, and asked what the additional cost would be. Mr. Willoughby responded that a gas fireplace element would add nominal cost and would help provide warmth and a relaxing environment.

Mr. Boyd asked if the project cost covers furniture, books, etc. Mr. Bill Schrader addressed the Board, stating that at the March, 2007 meeting of the Friends of the Library they agreed to take on \$1.6 million in fundraising – which will cover furnishings, books, desks and computers, as well as the fireplace.

Ms. Mallek asked if the price of elements could be broken out for review. Mr. Letteri replied that the estimate would be structured so that level of review can take place.

Mr. Rooker said the team has done a very good job of bringing this project to where it is now, as well as providing the rationale for the conceptual design.

Ms. Mallek commented that it has been great to see the evolution, even of the inside, and a lot of work has been done to make the space as efficient as possible.

Mr. Slutzky thanked the committee members for attending today's meeting.

Agenda Item No. 20. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. Thomas mentioned that she and Mr. Dorrier serve on the Lewis & Clark Exploratory Center Committee. The new Congressman has a more open method of getting items into the Appropriations Act. The Center has applied for a piece of HUD's appropriations and she would like to have a letter of support sent from the Board. The Center currently does a lot with a little bit of money, adding that they are offering programs out of a barn.

Mr. Slutzky agreed to issue the letter with Ms. Thomas working out the content details.

Mr. Tucker distributed an amendment to the budget work session calendar noting that the Board meets with the School Board tomorrow at 1:00 p.m. He said staff has answers to questions that arose at last Monday's meeting, and also from the joint meeting. He said the Board will discuss the CIP and tax rate next Monday.

Ms. Thomas asked if staff was able to determine whether there is any money for VDOT revenue-sharing projects. Mr. Tucker said staff determined there is money; how to use that money will be discussed tomorrow.

Mr. Boyd said the Board has had a Reserve Fund for years; there is a surplus transferred into the CIP that is not always allocated. Mr. Tucker said that will be discussed also.

Agenda Item No. 21. Adjourn to March 5, 2009, 1:00 p.m., Room 241.

At 4:27 p.m., with no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Mallek **moved** that the Board adjourn until Thursday, March 5, 2009, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 241 of the County Office Building. Mr. Rooker **seconded** the motion, which passed by the following recorded vote:

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

Chairman

Approved by the Board of County Supervisors
Date
Initials