

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on February 4, 2015, at 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Ms. Jane D. Dittmar, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer and Mr. Brad L. Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Thomas C. Foley, County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Jordan, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 1:02 p.m. by the Chair Ms. Dittmar.

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

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Ms. Dittmar noted that there are some changes to the agenda. First, the Board would like to move Item 8.10 from the consent agenda to the regular agenda and make it part of the solid waste discussion (Agenda Item No. 11) which now becomes 11a. and 11b. Board members concurred with the change.

The second change is to Agenda Item No. 14. Mr. Boyd has requested to bring forward a motion regarding the Small Area Plan for Route 29/Rio Road Intersection Improvements; this item is now 14b.

Mr. Boyd requested that the item be moved to Item 19a, as there are people who planned to attend the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Dittmar said that she has been answering a number of emails about this item. The advertised agenda has the discussion for this time, so she would still like to do that so that staff does not have to stay. She stated that Mr. Boyd may want to withdraw his motion after that discussion. However, if Mr. Boyd wants to vote on the motion next week, the Board could do that after listening to people who were directed by Smart 29 flyers to come at 6:00 and 7:00 p.m. She said there is a desire to hear from people during "From the Public" matters in the evening hours, but she does not want to move the Board's consideration of the motion until then. Ms. Dittmar stated, from a personal standpoint, the only time she failed to second a motion from Mr. Boyd was because it was late in the evening, and it had to do with transportation. She said that she does not want to be making decisions and motions having to do with transportation when the time gets near 11:00 p.m., especially after hearing from a lot of speakers.

Mr. Boyd asked when the next MPO meeting is scheduled and the Board's MPO representative would be asked to take action. Mr. Sheffield said that the next MPO meeting will be held at the end of March. The MPO meets every second month. Ms. Mallek said the MPO meets on the fourth Thursday.

Mr. Boyd said that the reason the people are not here now is because it is the middle of the workday, and these are hard-working people from all districts.

Ms. Dittmar stated that they are addressing two different things: hearing from the public, which could happen under the "From the Public" item in the evening; and when Mr. Boyd's motion should be considered. She suggested that perhaps the Board listen to everyone who comes to the meeting – and the staff – then reflect on the item, and vote the following week.

Mr. Sheffield confirmed that the next MPO Board meeting is scheduled for March 25.

Mr. Boyd said he will wait until 4:15 p.m., and see about the motion.

Ms. Dittmar said that radio advertising and flyers indicate times of both 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m., to discuss Solutions 29. The Board has a public hearing on Branchlands scheduled for the evening as well that will likely have a lot of older speakers from the public.

Mr. Sheffield said the applicant deferred their request so that the Board could cancel its January night meeting, so it is only fair to bump it up before the lengthy public discussion that would take place at 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Dittmar asked the Board if the agenda could switch those items, so that the Branchlands item would become Item 18, and the "From the Public" item would be moved to Item 19.

Board members agreed with that approach.

Ms. Mallek asked if the Board wanted to move "Brief Announcements from Board Members" to follow Item 7, as was done last month, so they have the opportunity to follow "Matters from the Public."

Board members agreed to leave this item as is.

Ms. Palmer then **moved** to adopt the Final Agenda, as amended. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

Agenda Item No. 5. Brief Announcements by Board Members.

Ms. Mallek reported that the Crozet Library is hosting a series of programs at the library for “savvy parenting,” especially parents of teenagers – with the next event scheduled for February 23 at 7:00 p.m. on “Social Media and Bullying,” and one in March on “Eating Disorders and the Struggle for Emotional Health.” She encouraged people to check them out.

Ms. Palmer reported that she and Ms. Dittmar attended the annual meeting of the League of Women Voters Natural Resources Committee, entitled “Have Trash Will Travel,” and two of the panelists serve on the County’s Long-Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Panel. She suggested that any interested persons contact her or Matt Regis, of the County Executive’s office, and they can tell them how to get involved. She said that there is also a survey on the County’s website for the Advisory Committee.

Ms. McKeel reported that on February 12, 7:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m., at the Meadows Presbyterian Church on Angus Road, she will hold a neighborhood open house to focus on the Route 29/250 Interchange Best Buy ramp projects, with the intent being to inform the neighbors directly affected by the project. She said that the meeting will give people the opportunity to see from VDOT what the project will look like, and to speak with police officers about any issues they might have. Ms. McKeel stated that she is holding the event in conjunction with the City, and a City Councilor will be present along with City staff and City police.

Mr. Boyd stated that he participated in a town hall meeting the previous week with more than 400 people in attendance. He thanked Supervisor Mallek for her attendance. There was a full hour of the session devoted to taking input from the public – with no one speaking up in favor of the Route 29 Solutions package proposed by the Governor and VDOT. Mr. Boyd emphasized that it is not the Solutions package people are objecting to, but the interchange at Rio road.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he hopes the Board has an opportunity to discuss that further under the agenda line item later in the meeting.

Ms. Dittmar reported that Dominion Power has completed its Bremo to Dooms transmission line, which is an exciting infrastructure improvement for the County. She noted that in the State of the Union address that the FCC and broadband has become a key item, so the Board will be asking legislators to keep the County abreast of that.

She stated that she had an MPO briefing set up for community leaders, from the Scottsville District, on road improvements and where the money comes from, and both Chip Boyles and Will Cockrell did a wonderful job in presenting the information and answering questions.

Ms. Dittmar said that she attended a presentation on a mountaintop project that Monticello is launching that will be an exciting addition to that attraction.

She reported that she and Ms. Palmer held a third meeting regarding the County’s Audit Committee and brainstormed next steps with Bill Letteri and Betty Burrell.

Ms. Dittmar said that the entire John Warner Parkway will open the following day, at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Sheffield asked if any other Supervisors are planning to attend.

Ms. Mallek said she is planning to be there.

Ms. Palmer stated that on February 5, at 7 p.m., the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission will host a presentation on House Bill 2, the new road prioritization and funding for the State.

Agenda Item No. 6. Proclamations and Recognitions.

- a. Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Budget Award.

Ms. Dittmar stated that the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada (GFOA), headquartered in Chicago, has awarded the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award to Albemarle County’s Office of Management and Budget, reflecting the commitment of Board and staff to meet the highest principles of government budgeting. She said that to receive the award, the budget

document must receive top ratings as a policy document, a financial plan and operations guide, and as a communications tool for the public.

Mr. Charles Ramsay, Immediate Past President of the GFAO and Senior Accountant with Henrico County, addressed the Board and presented the award to Albemarle County. This award has promoted the preparation of high quality budget documents since 1984. He said that the purpose of the program is to encourage and assist government to prepare excellent budget documents for the benefit of citizens and other parties with vital interests in government finances. Mr. Ramsay stated that during the 30 years the program has operated, it has gained widespread recognition as a premier indicator of excellence in government budget reporting. He said to earn this award, Albemarle had to substantially conform to the program's demanding criteria, and such a record reflects the professionalism and commitment of numerous individuals, many hours of hard work, and a high degree of dedication and leadership. Mr. Ramsay said this is the ninth time that the County had won this award, which covers the period beginning July 1, 2014. The GFAO hopes that this award will serve as an example and encourage others to strive for the same high standards in their own budget documents. He then presented the award to Lori Allshouse.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, thanked the Board on behalf of OMB, and recognized the department's staff. She mentioned that their Fellow, India Adams, is embedded in the OMB office but also does work for many County departments. Ms. Allshouse thanked the Board, County Executives' office and other departments for their guidance and involvement in the budget process.

Ms. Dittmar thanked staff for their work, and thanked Mr. Ramsay for presenting the award.

Agenda Item No. 7. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Mr. John Martin, a resident of Free Union, thanked the Board for its continuing support of Route 29 Solutions and the Rio Road interchange. He stated that he moved to the area 18 years ago, and was shocked at the design of the left-turn lane onto Rio Road West – and since that time it has only gotten worse. Mr. Martin said that he has done his homework, attended every meeting, but one of the project delivery advisory panel, have read all the documents, read the RFP and watched all the videos. He added that he is not susceptible to propaganda. He stated that the new proposed intersection was well-designed, sensible, intuitive, predictable to drivers, and will improve the situation immensely for a lot of reasons. Mr. Martin said when the red light camera was installed it just made the intersection worse, and the new design will eliminate the need for that enforcement. He encouraged the Board to continue its support. He stated that the business community does not like the intersection design because they really want to slow the traffic down on Route 29 so it comes into their businesses, but he does not think that is a good idea and instead supports the intersection redesign as part of an overall good package.

Ms. J.J. Towler, a resident of the Rio District, said that Route 29 Solutions is a package that includes the Berkmar Drive extension, the Hillsdale Drive extension, widening Route 29 north of the Rivanna River, and a grade-separated interchange at the Rio 29 intersection. She stated that enough studies have already been done, and these are plans that have been carefully developed and scrutinized for the last 30 years. She said that the Route 29 Solutions package is supported by Governor Terry McAuliffe, Secretary of Transportation Aubrey Layne, the local MPO, the Charlottesville City Council, and the Albemarle Board of Supervisors. She stated that this is a package of improvements that cannot be dissected by one small but very vocal group of disgruntled citizens who do not represent the majority of people in the community. Ms. Towler said that Route 29 Solutions is what the community needs, and she urged Board members to continue their support.

Mr. Spencer Gay, of the Jack Jouett District, said he was speaking in support of the Route 29 Solutions project as originally designed. Mr. Gay said that the project should be analyzed only by looking at the cost versus the benefit, and the benefit is that there will be traffic that moves, and the costs are now affordable – but may not be in the future if they delay. He stated that the cost to travelers would have to be borne, but if they look just to the north there is a light at the end of the tunnel, and he encouraged the Board to stay the course.

Mr. Scott Van der Pol, a resident of the Jack Jouett District, stated that he supports the full Route 29 Solutions package, especially the Rio Road grade-separated interchange. The process has been going on longer than the 11 years he has lived here. He said that the process has included players from other communities and is not just about this area but the entire Route 29 corridor, involving lots of politics and fraught emotions. Mr. Van der Pol stated that the Route 29 Solutions process has been a proscribed legal, public and open process, and through this process a solutions package has been devised and approved. He said that in this process, some local interests focused on the Rio interchange did not prevail, and that is inevitable because not everyone gets what they want. Mr. Van der Pol stated what they are seeing now is a "ginned-up storm" about the Rio interchange, and you would think from the advertising, mass mailings, print and radio advertising that if the interchange were to be built it would be an all-out catastrophe. He emphasized that nothing could be further from the truth, and these were standard changes to an intersection – with the whole package working together.

Mr. Mac Lafferty, a resident of the Jack Jouett District and Chair of the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), formerly known as CHART, said he serves on the MPO Policy Board, and was instrumental in writing the long-range transportation plan. Mr. Lafferty said that this was the way that ideas came into reality: through CTAC, through MPO via their technical and policy boards. He stated that Albemarle County has had Places 29 for years, and the grade-separated interchange is indicated in that plan. Mr. Lafferty said that the long-range transportation plan, which had many public meetings, began over two years ago and has a grade-separated interchange included. He stated that he was appalled at the people crawling out of the woodwork now and spending money to oppose this, while spreading misinformation, and they would be better off advertising their goods instead of blocking this plan. Mr. Lafferty asked for a show of hands from supporters of the Route 29 Solutions package (approximately 25 people raised their hands). Mr. Lafferty said he has been nursing the Route 29 Solutions package from its beginning and said it will do a lot to correct traffic. The traffic going under Rio Road will be generally through traffic and heading north.

Mr. Milton Moore of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board, stating that necessary construction is always an inconvenience, but the benefits are worth it. He stated that completion of the Route 29 Solutions package including the Rio Road interchange, will have a positive economic affect in the Route 29 business corridor. Mr. Moore said that he will continue to shop and spend at least as much money as he does now – and the interchange will not affect that. Mr. Moore said that Delegate Rob Bell's budget amendment will subject the Route 29/Rio Road interchange to additional studies, which would likely kill the interchange and probably the rest of the 29 Solutions package too, and anything the Board can do to help defeat it would be appreciated.

Mr. Daniel Bowman of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board, stating that they have to stop meeting like this sometime soon. Mr. Bowman said that he was speaking on his own behalf, as well as, on behalf of the Advocates for a Sustainable Population (ASAP), and for many neighbors and friends in this community, who all support the complete Route 29 Solutions package. He stated those neighbors knew that this meeting would happen at 1:00 p.m., and Mr. Boyd said there were supporters who could not be present, but Mr. Bowman stated that he was also speaking on behalf of people who could not be at this meeting and would not know that the discussion would happen later on the agenda as it contradicts what was on the County's website. Mr. Bowman emphasized that Route 29 is a component of a statewide and regional transportation system, and therefore there must be that kind of perspective on it. He stated that major infrastructure projects are long-term investments and the benefits accrue for many decades, so as the Board goes forward, it should remember that the community of support is broad, and many of those people are not financed by the type of support that Smart 29 has. Mr. Bowman encouraged the Board to keep the long-term and regional perspective.

Mr. Charles Bakewell, a resident of the White Hall District, stated that he appreciates the opportunity to recommend to the Board that it adopt and implement a comprehensive policy banning employee driver cell phone use and texting. Mr. Bakewell said there is a similar "zero tolerance" policy in place for school bus drivers, and he recommends the County expand it to cover all employees. He stated that the National Safety Council estimates that 26% of all traffic accidents are attributable to cell phone use and texting, and applying that to Albemarle would mean about 500 crashes, 200 injuries and three deaths per year. Mr. Bakewell said if you take the AAA estimates for cost of those crashes, the cost is about \$47 million to individuals and the municipalities for time lost at work and provision of emergency response. He asked the Board to consider this measure and offered to meet with them to provide additional detail.

Mr. Sheffield said he is afraid this issue might get drowned out and wondered if the Board is interested in pursuing it further. He stated that it is a dismissible offense at JAUNT to be caught texting or talking on a phone while operating a vehicle.

Ms. Mallek stated that since her conversation with Mr. Bakewell, Mr. Davis has provided an update on this issue. She said that she will provide Mr. Davis' information to the other Board members, as it seems that the County is in better shape than originally thought.

Mr. Foley said that the County completely supports what Mr. Bakewell is proposing, and is now just clarifying whether the County needs to do anything differently.

Ms. Shirley Midyette, a resident of Albemarle County, urged the Board to stay the course and support the state and community-approved Route 29 Solutions package.

Mr. Saunders Midyette, a resident of the Jack Jouett District, expressed his gratitude for the previous Supervisors' approval of the Route 29 Solutions road improvement projects, and urged the Board to continue supporting projects in the face of the Smart 29 coalition opposition. Mr. Midyette stated that the construction of these projects as a package will resolve the long-standing, unacceptable Route 29 North traffic flow. He thanked the Board for their time and efforts on behalf of residents.

Mr. Kirk Bowers of the Rivanna District addressed the Board, stating that he represents the Piedmont group of the Sierra Club and the Charlottesville Center for Peace and Justice, which covers about 22,000 people. Mr. Bowers said that they would like to continue support for the Route 29 Solutions

package, adding that he was present for the Free Bridge project 20 years earlier – which caused two years of traffic headaches and a lot of delays but resulted in a vastly improved Route 250. He stated that the same will happen with the Route 29 projects also. The group that is protesting the solutions is a special interest group that does not represent the majority of the views. Mr. Bowers stated that a year and a half earlier, elections were held, and four Supervisors won elections, with a margin of 57% to 43%, and part of the reason they won was because of the bypass vote. He said that the Smart 29 group has spread much misinformation about the Route 29 Solutions project and continues to do so, and he urged the Board to stand strong in its position of support.

Mr. Tom Olivier, a resident of the Samuel Miller District for the past 30+ years, said that for years he opposed the proposed Route 29 Bypass on the basis of its dollar cost and environmental cost, and the anticipated lack of functionality. He stated that he supports the planned improvements to Route 29, including at Rio Road, and said that the improvement plan has emerged from a very sound public process so he urged the Board to support it.

Ms. Debbie Goodman of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board and urged the Board to continue support for all of the components of the approved and funded Route 29 Solutions package.

Mr. Henry McHenry of the White Hall District addressed the Board, stating that he has been waiting to hear an objection to the Rio Road overpass that makes sense, but he had not heard one. Mr. McHenry said that he supports the entire package of improvements as presented with the intersection being constructed.

Mr. Morgan Butler, on behalf of the Southern Environmental Law Center, stated that he wished to speak on the motion intended to stop work on the Rio Road interchange in the name of Places 29 and the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Butler stated that in June 2011, just four months after approving the Places 29 Master Plan, a slim majority of the prior Board of Supervisors voted to revive the destructive and ineffective Western Bypass proposal, and voted to do so regardless of the fact the bypass was not included in the Master Plan – and despite language in the broader Comprehensive Plan specifically rejecting it. He said that the midnight vote to revive the bypass turned Places 29 completely on its head. At the time a majority of the Board tried to justify their action by arguing that the deal they struck in accepting the bypass was the only way to get funding for key improvements included in Places 29 – such as Berkmar Drive and Hillsdale Drive Extended – but this community and new Board have proved them wrong. Mr. Butler said that this Board, in working together with the State, has obtained full funding and approval to advance the projects that form the very backbone of Places 29, and have done it by committing to effective projects that are entirely consistent with the Master Plan, rather than swallowing an ill-advised proposal that was specifically excluded from it. He stated that curiously, the lone remaining member of the prior Board – who voted to turn the Master Plan on its head – is suddenly insisting on an overly rigid adherence to a plan that is supposed to be a general guide. Mr. Butler urged the Supervisors not to fall for it. He said that several of the items recommended to be part of a small area plan have already been accomplished and there may still be several small area plan type items worth working on as the County continues to work forward with the package of improvements. Mr. Butler said the County has an incredible opportunity to build the very foundation of Places 29 with these projects, and there is no need to go back to the drawing board now. He asked the Board to reject Mr. Boyd's motion, and thanked the Board for its leadership in moving these much needed projects forward.

Ms. Donna Van der Pol, of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board, stating that she supports the full package of transportation improvements developed by the Route 29 Solutions Committee, including the grade-separated intersection at Rio Road. Ms. Van der Pol said that the intersection is an important component of the package, has long been a locally identified need, studied by VDOT, and is included in the locally generated Places 29 plan. She stated that the projects are now approved and funded, and the Board should not allow those to be delayed and risk losing the funding. The grade-separated interchange at Rio Road is a key component of the package of projects. Ms. Van der Pol said that use of the intersection will increase when Berkmar Drive and Hillsdale Drive are extended, and the John Warner Parkway will also increase the use of the intersection. She the Route 29 Solutions package and transportation improvements will benefit the entire community, not just through traffic. Ms. Van der Pol said that the Route 29 Solutions package of improvements was developed as a result of a legitimate public process. She asked the Board to not to let a few businessmen who own businesses at the intersection to overrule a legitimate public process. She stated that a grade-separated intersection will benefit the whole community and should not be delayed, and she encouraged the Board to support all of the solutions.

Mr. Jeff Werner of the Piedmont Environmental Council addressed the Board, stating that later today the Board will discuss the improvements at Rio Road and Route 29 – and the alternative proposed by Smart 29 will likely be brought up. Mr. Werner presented information from a slide in 2009 in which the Board of Supervisors was reviewing Places 29, which included a network of streets in the area around Route 29 and Rio Road – which was vigorously opposed by some of the businesses, and by some Board members. He stated that as a result, when Places 29 was approved in 2011, the proposed street network was removed – eliminated because some businesses demanded it and Mr. Boyd, Mr. Thomas and Mr. Snow refused to support Places 29 unless the streets were removed. Mr. Werner said that last week,

Smart 29 announced a new alternative for Rio Road and Route 29, and this alternative has almost the same street network that was removed from Places 29. Mr. Werner presented a slide showing three maps side by side – with the street network present in 2009, gone in 2011, and now back again in the Smart 29 plan. He stated the reason the streets are there is because the people who had opposed them now want the County to believe they embrace them as an alternative to the approved work at Rio Road and Route 29. Mr. Werner said that in looking at the entire map that Smart 29 has put forward, it proposes work at several locations beyond Rio Road and Route 29, such as Georgetown Road, Hydraulic Road, Rio Road and Woodburn Road, and Hilton Heights. He stated that a key argument against the projects in Places 29 at Rio road and elsewhere was that the County had no right to put lines on a map on someone's property, so as Smart 29 and its supporters promote their alternative, someone might ask them if they have talked to the property owners that might be impacted by the lines they have put on their map.

Ms. Lettie Bien, a resident of the Rivanna District, said that she is in favor of the full Route 29 Solutions transportation package to include the Rio Road grade-separated interchange. Ms. Bien said she found much of the information put out by Smart 29 to be somewhat misleading, and has prepared a list of 29 examples of misinformation. She stated that one example was that this was a new project that the County was being too quick to rush into, but this specific intersection has been discussed in detail since 1994, at which time technical drawings were developed. Ms. Bien said that a second piece of misinformation was that 25-foot walls would be going up, but VDOT's information shows that the highest point – which is the bridge in the middle of the intersection – is only 16 feet. She stated that the people who believed the traffic to be so bad that a bypass was needed now state that the traffic is so minimal that the County does not need the Rio Road interchange. Ms. Bien said that the proposed options include a form of gridding that has traffic cutting through residential areas, which was never part of the plan and certainly would raise objections from the residents there. She stated that nothing the Board does will satisfy everybody, but this plan has been on the books for many years and they need to just get on with it. Ms. Bien said that she is prepared to be inconvenienced for a while to get to a better place for the community. She stated that she is a member of ACAC and goes quite often, and the failure to have a turn light into Albemarle Square will not negatively impact her presence at ACAC one iota – and many members there whom she has spoken with agreed with that statement. She asked that the Board not fall for this minority of people who want to derail the project and prevent it from moving forward.

Ms. Marta Keane, a resident of the Rio District and CEO of JABA, presented information from JABA's client satisfaction survey. The survey reported that JABA's three community centers serving Albemarle County residents include Scottsville, Esmont and Mary Williams Center, had a client satisfaction of 94% for overall satisfaction. An important component, home-delivered meals also received high ratings. She stated that 85% of the Hillsdale-based Adult Day Care Center caregivers go to work, which allows them to stay in the community. Ms. Keane reported that VICAP served over 1,200 people from October to December with Medicare Part D, with a 99% satisfaction rating and the one holdout stating that he would still refer people to the service. Ms. Keane said that the Board's support of JABA has gone a long way to helping a lot of people in the County feel like their needs have been met. JABA looks forward to the Board's participation in helping celebrate its 40th anniversary.

Mr. Bill Sublette addressed the Board, stating that he has lived in the White Hall District for more than 40 years and has spent a lot of that time on Route 29. Mr. Sublette stated he is very excited about the Route 29 Solutions package and hopes that the Board will not be swayed from going forward with the interchange at Rio Road. He said that he realizes this will be a strain for the businesses at Rio Road, but he hopes they will see it as a long-term investment in their future and an opportunity to make that location safer, more accessible and more attractive. Mr. Sublette stated that this is an opportunity to invest in the future of the community, and he hopes the Board will not let it slip away.

Ms. Tammy Moses of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board, stating that she is a business owner and is before the Board to ask it to affirm the decision to move forward with Route 29 Solutions as previously approved. Ms. Moses said that it is essential for the projects to as soon as possible, as the traffic on Route 29 and the stress on surrounding neighborhoods needs to be fixed. She stated that it has been proven that overpasses help alleviate traffic, along with parallel roads, and the interchanges need to be built first – then the parallel roads. Ms. Moses said that the order is very important, and if the parallel roads are constructed first, Route 29 will not be able to handle the traffic flow during construction. Berkmar Drive, Hillsdale Drive and Georgetown Roads currently divert a lot of traffic off of Route 29 and are essential routes for many families along the Route 29 corridor. She stated that Route 29 is already an F-rated road that cannot handle the additional traffic, which would be generated if the Berkmar Drive and Hillsdale Drive parallel roads are not constructed first. Ms. Moses said the Route 29 corridor has been studied enough, the monies have been allocated, and now is the time to take action. She stated that the MPO, City Council and the Board of Supervisors have all decided that the improvements along the Route 29 corridor as outlined in the Route 29 Solutions package, are imperative to the health of the community, along with the many studies performed by experienced traffic engineers. Ms. Moses said that it is time to “stop the madness” and listen to the people who travel the corridor each day, and not those who have some personal agenda. She said that she believes that her families' quality of life will improve if the Route 29 Solutions construction were to begin tomorrow. She again asked the Board to affirm its previous decision to support the Route 29 Solutions project.

Mr. George Larie addressed the Board, stating that he is a resident of Albemarle County in the Rivanna District. He said that for 25 years he has been involved with the Route 29 Solutions issue, and has served as a member on the Places 29 Advisory Committee. Mr. Larie stated that he strongly supports the Board and its action in supporting the Route 29 Solutions package. He emphasized that it is the right solution at the right time, and he urged the Board to go with it.

Mr. Dennis Rooker, a resident of the Jack Jouett District, stated that Smart 29 has spent over \$150,000 to spread information around the community, much of which is misinformation. Mr. Rooker said it appears that Smart 29 and Mr. Boyd, acting for them, will stop at nothing to kill the Rio Road overpass – and his most recent motion is just the latest part of this scheme. He stated that they are in this meeting after seven public hearings in the last year on the Route 29 Solutions package, and are here after the approvals from this Board, the MPO, the Commonwealth Transportation Board; and after 14 Route 29 Solutions project delivery advisory panel meetings, after the development and advertising of an RFP for the project, after bids being received, after the winning bid has been selected and advertised for signing by the CTB – and suddenly Mr. Boyd wants a small area plan. Mr. Rooker said the winning bid saves the State more than \$40 million, which are funds that will likely be made available for other projects in the area in the long-range transportation plan. He stated that he was on the Board when Places 29 was being considered and ultimately adopted, and presented quotes from a public hearing held by the Board on June 9, 2010; Tim Hulbert, Charlottesville Regional Chamber of Commerce: “The Chamber has continuing concerns that the small area plans contained in Places 29 have the potential, even likelihood, to retard and ultimately arrest economic vitality within the leading commercial, job sustaining, and tax revenue generating area within the County.” Mr. Rooker also quoted Mr. Boyd as saying that “it does not excite him very much to do another small area study, and he would rather use that money for the projects that can be easily completed”. Mr. Rooker said these comments speak for themselves, and encouraged the Board not to move forward and not fall for delay schemes.

Ms. Adele Wood of the Scottsville District addressed the Board and stated that she is grateful to the Board for its support of the Route 29 Solutions package, and is looking forward to it being delivered. Ms. Wood said it is unfortunate that there is a budget amendment proposal that could lose all of the money, going back to square one, and for possible smaller projects like Safe Routes to School. She stated that her belief is the proposal was only proposed to try to kill Route 29 Solutions. People want a safe road and will continue to use services regardless of construction going on for a few years.

There were no further public comments, and the Chair closed the matters from the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Boyd said there have been comments made about people coming in at 6:00 p.m., but the Board’s rules and procedures provide two public comment periods. He stated that this issue is not about the bypass, and he does not understand why these people are fighting the fact that Smart 29 feels the grade-separated interchange is not the proper solution.

Ms. Dittmar clarified that her concern about people coming at 6:00 p.m., is that there was some confusion about whether the Board was having a public hearing and would have already voted.

Ms. Mallek commented that there are a lot of people who work in the evenings and are able to come in the daytime, so saying that other people are working hard and cannot be here is out of order.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

Discussion: Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd indicated that they had read their assigned minutes. Ms. Mallek, Ms. Dittmar, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer stated that they had not read their assigned minutes.

Referring to Item 8.11, Mr. Boyd asked if the \$3,900 allocation for the broadband item was necessary for approval to get a \$30,000 grant.

Ms. Mallek said that the \$30,000 is the match for the grant that would come later.

Mr. Mike Culp, Director of Information Technology, addressed the Board, stating that it is required through DHCD that the County contract through the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) to do the application, and their fee for the application process is \$3,900.

Mr. Boyd said that he understands that, but would like to know the grant amount. Mr. Culp said that the grant is a \$30,000 grant from the State to help the County develop a telecommunications plan for the County as well as for other parts of the region.

Mr. Boyd said that he wonders about the cost benefit of spending \$3,900 to get \$30,000.

Ms. Dittmar stated this plan needs to happen before the County can do a whole lot of other things, including applying for a lot of other grants, and this is the first step in that process.

Mr. Foley said that this is referred to as a planning grant, which will ultimately lead to a project that will then be considered.

Mr. Culp said that the follow-up grant from DHCD will be an "infrastructure grant" that will help provide funding to build a network. He stated that the plan helps the County submit for the secondary funding.

Ms. Mallek said that this is similar to the planning grant for the Artisan Trail, which led to the \$25,000 grant for implementation.

Referring to the rural rustic road projects, Mr. Boyd asked where Bunker Hill Road was in the rural rustic road project list, as it has been on and off the list.

Mr. David Benish, Chief of Planning, responded that he will provide that information during the evening portion of the Board meeting. He said that when the Board adopted the priority list in June last year, VDOT had identified some projects that were on the regular road list that are now eligible, and this year the County is trying to mesh them with the rural rustic list.

Mr. Boyd said that he would like to see that appear on a Consent Agenda in the future, as long as VDOT has agreed to it, so the Board knows what it has to go through in order to get it qualified as a rural rustic road.

Mr. Benish clarified that the step before the Board today is the last step that allows VDOT to use the lesser road standard for paving. This is the step before going to construction, with the next step being to prioritize Bunker Hill.

Mr. Foley noted that the Board does have a work session on the road prioritizations beginning in March.

Ms. Dittmar said that Ms. Jordan will be adding the magisterial districts beside the road names on future agendas, which will be helpful for Board members in identifying locations.

Referring to Item 8.2, Ms. Mallek said that she was startled to see the \$500,000 change in rental and insurance costs in fire and rescue. She would like to know what the County is renting that costs that much money. Mr. Foley said staff will follow up and copy Board members on that item.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to approve Items 8.1, as read, through Item 8.11, on the consent agenda. Ms. Palmer **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Item No. 8.1. Approval of Minutes: March 5, April 2, June 10, July 1, July 8, August 26, September 9 and October 30, 2014.

Mr. Boyd read the minutes of March 5, 2014, pages 28 (begin #12) – 93 (end #23), and July 1, 2014, and found them to be in order.

Ms. Palmer pulled her portion of the March 5, 2014 minutes, and the September 9, 2014 minutes.

Mr. Sheffield read the minutes of April 2, 2014, pages 1-39 (end at Item #10), and found them to be in order.

Ms. Mallek pulled her portion of the minutes of April 2, 2014.

Ms. McKeel pulled the minutes of June 10, 2014 and October 30, 2014.

Ms. Dittmar pulled the minutes of July 8, 2014 and August 26, 2014.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved the minutes of March 5, 2014, pages 28 (begin #12) – 93 (end #23), April 2, 2014, pages 1-39 (end at Item #10), and July 1, 2014, and carried the remaining minutes to the next meeting.

Item No. 8.2. FY 2015 Budget Amendment and Appropriations.

The executive summary states that the Virginia Code § 15.2-2507 provides 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; provided, 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 Code section applies to all County funds, i.e., General Fund, Capital Funds, E911, School Self-Sustaining, etc.

The total **decrease** to the FY 15 budget due to the appropriation itemized below is \$518,022.98. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the amount of the cumulative appropriations does not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

This request involves the approval of five (5) appropriations as follows:

- One (1) appropriation (#2015071) to appropriate \$68,460.00 from the Reserve for Contingencies to the Commonwealth's Attorney for the costs associated with new attorney and legal services assistant positions. This appropriation will not increase the total County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015074) to appropriate \$6,436.31 from recovered cost revenue to the Department of Fire Rescue;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015075) to reduce appropriations by \$828,459.29 for various current capital projects;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015076) to appropriate \$304,000.00 for current capital projects; and
- One (1) appropriation (#2015077) to appropriate \$3,900.00 from the Grants Leveraging Fund to the Information Technology Department for the costs associated with a grant application for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program administered by the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD).

Staff recommends approval of appropriations #2015071, #2015074, #2015075, #2015076, and #2015077 for general government and school division programs and projects as described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #2015071 **\$0.00**

This appropriation will not increase the County budget.

Source: Reserve for Contingencies \$ 68,460.00

This request is to appropriate \$68,460.00 from the Reserve for Contingencies to the Commonwealth's Attorney's Office for Assistant Commonwealth Attorney and Legal Services Assistant positions pursuant to the Board's action at its January 7, 2015 meeting. This position is budgeted to begin in March 2015.

Appropriation #2015074 **\$6,436.31**

Source: Recovered Costs \$ 6,436.31

This request is to appropriate \$6,436.31 in hazardous materials (Hazmat) recovered cost revenue to the Department of Fire Rescue for the purchase of gas and radiological detectors. These recovered costs are related to the Department's response to and the abatement of Hazmat incidents.

Appropriation #2015075 **(\$828,459.29)**

Source: Local (Non-Tax) \$ 1,967,789.42
 Borrowed Proceeds \$(2,666,462.82)
 General Government CIP Fund Balance \$ (129,785.89)

This request is to amend the budgets of currently appropriated capital projects:

- **ECC Integrated Public Safety Technology Project:** This request is to reduce the currently appropriated budget and supporting revenues by \$768,459.29 for the ECC Integrated Public Safety Technology Capital Project. This reduces the budget from \$6,333,276.89 to 5,564,817.60. This reduction is a result of finalizing the negotiated price with the vendor. On December 22, 2014, the ECC Management Board approved the vendor, the project amount, and the contract execution. On December 23, 2014 the contract was executed by the County and the project is expected to be completed and operational by June 30, 2016. The currently appropriated revenues will be revised to \$730,661.46 or 13.13% in local revenue for UVA's share, \$2,213,127.96 or 39.77% in local revenue for the City's share, and \$2,621,028.18 or 47.10% in borrowed proceeds for the County's share.
- **School CIP Maintenance – CATEC:** This request is to reduce the currently appropriated budget of School CIP Maintenance Program project for CATEC maintenance from \$120,000.00 to \$60,000.00 to reflect only the County's share of this jointly funded project in the County's CIP. At the time the County developed the FY 15 CIP budget, the County expected to be the fiscal agent for this project, which would require the City of Charlottesville to provide its 50% share of the \$120,000.00 in funding to the County. It was subsequently determined that the City will be the fiscal agent. Therefore, on approval of this request, the appropriated budget in the County's CIP for CATEC Maintenance will be reduced by the City's share for a new total of \$60,000.00.
- **Crozet Elementary School Sidewalk and Crossing Improvements Project:** This

request is to correctly identify Grayrock West proffer revenue in place of Grayrock proffer revenue as identified in Appropriation 2015-073 approved January 7, 2015 for the Crozet Elementary School Sidewalk and Crossing Improvements Project. Upon approval of this request, the Grayrock proffer revenue associated with this project will be \$0 and the Grayrock West proffer revenue will be \$946.98. This appropriation will not increase the total County budget.

Proffer	APP# 2015-073	APP #2015-075 Correction	Revised
Liberty Hall	\$25,657.28		\$25,657.28
Wickham Pond	9,000.00		9,000.00
Wickham Pond II	13,500.00		13,500.00
Grayrock	946.98	-\$946.98	0.00
Haden Place	2,430.98		2,430.98
Grayrock West	1,051.72	\$946.98	1,998.70
Total	\$52,586.96	0	\$52,586.96

- **Transportation Revenue Sharing Program:** This request is to appropriate proffer revenue currently appropriated as general support of the Transportation Revenue Sharing Program to specific eligible projects supported by the program. This appropriation will not increase the total County budget. The revenue will be appropriated as follows:

Proffer	Revenue	Assigned Project
Martha Jefferson Hospital (MJH) @ Peter Jefferson Place	\$369,503.00	Sidewalk, South Pantops Dr./State Farm Blvd.
Albemarle Place-Stonefield	60,000.00	Sidewalk, Hydraulic & Barracks Rd.
Total	\$429,503.00	

Appropriation #2015076 **\$304,000.00**

Source: General Government CIP Fund Balance \$ 304,000.00

This request is to appropriate \$304,000.00 from the General Government CIP fund balance to accommodate the new Economic Development Office and the related Finance Department Renovations on the first floor of the COB McIntire building. As discussed with the Board on November 5, 2014, this project will be accomplished in two phases. Phase 1 will include renovations and furnishings for the new Economic Development Office and for displaced Human Resource Department staff. Phase 2 will include renovations for the Finance Department and Board of Elections Office that are impacted by the Phase 1 renovations.

Appropriation #2015077 **\$0**

Source: Grants Leveraging Fund \$ 3,900.00
 This appropriation will not increase the County budget

Based on guidance obtained from the Board at the November 5, 2014 Broadband Update Work Session, this request is to appropriate \$3,900.00 from the Grants Leveraging Fund to the Information Technology Department for the department to contract with Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) for the preparation of a Fiscal Year 2015 Telecommunications Planning Grant application being submitted to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program administered by the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) to support the completion of a Community Connectivity Plan for the County's Broadband efforts. An additional \$30,000 is being reserved in the Grants Leveraging Fund for the match for this grant, should the grant be awarded to the County. Additional details regarding the Broadband Planning Grant will be provided to the Board as a separate item on the February 4, 2015 Board agenda.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved Appropriations #2015071, #2015074, #2015075, 2015076, and #2015077 for general government and school division programs and projects as set out below:

**COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION SUMMARY**

APP#	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-110000-1002	43510.00	SA2015071 Salaries
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-210000-1002	3330.00	SA2015071 FICA
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-221000-1002	5870.00	SA2015071 VRS
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-241000-1002	520.00	SA2015071 Group Life
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-231000-1002	5200.00	SA2015071 Medical Insurance
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-232000-1002	170.00	SA2015071 Dental Insurance
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-270000-1002	40.00	SA2015071 Worker's Compensation
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-301223-1002	550.00	SA2015071 Parking
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-332104-1002	350.00	SA2015071 Computer Maintenance
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-520300-1002	150.00	SA2015071 Telecommunications
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-550100-1002	350.00	SA2015071 Travel/Training/Education
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-580100-1002	350.00	SA2015071 Dues & Memberships
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-600100-1002	170.00	SA2015071 Office Supplies
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-360000-1002	400.00	SA2015071 Advertising
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-800200-1002	4000.00	SA2015071 Furniture
2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-800700-1002	2500.00	SA2015071 Computer

2015071	4-1000-22010-422010-800701-1002	1000.00	SA2015071 Software
2015071	4-1000-99900-499000-999990-9999	-68460.00	SA2015071 Commonwealth's Attorney Positions
2015074	3-1000-19000-319000-199904-1003	6436.31	SA2015074 Recovered Costs - FR
2015074	4-1000-32013-432010-800100-1003	6436.31	SA2015074 Prevention Detectors
20150875	4-9000-69980-464600-301210-6305	-60000.00	SA20150875 Sch CIP Maint CATEC
20150875	3-9000-69000-319000-190319-6599	-60000.00	SA20150875 Sch CIP Maint CATEC
20150875	3-9010-19000-319000-190321-9999	2027789.42	SA20150875 ECC IPST Project Partner Shares
20150875	3-9010-41400-341000-410530-9999	-	SA20150875 ECC IPST Project Borrowed Proceeds
		2666462.82	
20150875	3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999	-129785.89	SA20150875 ECC Integrated Public Safety Technology Project
20150875	4-9010-31000-431000-800306-9999	-768973.40	SA20150875 ECC Integrated Public Safety Technology Project
20150875	3-8523-51000-351000-510100-9999	-946.98	SA20150875 Crozet Ave SRTS From Grayrock
20150875	4-8523-93010-493010-930010-9999	-946.98	SA20150875 Crozet Ave SRTS From Grayrock
20150875	3-8577-18977-318000-189911-9999	946.98	SA20150875 Crozet Ave SRTS From Grayrock West
20150875	4-8577-93010-493010-930010-9999	946.98	SA20150875 Crozet Ave SRTS From Grayrock West
20150875	3-9010-51000-351000-512063-9999	-946.98	SA20150875 Crozet Ave SRTS From Grayrock
20150875	3-9010-51000-351000-512087-9999	946.98	SA20150875 Crozet Ave SRTS From Grayrock West
2015076	4-9010-81050-481050-800200-1008	17000.00	SA2015076 Economic Development Furniture
2015076	4-9010-81050-481050-800605-1008	24800.00	SA2015076 Economic Development Construction
2015076	4-9010-81050-481050-999999-1008	2200.00	SA2015076 Economic Development Contingency
2015076	3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999	44000.00	SA2015076 Economic Development Fund Balance
2015077	4-1000-99900-499000-999974-9999	-3000.00	SA2015077 Grant Leveraging Fund
2015077	4-1000-12200-412200-562500-1001	3000.00	SA2015077 TJPDC grant support
TOTAL		-1,556,560.07	

Item No. 8.3. HO-2014-217, Joseph R. Dane Ph.D. Special Exception.

The executive summary states that the applicant is requesting a Home Occupation Class A (HOCA) modification under County Code § 18-5.1(a) for the number of trips generated by a proposed home office/practice for a clinical psychologist. The applicant is requesting a modification to allow up to thirty (30) additional trips per week. Characteristics of the anticipated operation:

- Hours of operation: Monday-Friday, 8:00 AM – 7:00 PM and every other Sunday, 6:00 – 7:30 PM.
- Operating hours are by appointment Monday – Friday and appointments last for one (1) hour.
- Typically, five (5) clients are seen per weekday. Some appointments may include two clients/couples, each arriving in their own car.
- A group session every other Sunday from 6:00 – 7:30 PM, with a maximum of five (5) attendees.

The property (TMP 062A1-00-0E-01200) is in the Northfields neighborhood and is located on Huntington Road, approximately .4 mile north of Rio Road East. The .83 acre parcel is zoned R-2, Residential and the surrounding properties consist of single-family detached homes.

County Code § 18-5.2(e) states, “[t]he traffic generated by a home occupation shall not exceed the volume that would normally be expected by a dwelling unit in a residential neighborhood.” Traffic generation for a dwelling unit is five (5) round trips (one vehicle entering and exiting the site) per day (35 total round trips per week). The longstanding interpretation of County Code § 18-5.2(e) by the Zoning Administrator is that the *total normal traffic volume* generation per dwelling unit with a Home Occupation in a residential neighborhood is six (6) total round trips per day (42 total round trips per week). The applicant’s proposal would generate an additional five (5) round trips per day, Monday – Friday (for a total of 10 round trips per day; 60 total round trips per week) plus five (5) additional round trips every other Sunday for the group session (for a total of 65 round trips per week in those weeks).

Staff typically evaluates traffic generation for this type of request against other uses permitted by-right within residences, most particularly a family day home serving up to five (5) children (a special use permit is required for a family day home serving six or more children). A family day home would thus generate up to 10 additional round trips per day (2 round trips/day per child for drop-off and pick-up), or 15 total round trips per day and 75/90 total round trips per week (Mon.-Fri./Sat.). The applicant’s proposal would generate less additional traffic than a family day home use.

The section of Huntington Drive on which the proposal is located currently carries 790 vehicle trips per day and is of adequate geometrics and condition to accommodate the additional trips that would be generated by this proposal. The subject property has a 150+ foot long driveway and parking area that is of adequate geometrics and condition to accommodate client parking and/or pick-up and drop-off. Adequate site distance exists at the driveway entrance on to Huntington Drive.

County Code § 18-5.1(a) provides for this modification, “upon a finding that . . . a modified regulation would satisfy the purposes of this chapter to at least an equivalent degree as the specified requirement.” Based on the above analysis, staff finds that the requested modification with conditions will result in traffic generated by the home occupation that will not exceed that which would be expected by a dwelling in a residential neighborhood.

There is no budget impact from this proposal.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment D) approving the special exception to allow an increase in permitted traffic generation for HO 2014-217 subject to the following conditions which cover peak activity:

1. Client sessions shall be held Monday through Friday, provided that one group session may be held every other Sunday.
2. During weeks in which client sessions are held only Monday through Friday, no more than sixty (60) total vehicle round trips generated by this home occupation are permitted per week (Sunday through Saturday).
3. During weeks in which a Sunday group session is held in addition to the Monday through Friday client sessions, no more than sixty-five (65) total vehicle round trips generated by this home occupation are permitted per week (Sunday through Saturday).

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution approving the special exception to allow an increase in permitted traffic generation for HO-2014-217 subject to conditions:

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SPECIAL EXCEPTION
FOR HO 2014-217, JOSEPH R DANE, PhD**

WHEREAS, Martin J. Mckie and M. Marcelin are the owners of Tax Map and Parcel Number 062A1-00-0E-01200 (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, Joseph Dane resides at the Property and owns a business, Joseph R Dane, PhD; and

WHEREAS, Joseph R. Dane, PhD, filed a request for a special exception in conjunction with HO 2014-00217, Joseph R Dane, PhD, to modify the number of vehicle trips permitted by County Code § 5.2(e) to be generated by a proposed home occupation to add an additional five (5) round trips per weekday plus five (5) additional round trips every other Sunday.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, upon consideration of the foregoing, the executive summary prepared in conjunction with the special exception request, staff's supporting analysis included in the executive summary, and all of the factors relevant to the special exceptions in Albemarle County Code §§ 18-5.1 and 18-33.8, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves the special exception to modify the number of vehicle trips permitted in conjunction with HO 2014-217, Joseph R Dane, PhD, as described hereinabove, subject to the condition attached hereto.

* * *

HO 2014-217, Joseph R. Dane Ph.D Special Exception Conditions:

1. Client sessions shall be held Monday through Friday, provided that one group session may be held every other Sunday.
2. During weeks in which client sessions are held only Monday through Friday, no more than sixty (60) total vehicle round trips generated by this home occupation are permitted per week (Sunday through Saturday).
3. During weeks in which a Sunday group session is held in addition to the Monday through Friday client sessions, no more than sixty-five (65) total vehicle round trips generated by this home occupation are permitted per week (Sunday through Saturday).

Item No. 8.4. Resolution Requesting Increased Funding For Public Education In Virginia.

At the request of the School Board, by the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution requesting increased funding for public education in Virginia:

WHEREAS, the General Assembly shall provide for a system of free public elementary and secondary schools for all children of school age throughout the Commonwealth, and shall seek to ensure that an educational program of high quality is established and continually maintained (Virginia Constitution, Article VIII, Section 1); and

WHEREAS, the General Assembly shall determine the manner in which funds are to be provided for the cost of maintaining an educational program meeting the prescribed standards of quality, and shall provide for the apportionment of the cost of such program between the Commonwealth and the local units of government comprising such school divisions. (Virginia Constitution, Article VIII, Section 2); and

WHEREAS, the General Assembly shall provide for the support of public education as set forth in Article VIII, Section 1 of the Constitution of Virginia which states that the General Assembly and the Board of Education find that the quality of education is dependent upon the provision of (i) the appropriate working environment, benefits, and salaries necessary to ensure the availability of high-quality instructional personnel; (ii) the appropriate learning environment designed to promote student achievement; (iii) quality instruction that enables each student to become a productive and educated citizen of Virginia and the United States of America; and (iv) the adequate commitment of other resources. In keeping with this goal, the (Standards of Quality, 22.1-253.13:1, Standard 1); and

WHEREAS, increased funding for public education is needed to ensure that the state meets its responsibility to provide public education as a core function of state government and to promote economic development in Virginia (VASS Blueprint for Public Education); and

WHEREAS, Virginia's state aid to public education has been declining since the 2009 recession with State direct aid K-12 appropriations currently at \$6.8 billion (all funds)/\$5.2 billion (GF) compared to \$7.1 billion (all funds)/\$5.6 billion (GF) in FY2009; and

WHEREAS, State K-12 funding reductions have reduced K-12 funding from 35 percent of the general fund in FY 2009 to below 30 percent in FY 2014 and beyond; and

WHEREAS, Virginia continues to provide for special interest tax preferences and loopholes, while reducing its financial obligation to public education; and

WHEREAS, the state's reduction in funding for K-12 has occurred through policy changes since FY 2009, such as reduced state funds for school "support" personnel and administrative and employee benefits; and

WHEREAS, the voters of Virginia in 1987 approved the establishment of a state-operated Lottery for the purpose of providing funding for public education and further approved a constitutional amendment in 2000 which required Lottery proceeds to be distributed to localities to spend for public education purposes. Instead of additional resources for public education, 100 percent of Lottery proceeds now supplant general fund revenues to support public education; and

WHEREAS, localities have paid for the increased costs of education required by state mandates to improve public school performance with localities currently paying 56 percent of the state versus local share of public education rather than the 45 percent they should be paying as defined by the Standards of Quality; and

WHEREAS, localities budgeted \$3.55 billion in FY2013 above their state required local effort (RLE) to maintain the actual costs of public education (Annual Superintendents Report to the Department of Education); and

WHEREAS, real estate values in Virginia and, therefore, local government revenues continue to be depressed in Virginia - increasing only two percent in fiscal year 2013 - with little prospect for even average growth rates in future years without significant local tax rate increases; and

WHEREAS, the number of at-risk students in Virginia schools has significantly increased to the point where more than one-third of K-12 students are now free lunch-eligible and seven percent reduced-price lunch eligible, thereby increasing the need for more personnel and material resources to help them; and

WHEREAS, we believe our state's future prosperity relies on a high-quality education system that prepares students for college and careers, and that without it, Virginia's economic competitiveness and ability to attract new business will falter; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors calls upon the Virginia General Assembly to immediately increase the state's share of funding for public education to the level of quality that is prescribed by them in the Standards of Quality and expected by all of the Commonwealth's citizens.

Item No. 8.5. Resolution Designating Route 703, Pocket Lane, as a Rural Rustic Road (Samuel Miller District).

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution designating Route 703, Pocket Lane, as a Rural Rustic Road:

The Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, in regular meeting on the 4th day of February, 2015, adopted the following:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Section 33.1-70.1 of the *Code of Virginia*, permits the hard surfacing of certain unpaved roads deemed to qualify for designation as a Rural Rustic Road; and

WHEREAS, any such road must be located in a low-density development area and have no more than 1,500 vehicles per day; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia desires to consider whether Route 703 Pocket Lane, From: Route 715 Chestnut Grove Road To: End of State Maintenance should be designated a Rural Rustic Road; and

WHEREAS, the Board is unaware of pending development that will significantly affect the existing traffic on this road; and

WHEREAS, the Board believes that this road should be so designated due to its qualifying characteristics; and

WHEREAS, this road is in the Board's six-year plan for improvements to the secondary system of state highways.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Board hereby designates this road a Rural Rustic Road, and requests that the Residency Administrator for the Virginia Department of Transportation concur in this designation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board requests that this road be hard surfaced and, to the fullest extent prudent, be improved within the existing right-of-way and ditch-lines to preserve as much as possible the adjacent trees, vegetation, side slopes, and rural rustic character along the road in their current state; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Virginia Department of Transportation Residency Administrator.

Item No. 8.6. Resolution Designating Route 784, Doctors Crossing, as a Rural Rustic Road (Rivanna District).

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution designating Route 784, Doctors Crossing, as a Rural Rustic Road:

The Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, in regular meeting on the 4th day of February, 2015, adopted the following:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Section 33.1-70.1 of the *Code of Virginia*, permits the hard surfacing of certain unpaved roads deemed to qualify for designation as a Rural Rustic Road; and

WHEREAS, any such road must be located in a low-density development area and have no more than 1,500 vehicles per day; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia desires to consider whether Route 784 Doctors Crossing, From: Route 600 Watts Passage Road To: Route 640 Gilbert Station Road should be designated a Rural Rustic Road; and

WHEREAS, the Board is unaware of pending development that will significantly affect the existing traffic on this road; and

WHEREAS, the Board believes that this road should be so designated due to its qualifying characteristics; and

WHEREAS, this road is in the Board's six-year plan for improvements to the secondary system of state highways.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Board hereby designates this road a Rural Rustic Road, and requests that the Residency Administrator for the Virginia Department of Transportation concur in this designation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board requests that this road be hard surfaced and, to the fullest extent prudent, be improved within the existing right-of-way and ditch-lines to preserve as much as possible the adjacent trees, vegetation, side slopes, and rural rustic character along the road in their current state; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Virginia Department of Transportation Residency Administrator.

Item No. 8.7. Resolution to accept Road(s) in Avon Park Subdivision into the State Secondary System of Highways (Scottsville District).

At the request of the County Engineer, by the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution accepting Avon Park Subdivision into the State Secondary System of Highways:

The Board of County Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, in regular meeting on the 4th day of February 2015, adopted the following resolution:

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the street(s) in **Avon Park Subdivision**, as described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3 dated **February 4, 2015**, fully incorporated herein by reference, is shown on plats recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Albemarle County, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation has advised the Board that the street(s) meet the requirements established by the Subdivision Street Requirements of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Albemarle Board of County Supervisors requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add the street(s) in **Avon Park**, as described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3 dated February 4, 2015, to the secondary system of state highways, pursuant to §33.2-705, Code of Virginia, and the Department's Subdivision Street Requirements; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board guarantees a clear and unrestricted right-of-way, as described, exclusive of any necessary easements for cuts, fills and drainage as described on the recorded plats; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

The road(s) described on Additions Form AM-4.3 is:

- 1) **Hathaway Street (State Route 1367)** from Route 1366 (Arden Drive) north to the end of State maintenance, as shown on plat recorded in the office the Clerk of Circuit Court of Albemarle County in Deed Book 3291, pages 607-655, 644, 649 and 654, for a length of 0.09 miles.
- 2) **Arden Drive (State Route 1366)** from Route 742 south to Route 1367 (Hathaway Street), as shown on plat recorded in the office the Clerk of Circuit Court of Albemarle County in Deed Book 3291, pages 607-655, 644, 649 and 654, for a length of 0.12 miles.

Total Mileage – 0.21

Item No. 8.8. Resolution to accept Road(s) in Longacre Farm Subdivision into the State Secondary System of Highways (White Hall District).

At the request of the County Engineer, by the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution adding the streets in Longacre Farm Subdivision into the State Secondary System of Highways:

The Board of County Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, in regular meeting on the 4th day of February 2015, adopted the following resolution:

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the street(s) in **Longacre Farm Subdivision**, as described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3 dated **February 4, 2015**, fully incorporated herein by reference, is shown on plats recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Albemarle County, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation has advised the Board that the street(s) meet the requirements established by the Subdivision Street Requirements of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Albemarle Board of County Supervisors requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add the street(s) in **Longacre Farm**, as described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3 dated February 4, 2015, to the secondary system of state highways, pursuant to §33.2-705, Code of Virginia, and the Department's Subdivision Street Requirements; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board guarantees a clear and unrestricted right-of-way, as described, exclusive of any necessary easements for cuts, fills and drainage as described on the recorded plats; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

The road(s) described on Additions Form AM-4.3 is:

- 1) **Longacre Farm Lane (State Route 1023)** from Route 680 to 0.13 miles north to end of cul-de-sac, as shown on plat recorded in the office the Clerk of Circuit Court of Albemarle County in Deed Book 2892, pages 550-574, for a length of 0.13 miles.

Total Mileage – 0.13

Item No. 8.9. Resolution to accept Road(s) in Mountain Vista Subdivision into the State Secondary System of Highways (Rivanna District).

At the request of the County Engineer, by the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution adding the roads in Mountain Vista Subdivision into the State Secondary System of Highways:

The Board of County Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, in regular meeting on the 4th day of February 2015, adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the street(s) in **Mountain Vista Subdivision**, as described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3 dated **February 4, 2015**, fully incorporated herein by reference, is shown on plats recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Albemarle County, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation has advised the Board that the street(s) meet the requirements established by the Subdivision Street Requirements of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Albemarle Board of County Supervisors requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add the street(s) in **Mountain Vista**, as described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3 dated February 4, 2015, to the secondary system of state highways, pursuant to §33.2-705, Code of Virginia, and the Department's Subdivision Street Requirements; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board guarantees a clear and unrestricted right-of-way, as described, exclusive of any necessary easements for cuts, fills and drainage as described on the recorded plats; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

The road(s) described on Additions Form AM-4.3 is:

- 1) **Forloines Drive (State Route 1022)** from Route 600 east 0.776 miles to end of cul-de-sac, for a length of 0.78 miles.

Total Mileage – 0.78

Item No. 8.10. Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee – Revised Charge and Request for Consultant Services (*moved to regular agenda*).

Item No. 8.11. Broadband Planning Grant Update.

The executive summary states that on November 5, 2014, the Board discussed the following Broadband Planning issues:

- 1) The continuation of efforts to review regulatory barriers and grant opportunities, and to pursue regional discussions that involve the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission ("TJPDC") and the Center for Innovative Technology ("CIT") and partnerships with public safety and schools;
- 2) The provision of funding for the completion of a grant application for the Community Connectivity Planning Grant through the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD); and
- 3) The authorization for staff to issue a Request for Proposals to develop a "Broadband Deployment and Funding Strategy".

The purpose of this Executive Summary is to: 1) provide a progress update; and 2) seek the adoption of a Resolution to commit funds for the Community Connectivity Plan to support the DHCD Telecommunications Planning Grant application. The Plan will detail the lack of broadband coverage in the region; document several innovative strategies for bridging the broadband service gap; and make recommendations for increasing broadband service in the rural areas.

In a separate but related agenda item, staff is recommending that the Board appropriate \$3,900 from the Grant Opportunity Fund (Appropriation #2015077 set forth in the February 4th FY 15 Appropriations Executive Summary) to fund a grant application writing contract with the TJPDC. The TJPDC proposal is included as Attachment A.

Since November, 2014, staff has researched other jurisdictions' efforts to obtain DHCD telecommunication planning grants; kept in contact with DHCD about the release of the grant application, and prepared for the application process. After reviewing the planning grant fund application process and considering the options for submittal, staff is recommending the County contract with the TJPDC to complete the grant application. This method of submittal has worked for other jurisdictions (Bath and Highland Counties were awarded a grant after receiving assistance from the Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission in writing their grant applications), and staff believes this process would give the County the best chance of being awarded the grant. The telecommunications planning grant requires that grant applicants show that the additional funding is available if necessary to fully fund the Plan prior to receiving a grant offer. A Resolution approving the use of \$30,000 is attached (Attachment B) for the Board's consideration.

Staff and the TJPDC are working on the grant application and plan to submit it prior to March 15, 2015. If awarded, DHCD will work with staff to finalize the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) to provide Consulting Services to complete a Community Connectivity Plan.

In addition, staff continues to research other grant opportunities. Staff participated in a discussion with Congressman Robert Hurt's office regarding support from a federal level, and Hurt's office committed to contacting federal agencies and keeping County staff informed of new opportunities as they arise.

The total budget impact is \$33,900. OMB staff has reserved \$30,000 in the Grant Opportunity Fund for the grant "match," as well as \$3,900 to contract with TJPDC to complete the DHCD grant application on behalf of the County. Appropriation #2015077 in the amount of \$3,900 is included as part of the FY 15 Appropriations set forth in the Executive Summary being presented to the Board for approval on February 4, 2015.

Staff recommends that the Board:

- 1) Support the continuation of all efforts toward advancing broadband deployment. This can include identification of funding strategies, meetings with public safety and other government agencies to discuss their continued participations, meetings with concerned citizens and business representatives willing to participate in the upcoming planning meetings, and continued support of staff efforts;
- 2) Adopt the attached Resolution approving the use of \$30,000 from the Grant Opportunity Fund to complete a Community Connectivity Plan if the County is awarded the DCHD grant.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board supported the continuation of all efforts toward advancing broadband deployment. This can include identification of funding strategies, meetings with public safety and other government agencies to discuss their continued participations, meetings with concerned citizens and business representatives willing to participate in the upcoming planning meetings, and continued support of staff efforts; and adopted the following resolution approving the use of \$30,000 from the Grant Opportunity Fund to complete a Community Connectivity Plan if the County is awarded the DCHD grant:

**RESOLUTION COMMITTING \$30,000 IN FUNDING
TO SUPPLEMENT THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS PLANNING GRANT**

WHEREAS, the County of Albemarle, Virginia, wishes to advance the deployment of broadband services to underserved areas of the County; and

WHEREAS, the County is planning to submit an application to the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development ("DHCD") for the Community Development Block Grant ("CDBG") Telecommunications Planning Grant for the purpose of completing a Community Connectivity Plan with a focus on the Rural Areas' economy; and

WHEREAS, because DHCD's experience with Telecommunications Planning Grants is that the maximum available amount is not sufficient to complete the activities required to create a Community Connectivity Plan, applicants are expected to show additional funding is available and committed prior to receiving a planning grant offer; and

WHEREAS, \$30,000 has been reserved in the County's Grant Opportunity Fund to supplement the Telecommunications Planning Grant if it is necessary to complete a Community Connectivity Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia that it hereby commits the use of up to \$30,000 to supplement the Telecommunications Planning Grant if the County is awarded the Telecommunications Planning Grant to complete a Community Connectivity Plan.

Item No. 8.12. FY 2015 2nd Quarter Cash Proffer Report, **was received for information.**

The executive summary states that in 2007, the Board directed staff to provide a quarterly report on the status of cash proffers. Since that time, the report has been expanded to also include updates on non-cash proffers. The Board received the last quarterly proffer report on November 5, 2014, which included information on cash proffer revenue and expenditures and non-cash proffers for July through September, 2014. This report includes all proffer activity (both cash and non-cash) for the second quarter of Fiscal Year 2014 (October-December). The next quarterly report will be on the Board's May 6, 2015 agenda

Proffer Activity for Fiscal Year 2015 Second Quarter (October-December)

A. New Proffered Revenue: There were two rezoning requests approved this quarter that provided new cash proffers and results in an estimated increase to total proffered revenue of \$2,806,370.55.

DEVELOPMENT	TOTAL	INTENDED PURPOSE
Spring Hill Village	\$1,387,226.19	CIP
Avinity II	\$1,419,144.36	CIP

B. Total Proffered Revenue: Total proffered revenue is \$48,943,356.45. This reflects estimated new proffered revenue (described above) in addition to 2013 annual adjustments to anticipated proffer revenue (not received yet obligated) from proffers in which annual adjustments were proffered.

C. 2nd Quarter Cash Revenue: The County received a total of \$333,921.65 from existing cash proffers during this quarter from the following developments:

DEVELOPMENT	TOTAL	INTENDED PURPOSE
Avinity	\$84,399.42	CIP-Neighborhoods 4&5
Estes Park	\$41,973.42	CIP
Grayrock West	\$1,051.72	CIP
Haden Place	\$3,200.00	CIP-Crozet
Hollymead Town Center (Area C)	\$40,476.26	
Livengood (Glenmore S5)	\$23,652.20	CIP/Affordable Housing
Leake (Glenmore K2)	\$46,194.23	CIP/Affordable Housing
Old Trail	\$24,000	Crozet Parks/Schools
Willow Glen	\$41,974.40	CIP
Wickham Pond II	\$27,000.00	CIP-Crozet
TOTAL	\$333,921.65	

D. 2nd Quarter Expenditures and Appropriations: A total of \$5,000 in proffer funds from Belvedere were appropriated during this quarter. The funds will be used for historical markers to commemorate the Free State community and Amy Parker Bowles, who was a resident of Free State.

Current Available Funds: As of December 31, 2014, the available proffered cash on-hand is \$4,638,574.99 (including interest earnings on proffer revenue received). Some of these funds were proffered for specific projects while others may be used for general projects within the CIP. Of the available proffered cash on-hand, \$2,324,156.12 (including interest earned) is currently appropriated (Attachment A). The net cash balance is \$2,314,418.87 and Attachment B provides information on how the net cash balance may be used for future appropriations to CIP projects.

The Community Development Department and Office of Management and Budget staff monitor proffer funds on an ongoing basis to ensure that associated projects not currently in the CIP move forward and to ensure that funding is appropriated to projects before any proffer deadlines.

Cash proffers are a source of revenue to address impacts from development and they support the funding of important County projects which would otherwise be funded through general tax revenue. Using cash proffer funding for current or planned FY15–FY18 CIP projects builds capacity in the CIP by freeing up funding for other projects. In addition, non-cash proffers provide improvements that might otherwise need to be funded by general tax revenue.

This executive summary is for information only and no action is required by the Board.

Item No. 8.13. FY 15 General Fund Q2 Report; Revised FY 15 Revenue Projections Report; and Quarterly Economic Indicators Report, **was received for information.**

The executive summary states that the attached Quarterly Financial Report (QFR) (Attachment A) provides information regarding the County's FY 15 General Fund and School Fund performance as of December 31, 2014. The General Fund Revised Financial Projections Report (Attachments B and C) includes projected General Fund revenues and expenditures for FY 15. The Quarterly Economic Indicator Report (Attachments D and E) provides an overview of recent general economic conditions in the County.

Quarterly Financial Report

The Quarterly Financial Report reflects year-to-date (YTD) data through December 31, 2014, the end of the second quarter of FY 15. The data in the attached QFR is organized in a way that is consistent with Exhibit 12 of the County's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). Most line item titles in the QFR match the line item titles in the CAFR. Highlights from the QFR include:

Revenues – YTD Actual. YTD total revenues in Q2 FY 15 are \$104,992,177, compared to \$100,453,741 in Q2 FY 14. In percentage terms, FY 15 YTD actual revenues as a percentage of FY 15 Revised Budget revenues was 43.32%, compared to 43.04% in FY 14. This result means that the rate of revenue collection was essentially consistent between the two years. Individual revenue streams performed fairly consistently in Q2 FY 15 when compared to Q2 FY 14. Only revenue from the Federal Government experienced significant year-to-year variance. For additional information about this revenue variance, please see the analysis on page 2 of the QFR.

Expenditures – YTD Actual. YTD total expenditures in Q2 FY 15 are \$83,858,238, compared to \$107,036,927 in Q2 FY 14. In percentage terms, FY 15 YTD actual expenditures as a percentage of FY15 Revised Budget expenditures was 34.60%, compared to 45.87% in FY 14. This result means that overall expenditures were relatively lower between the two years. Individual expenditure streams performed fairly consistently in Q2 FY 15 when compared to Q2 FY 14. Seven expenditure streams did experience significant year-to-year variance. These expenditure streams include Public Safety: Police; Public Safety: Volunteer Fire; Public Safety: Regional Jail; Public Safety: Contributions to Public Safety; Human Development: Social Services; Education: Transfer to Schools; and Transfers: Transfer Accounts.

For additional information about these expenditure variances, please see the analysis on pages 2 and 3 of the QFR.

ACPS Quarterly Financial Report. The Albemarle County Public Schools Quarterly Financial Report as of December 31, 2014 is included as a table on page 9 of the QFR.

Administratively-Approved Budget Transfers. In addition to the attached financial reports, the Board has directed staff to provide a quarterly update of any budget transfers administratively approved by the County Executive. As of December 31, 2014, the County Executive has not administratively approved any transfers.

General Fund Revised Financial Projections Report

The General Fund Revised Financial Projections Report (GFRFPR) provides a streamlined summary of forecasted revenues and expenditures. The GFRFPR indicates that by June 30, 2015, revenues are forecasted to exceed appropriated revenues by \$0.344 million. Expenditures are projected to be \$1.131 million below appropriated expenditures. The difference between appropriated expenditures and forecasted expenditures is due primarily to savings associated with salary lapse and insurance. Excess revenues and expenditures savings are projected to result in a net of \$1.475 million additional fund balance by the end of FY 15. Please note that this projected \$1.475 million in additional fund balance equals only 0.61% of the forecasted \$ 241.256 million FY 15 expenditures and transfers; this small percentage "buffer" reflects an extremely tight budgetary environment.

Quarterly Economic Indicators Report

The Quarterly Economic Indicators Report (QEIR) shows the state of the County's economy. The QEIR contains data taken from the most recently available quarter and compares this data with data from the same quarter of previous fiscal years. General economic activity, as measured by six select revenue streams, collectively grew between Q1 FY 14 and Q1 FY 15, although among the revenue streams there were substantial differences in rates of growth. The unemployment rate in Albemarle declined slightly between Q1 FY 14 and Q1 FY 15, dropping from 4.70% to 4.67%. This year-over-year decline, however, was the smallest in the Q1 FY 12 to Q1 FY 15 period. Note that the County's jobs base grew modestly between Q4 FY 13 and Q4 FY 14, the most recent quarter for which information is available. The unemployment rate and jobs data suggests that the County is in a period of only moderate growth, despite somewhat stronger growth in the U.S. economy.

Revenues and expenditure data contained in the QFR reflects the state of the County's FY 15 budget-to-actual financial performance as of December 31, 2014. Year-end projections contained in the GFRFPR are subject to change, based on the result of actual collections and expenditures through June 30, 2015. Data shown in the QEIR reflects economic variables that impact the County's current and future revenues and expenditures.

These reports are for information only. Staff welcomes the Board's feedback regarding the content and presentation of these reports.

Item No. 8.14. FY 15 School Division Capital Improvement Plan Funding, **was received for information.**

Albemarle County's Capital Improvements Plan's expenditures are budgeted, appropriated, and accounted for in four main funds: General Government, Regional Public Safety Firearms Training Center, Stormwater, and School Division. The sources of funding (revenue) to support CIP expenditures include the general fund allocation transfer, loan proceeds, state revenue, local revenue, and other sources. The purpose of this informational Executive Summary is to provide the Board with preliminary information

regarding the potential need to provide the School Division CIP cash funding to support the School Division's projected expenditures through June 30, 2015.

For the past few fiscal years, the County has issued debt on an every-other-year basis in an amount sufficient to reimburse itself for prior fiscal year capital improvement fund expenditures as well as to fund the then-current fiscal year expenditures. At least two official actions are taken by the Board that authorizes each debt issuance. The first action is authorization that is granted through the annual appropriation of the CIP budget that reflects loan proceeds as a source of funding, and the second action is taken by the Board when the County is preparing to issue debt through the sale of bonds.

The benefit of issuing debt every other year is a lower cost of issuance. The fees are incurred once rather than twice for services provided by bond counsel, rating agencies and some of the other third parties involved in the issuance.

One disadvantage of every-other-year issuance is the negative impact on the County's pooled cash, which results in a reduction of the County's access to cash for operational purposes. Another disadvantage is in the process of accounting for the sources and uses; the County's "books" reflect a negative cash position in those funds/projects that are reliant upon bond proceeds as a source of funding that is not available until the debt is actually issued (although the funds have been appropriated). In the past, supplemental appropriations have been made to cure this deficiency so the County's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report does not reflect a cash deficiency.

The Finance Department intends to present a Plan of Finance to the Board at its March meeting to address projected FY15 cash shortfalls in the Schools CIP program. At that time, Finance will provide an overview of the upcoming debt issuance to take place in the fall of 2015 (FY16) that corresponds with our every-other-year financing schedule.

There is no budget impact related to this executive summary.

This executive summary is for information only and no action is required by the Board.

Item No. 8.15. Board-to-Board, February 2015, *a monthly report from the Albemarle County School Board to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors*, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.16. Citizens Advisory Committee of the Charlottesville-Albemarle Public Defender Office 2014 Annual Report, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.17. Copy of letter dated December 19, 2014, from Mr. Ronald L. Higgins, Chief of Zoning/Deputy Zoning Administrator, to Mr. Nimrod T. Clark, *re: LOD2014-00019 - OFFICIAL DETERMINATION OF PARCEL OF RECORD & DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (Nimrod T. Clark property) – Tax Map 100, Parcel 3 – Samuel Miller Magisterial District*, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.18. Copy of letter dated January 6, 2015, from Mr. Francis H. MacCall, Principal Planner, to Ms. Kathy D. Abell, McCallum & Kudravetz, PC, *re: LOD2014-00014 - OFFICIAL DETERMINATION OF PARCEL OF RECORD & DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS – Tax Map 8, Parcel 50 (property of Frances P Gibson trustee of the Frances P Gibson Trust) – White Hall Magisterial District*, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.19. Copy of letter dated January 7, 2015, from Mr. Ronald L. Higgins, Chief of Zoning/Deputy Zoning Administrator, to Ms. Laura D. Dollard, *re: LOD2014-00020 - OFFICIAL DETERMINATION OF PARCEL OF RECORD & DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS – Tax Map 122, Parcel 17 and Parcel 17C, "Broomfield Farm" (property of Laura D. Dollard) – Scottsville Magisterial District*, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.20. Copy of letter dated January 21, 2015, from Mr. Francis H. MacCall, Principal Planner, to Mr. James E. Criag, Jr., *re: LOD2014-00021 - OFFICIAL DETERMINATION OF PARCEL OF RECORD & DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS – Tax Map 94, Parcel 17 (property of Carolyn P. Sweeney) – Scottsville Magisterial District*, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.21. County Grant Application/Award Report, **was received for information.**

The executive summary states that pursuant to the County's Grant Policy and associated procedures, staff provides periodic reports to the Board on the County's application for and use of grants.

The following Grants Report provides a brief description of one grant application and one grant award received during the time period of November 14, 2014 through January 15, 2015.

The budget impact is noted in the summary of each grant.

This report is for information only.

GRANT REPORT ACTIVITY – November 14, 2014 through January 15, 2015

An application was made for the following grant:

Granting Entity	Grant	Type	Amount Requested	Match Required	Match Source	Department	Purpose
Department of Homeland Security (FEMA)	Assistance to Firefighters - Mobile Live Fire Multi-Trainer System	Federal	\$206,019	\$20,601	Grants Leveraging Fund	The Fire Rescue Department	This grant will be used to provide funds for the Fire Rescue Department to purchase a Mobile Live Fire Multi-trainer system. This would be a portable prop in which County personnel could achieve live fire training at the station level.

An award was received for the following grant:

Granting Entity	Grant	Type	Amount Received	Match Required	Match Source	Department	Purpose
Charlottesville Area Community Foundation	BAMA Works Fund of Dave Matthews Band	Foundation	\$2,500	No match required	None	Department of Social Services	This grant will be used to provide funds for the Family Support Workers to purchase summer kit for children on the Family Support Worker's caseloads. Families will receive an age appropriate summer kit containing a variety of activities to improve family engagement.

Item No. 8.22. Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) Summary for the end of FY 2014 and the first half of FY 2015, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.23. VDOT Culpeper District, Albemarle County Monthly Report, February 2015, **was received for information.**

Agenda Item No. 9. Places 29 Community Advisory Council.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that at its December 10, 2014 meeting, the Board discussed concerns regarding the effectiveness of the Places29 Community Advisory Council in achieving its mission. As a result of that discussion, the Board directed that operations of the Places29 Community Advisory Council be suspended until staff could do an assessment and develop recommendations for the Board's consideration. The Board and County staff stressed the importance of an effective and well-functioning advisory council given the significant amount of development activity affecting the Places29 master plan area and the expressed interest by the Council in resuming its responsibilities as soon as possible.

Following the December 10 Board meeting, staff initiated a review of the Places29 Community Advisory Council. That review included interviews with staff who regularly engage with the Council, a survey that was circulated to all current Places29 Council members, and feedback provided by Board members on December 10. A summary and the full results from the Council member survey are included as Attachment A.

During the course of the review, staff identified several areas where the new Community Engagement Coordinator could reinstate some services that were originally in place to support all of the Councils and where clarity could be provided to all Councils. Additionally, some suggested operational changes specific to the Places29 Council were identified in response to feedback received from the Board and from current Council members. The recommendations are included as red line edits to the existing Community Advisory Council Fact Sheet – Places 29 (Attachment B) and the Community Advisory Council Rules of Procedure (Attachment C). The highlights of those recommendations are provided below.

Community Advisory Council Fact Sheet

Recommendations for all Advisory Councils:

- Background – clarified new role in development review to provide venue for neighborhood meetings
- Charge – clarified role in supporting adopted master plan implementation and noted that approval/disapproval votes for specific development proposals are not appropriate given that the Councils do not have an official voting role in the legislative approval process
- Liaison Role – language added to clarify distinction between roles of liaisons and appointed members
- Responsibilities – language added to provide for annual report to the Board regarding Council activities to be consistent with Board's adopted policy
- Principles – language added to emphasize Council's role in supporting the elements of adopted Master Plans

Recommendations for Places29 Community Advisory Council:

- Structure – recommend establishing two sub - Councils – Places29 North and Places29 South - to provide more productive focus on a smaller geographic area
- Membership – revised membership composition to reflect sub-Council concept and to clarify Board and Planning Commission assignments
- Liaisons – clarified liaison assignments for the sub-Councils
- Time Commitment – revised time commitment to reflect sub-Council and full Council meetings

Community Advisory Council Rules of Procedure

Recommendations for all Advisory Councils:

- Officer Terms of Office – chairs and vice chairs may not serve more than two consecutive terms to allow for rotation of leadership
- Orientation – staff requirement to provide timely orientation for all newly appointed members is strengthened
- Establishment of Agenda – staff to maintain a calendar of topics aligned with County priorities and projects in the Master Plan areas to assist in agenda development
- Voting Procedures – noted that approval/disapproval votes for specific development proposals are not appropriate given that the Councils do not have an official voting role in the legislative approval process.

There is no budget impact associated with this item.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the revisions to the Community Advisory Council Rules of Procedure and the Community Advisory Council Fact Sheet - Places29 as proposed in Attachments B and C, and appoint members to the two sub-Councils that will establish the Places29 Master Plan Council in its reconstituted form as soon as possible.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he had several comments on this item that he has not yet shared with staff regarding semantics, but he will not go through them all at this point. He will follow up with staff at another time.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, stated that she is present to discuss the Places 29 Community Advisory Council. Ms. Catlin said at the December meeting, there was some discussion about the Council and how it was operating, and whether it was as efficient and effective as it could be in fulfilling its mission. The Board asked staff to evaluate the situation and report back with recommendations. She stated that staff thinks this is a timely opportunity to take a look at the advisory council and all the advisory councils in general, and Places 29 as an area has a lot of activity and issues, so to have a well-functioning advisory council is really critical. Ms. Catlin said when the Board adopts the Comp Plan Amendment, it will likely be forming two more advisory councils. She stated that because the concept was established before four of the Supervisors were seated on the Board, it is good to have these conversations to ensure that everyone's expectations are in the same place.

Ms. Catlin reported that following the meeting in December, staff initiated a review process to look at the advisory councils. Staff took comments from the Board at the meeting and through some other venues, including consulting with County staff – particularly in the Planning Department and other Community Development staff, who have regular engagement with the advisory councils. She said that staff also did a survey of Places 29 council members, with 13 out of 14 members providing feedback, and also had discussions with other community advisory councils to make them aware of what was going on and provide any feedback. Ms. Catlin said during the course of the review, while focused on Places 29 in the beginning, it evolved to identifying some things that would be helpful to all advisory councils – particularly reinitiating staff support in places that had been pulled back in the past such as the Community Engagement Specialist position.

Referring to Attachment B, Places29 Community Advisory Council Fact Sheet, Ms. Catlin said there is a portion of the information that is applicable to all advisory councils and a portion that is applicable to Places29 only. The first proposed change is in the background section, to include a sentence that “they can provide a venue for neighborhood meetings for development projects”. Ms. Catlin stated that the major change she wants to present to the Board is the charge of the committees, and the clarification that staff put in was that the charge is “support of the adopted master plan”. There has been discussion about what these committees are supposed to be doing. She explained that staff's understanding has been that the Board created these councils to support the implementation of master plans that had been developed with community input, had been through an approval process, and had been adopted by the Board. Ms. Catlin said that if there are issues the Board wants to take to the advisory council to get feedback on – policies, issues, or projects being implemented – those would all be within the charge of the committee. She stated that staff's sense was not that the Board intended the committees to be places where elements of the master plan would be continually revisited and brought back up outside of the cycle of the master plan revision, unless the Board requested them to do that. She said that is an important clarification point because that is where Places29 got hung up. There were things supported in the adopted master plan and the council was not sure if their role was to rehash those things or support that plan. Ms. Catlin said the other point for clarification was that the councils were a venue to discuss and provide comments on program and policy questions and/or proposals, and while they are an important venue for discussion and feedback they did not have a legislative role in the development process and are discouraged from taking votes of approval or disapproval. She added that the thought was that the councils should not function as mini-Planning Commissions or quasi-legislative place to go, but should be robust opportunities for developers and other project people to come forward and get a sense of how the community would react and what they can do to improve a project.

Mr. Sheffield said that after this decision was made, he has had several developers express their discontent with the councils and have felt that they were just another approval barrier to be overcome.

Ms. Mallek stated that the Crozet Community Advisory Council sees itself as “helpers” for people who come to one meeting because there is a project in their neighborhood and have not been part of the

process before. She said her concern with the expectations for council is that they seem to be expecting things that are in opposition to each other – saying that the community can give responses when asked, but otherwise should not be providing input. Ms. Mallek emphasized that the reason the projects in Crozet are achieving community support when they come to the Board or the Commission is because the advisory council has worked tirelessly with applicants to help them solve whatever the issues are with the neighbors. She said to say that the councils cannot make a resolution of support about something is an insult, and she hopes that the Board will not say that, as it is a step back to the time a few years ago when the community felt they were being controlled by staff and told what to do. This could inhibit the ability of other councils to grow in their own way.

Mr. Sheffield said that he has not witnessed this personally, but has seen some of the reviews and media coverage of the council meetings and can imagine the frustration from a development standpoint.

Mr. Boyd said that he has observed some of those things before, and has had people come to him and ask if it is a legislative necessity to go through this. He said that the stage was set with Crozet because they were the first CAC. It was intended for them to be an advisory council, but they migrated to a place where this became one of the steps an applicant had to go through.

Ms. Mallek said the applicants came; there was no one out there beating the bushes to tell them they had to get the Council's approval, but people found that it was to their great advantage to be able to have a sounding board and discuss things in hopes of getting some agreement.

Mr. Boyd said the first thing the CAC discussed was the Crozet Library. The Committee was comprised of most of the same people, and they spent a huge amount of time with the development, design and process. He stated that the councils do not have any legislative authority, and he was not in favor of adding them as a layer then or now.

Ms. Dittmar said that it might be worth stating that the councils are not a legislative body. Her experience with the Village of Rivanna CAC was that they brought real value to the planning process for neighbors with regard to Rivanna Village. She stated that she does not mind votes from the council, and has sat through many meetings in which the Rivanna Chair had to work with the group to see where they stood on issues and did not feel comfortable coming before the Board without making sure he had majority support. She added that she does not think it is worthwhile to encourage the advisory councils to revisit things the Board has already made a decision on. Ms. Dittmar said that she and Ms. Palmer have an advisory committee that will be launched sometime this year, and she would like them not to be so proscribed about helping with master plans, but instead to encourage their own ideas.

Mr. Boyd asked Ms. Mallek what the status of the Barnes Lumber Company property was, and how that was interacting with the advisory council's work. Ms. Mallek stated that the property has changed hands, and the new owner is working on plans for a whole series of meetings with the advisory council. She said that the owner is asking for citizen input on the most desired elements and what they are willing to go help fight for.

Mr. Boyd asked if there is a difference in the economy of the project as opposed to what the CAC wants, because that is what he is hearing. Ms. Mallek said there has not been a determination of what they want, because it is all evolving.

Mr. Boyd said that if you establish it the way it is established now, someone would be very reluctant to go against the recommendations of the advisory council and bring it to the Board, because it is being thought of as a necessary step to get approval before even going to the Planning Commission. He stated that this is the fine line the Board needs to go through, because they do not want for the advisory councils to be making decisions for the Board or the Commission because people fear they cannot come forward without their blessing.

Mr. Sheffield said it is a double-edged sword for the Board, because they are setting up the committees, but if the Board decides against them they feel that they are not being listened to.

Ms. Mallek stated that the councils have no illusions that they are in charge; their whole point is that they are an initial sounding board and are aware that the Planning Commission could do something else. She said that she would be satisfied if the last one-half of the sentence in the charge were taken away. The Board should state that, "Councils do not have a legislative role in the development process."

Ms. Catlin said that regarding the vote issue, part of why the councils are established is because they have diverse perspectives and broad input, and staff hates to see it boiled down to a vote, because the Board does not get the benefit of hearing differing opinions that may make a difference to them in their deliberations. She suggested including a provision that would direct the councils to indicate a statement of support, if they chose to do so, but would not want to dilute the value if there are dissenting views.

Ms. Palmer stated that she would like these groups to be called committees rather than councils, as council sounds like a more official body that would be taking a vote, and committee seems to imply a more inclusive process.

Ms. McKeel agreed with Ms. Palmer.

Ms. Catlin clarified that the Board wants to make sure the language is about supporting the master plan but is not too prescriptive, to figure out organized ways to indicate the sentiment of the committee without diluting the strong value of different voices being able to be heard by the Board as decision makers, and to make it clear they are not a legislative body, using the term "committee" instead of "council." Ms. Catlin said that the language also clarifies the role of the liaison. The intent when these were formed was that they be citizen-led, with feedback brought back to the Board, but they and the Planning Commission liaison should not be in a leadership/management type of role. She stated that under responsibilities, there is a forward-looking agenda with respect to adopted resolutions and policies, reflecting the fact that council meetings are not the appropriate venue to oppose adopted policy. Ms. Catlin said that this does not mean that individual members cannot do whatever they want – either by themselves or in other groups – but in the moment of being the advisory council, they are about implementing adopted master plans unless asked otherwise.

Ms. Mallek stated that the language that is problematic to her is, "Discourage taking votes of approval or disapproval." She feels that it is really a big mistake to tell these councils that the Board is not interested in hearing from them.

Mr. Foley and Ms. Catlin said that staff will rework and modify that language.

Mr. Sheffield said that if they are taking a vote, then that legitimizes their support or non-support for a project, which adds a complexity.

Mr. Foley stated that staff is trying to find that sensitive balance and definitely wants the feedback and input. The language initially did not say that the councils would look at development proposals – which was concerning – but it has actually worked out pretty well. He said that staff will bring this back on a consent agenda, and hopefully it captures what the Board wants, but if not staff can continue to work on it.

Ms. Catlin said that the second section of the fact sheet is Places 29 Community Advisory Council, which includes these things that are specific to Places 29. She stated that the major suggestion from staff is to break the group into two sub-councils: Places 29 North, which will focus on Piney Mountain and Hollymead; and Places 29 South, which will focus on Neighborhood 1 and 2. Ms. Catlin said that membership will become two groups of 11 members each, with some revised membership criteria that pose a challenge to staff to make sure they are bringing forward good candidates to fill all of the slots so that it stays balanced in terms of member perspective. She stated that the changes also reflect breaking down the liaisons into two sub-councils, with one Board member and one Planning Commissioner being considered the liaison for each of the groups. Ms. Catlin noted that there were potentially four Board members who had an ownership in Places 29, and with people coming and going, that council is not sure who their Board liaison was supposed to be – so staff would advise having an acknowledged liaison with the committee.

Mr. Boyd asked why they divided the area north/south as opposed to east/west. Ms. Catlin said that staff felt that the interests were more shared across the north/south boundary, and tried to follow magisterial district lines, but it could be divided up differently if the Board desired. She stated that the councils or committees would meet together as a whole once per year, and the rest of the time would meet within their committee structure.

Ms. Mallek said that as she had stated from the beginning, she was hoping they could have three councils – with Greenbrier to Hydraulic, Rio, and Piney Mountain – and with three Supervisors covering those areas, each committee would have a liaison to call their own. She stated that the committees could all meet together for a presentation, and then separate into their designated groups, which would be more of a solution than just having two groups.

Ms. Dittmar stated that the conversations need to be linked to the people that represent that corridor.

Ms. Mallek said that they will not know how to configure it unless they come to this decision first.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would hate to delay this item, but would like for staff to look at dividing this in three sections to see what the composition would look like.

Mr. Boyd said that drawing a map of the magisterial district distribution would be helpful.

Ms. Catlin reported that there were concerns about length of term for council members, and what was decided upon when these groups first formed is that members should only have two terms, and the language has been liberalized to say that members should be limited to serving no more than two consecutive terms, and additional terms may be considered if circumstances necessitate a need. She said that the idea is to have some turnover in the groups so that new people have a chance to come on, and some of the committees are concerned about that and like the longevity – so the question for the Board is whether that should be the case.

Ms. Mallek said they already have automatic reapplication, so that addresses the concern, and the committee has been able to keep members on if they are in the midst of specific issues, so she would like to leave if flexible.

Mr. Boyd stated that he agreed, and with the Pantops Advisory Council, 11 members will be rotated off under the proposal, so they will lose the history and continuity.

Mr. Sheffield said what he is looking for also is a succession planning kind of approach, so that people who might be staying on the council but do not have time for it anymore will see that new attendees have shown enough interest to be appointed as members.

Ms. Catlin stated that the provisions call for chairs and vice chairs not serving more than two consecutive terms, which is a leadership opportunity change issue; orientation is another area of focus, putting the burden on staff to make sure that new council members are completely oriented and up to speed within a timely way of their appointment. Ms. Catlin said that the agenda process will have staff assuming the responsibility to look ahead and establish what will be on the agenda, so that they can work cooperatively with the committee chair to make sure the issues get on the agenda in a timely fashion. Ms. Catlin said the last consideration is when to vote, and staff recommends including language that states while advisory councils are not expected to take votes of approval or disapproval on specific development proposals, voting is a tool the committee may use to express support for a program or policy question under consideration.

Mr. Boyd said if they are going to shift the responsibility of the chair back to staff, that makes sense, but the amount of work involved in being a committee chair is significant – and they have to drag people into it.

Ms. Catlin said each council has their own way of doing it, and what staff would like to convey is that for those committees for whom that is onerous, there is a staff person available to help out. She stated that this is just a mechanism by which they have the opportunity for a leadership change if that is appropriate for the committee.

Ms. McKeel stated that she had recalled the intent being to have a one-page report coming from each committee, and she is not sure what month they had wanted to receive it; the other part of that report was attendance at committee meetings.

Ms. Catlin noted that under “Rules of Procedure,” meeting attendance has a line added to say that staff would work with council secretaries to ensure adherence to the attendance policy.

Ms. Mallek said that the minutes reflect the attendance, and the councils usually meet once or twice per month.

Ms. Dittmar said that missing two out of 12 meetings does not seem like grounds for dismissal, but perhaps they can say two consecutive meetings.

Ms. Catlin emphasized that those were unreported absences, and anyone who says they cannot attend due to a conflict did not fall into that category.

Ms. Dittmar said that she just wanted them to clarify the attendance expectations so that it is not a deterrent in their recruitment of members.

Ms. Catlin stated that the fact sheet provided an item under responsibilities, “Work with staff to provide an annual report to the Board of Supervisors at the end of each calendar year.”

Agenda Item No. 10. Consideration of Video Streaming of Board Meetings.

Ms. Catlin stated that staff had presented the information on video streaming to the Board several months ago, and had gone back and asked Granicus representatives about the add-on to their agenda management service, and they are willing to honor their bundle price. Ms. Catlin said the only caveat will be that the need for an additional \$2,000 one-time cost for a computer to allow for switching between cameras, and there is money in the Innovation Fund to cover that. She noted there will be a person manning that computer from a remote location in order to switch between cameras, and one camera in the room will not be sufficient as there will need to be a camera on the Board and one on the podium, at a minimum.

Ms. Mallek asked if there will need to be a live person monitoring the computer. Ms. Catlin said that there will be, and the total estimated costs included the up-front cost of two cameras and an annual cost for videography support, plus the additional \$2,000 cost for the computer that would allow the operator to manage the cameras during the broadcast.

Mr. Boyd asked if they will be able to zoom in on a single Supervisor, or just the whole podium. Ms. Catlin said they will have to see what is available, and in time they may want to consider three cameras so that there is one on the dais, one on individual Supervisors, and one on the podium.

Mr. Boyd commented that it may be just as confusing for the public to figure out who is talking if they are just doing a broad scope of the whole Board.

Ms. Palmer said that she feels it would be close enough to be able to tell who is talking, and one of the complaints people have had with the audio podcasts is that they cannot tell who is speaking.

Ms. Catlin stated that staff has not yet worked with the technology to see what is possible, but they will do so, and the video streaming will align with the implementation of Granicus in May.

Mr. Boyd asked if there will be a way to test drive this before putting in the up-front costs. Ms. Catlin said that they can bring the cameras in to see what the placement will be and what kind of visual they will get from that, and she has sent around links from other communities that already use this system.

Mr. Boyd said that his concern is that once they commit to this, they are committed because of the up-front costs of \$8,000 and the annual cost of \$12,000.

Ms. Dittmar stated that if the citizens feel it is confusing, or the Board thinks it is terrible, they will have lost the up-front costs but can terminate the annual contract.

Mr. Foley said the issue for staff is, if the Board were to support proceeding with this, staff may not be able to do all of the implementation before it is decided. He stated that staff has shown a lot of information about this being the standard for localities, and while it may not be perfect at first, they can make some adjustments along the way. Mr. Foley said what staff is looking for at this point is direction on costs to proceed, and if they need more information staff can bring it back – but it will be hard to be in the middle of it and then decide.

Ms. Dittmar said when they voted for it in December, it failed on a 3-3 tie, and she wonders if anyone has changed their minds about it.

Ms. Mallek stated that she has become more appreciative of the idea, and will vote in favor of it this time.

Ms. Palmer **moved** to proceed with the purchasing of the video streaming software package and implementation, as proposed by staff, with the addition of the \$2,000 for the computer. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No.11. Transfer Station Location – Ivy MUC.

11a. Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee – Revised Charge and Request for Consultant Services.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that at its April 2, 2014 meeting, the Board established the Albemarle County Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee (the "Committee"). At its July 2, 2014 meeting, the Board approved the formal Charge of the Committee as recommended by the appointed members of the Committee. Since then, the Committee has been moving forward with its work plan, including the development and initial implementation of a Public Engagement Plan and consideration of what technical support will be needed to assist the Committee as it works to complete its Charge. Citizen Engagement: Successfully engage citizens so that local government reflects their values and aspirations.

The Committee is requesting that the Board consider amending the Committee's Charge to clarify specifically that an outcome of the Committee work will be to recommend "policy and implementation strategies" rather than a "process for developing solid waste policy." In the Committee's view, this change in its Charge is consistent with its actual work to date and in line with what it believes to be the primary interest of the Board. A red-lined version of the proposed revised Charge is included as Attachment A.

The Committee has also considered fully the need for technical assistance to support its work as it strives to address its Charge. Although the original plan was for the Committee, with technical assistance, to conduct a comprehensive study of solid waste options similar to the study performed for the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) in 2007-2008, the Committee has recently concluded that it believes adequate technical information is available in the 2008 RSWA study and subsequent studies performed for the County in 2012 and 2014. However, the Committee believes that it would benefit from professional facilitation in reaching a consensus regarding long term solid waste goals and identifying viable options available to the Board to achieve those goals. At its most recent meeting on January 13th, the Committee decided to request the Board to consider authorizing a scope of work for facilitation services with the understanding that if some limited, targeted technical assistance is needed later by the Committee, it would seek support from the Board for those services at that time. A draft Request for Information (RFI) to procure those requested services is included as Attachment B.

It is estimated that professional facilitation services requested by the Committee would cost between \$5,000 and \$10,000. If approved, funding for this project would come from the Ivy Landfill Remediation project in the Capital Program Fund.

On behalf of the Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee, staff recommends that the Board:

1. Approve a revised Charge Statement, Membership, and Organization as requested specifically by the Committee; and
2. Approve the Scope of Work for facilitation services as requested specifically by the Committee.

Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, addressed the Board, stating that staff is asking for Board consideration and action on three items, with the first two related to the activity of the Albemarle County Long-Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee. Mr. Walker said the committee have been working actively over the past several months, including a public engagement plan – which the Board has since endorsed – and has asked that the Board consider a change to the committee's charter, as presented in their packets. He stated that the change would principally amend the charter to clarify that the outcome of the committee's work would be to recommend policy and implementation strategies rather than a process for developing a solid waste policy, with the thought being they are actively engaged now through their public engagement plan. Mr. Walker said the committee feels that the Board's interest is more aligned with their recommendation of alternative policy strategies, so that is the basis of their recommendation, so staff does recommend that the Board approve that request. Mr. Walker said the committee's second recommendation is to have the Board revise the scope of work for consulting services. At this point, the committee believes that much information has already been available, so they would instead prefer the use of a facilitator to help identify problem statements, translate that into goal statements, and develop solutions and alternatives as part of their recommendation to the Board. He stated this is much more cost effective, and since some technical assistance will be needed in the future, this will better serve their need to get the committee in a better position to have a final report for the Board this summer. Mr. Walker said that staff would recommend the Board approve the scope of services put forward, and take separate action on each of the two proposed items.

Mr. Boyd asked how much has been spent on this project thus far. Mr. Walker said that there are two separate projects – the near term related to the Ivy MUC, with support for Draper Aden, which is separate from the work of the advisory committee, which has only had staff support to date. He clarified that the County has spent money in the review of the Ivy transfer station, and is currently spending money on Draper Aden regarding the Ivy transfer station issue.

Mr. Foley said that the committee's request is totally unrelated to the transfer station work.

Mr. Boyd stated that the committee is doing all the work, but the County does have consultants and expenses involved with this.

Mr. Walker said it has been challenging to keep the two parallel tracts apart – the long-term evaluation of solid waste solutions and the near term issue of Ivy and the transfer station and the expiring deadline for the consent order and letter of agreement. He said while those have tracked similarly, they are trying to be kept separate as processes.

Ms. Palmer stated that one of the reasons why the committee was involved in the Draper Aden GVB study was because she had asked for the special meeting, and asked because she had wanted to get feedback from that committee, and also wanted to keep them informed as to what the County is thinking about for Ivy so they can better do their long-term planning.

Mr. Boyd said that his point is that it was very difficult to separate these two, because the short-term solution would also be part of the long-term solution.

Ms. Palmer stated it is difficult for the committee as well, and she has asked for these two items to be taken from the consent agenda just to provide an update on what is going on with the committee.

Mr. Foley said the main difference on cost is that staff had anticipated much more technical assistance than the committee feels is necessary, because so much work has been done before – even by Rivanna. He stated the scope of work done is very narrow in terms of facilitation, to help the committee bring forth some good solid recommendations – and that work likely will have had to be done anyway, even if there was not a committee, just to evaluate options. Mr. Foley said staff does agree with the committee's recommended approval on both of these items, and they will likely save money over what was expected when the committee was approved.

Ms. Palmer **moved** to approve the revised Charge Statement, Membership and Organization, as requested specifically by the Long-Term Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

Ms. Palmer then **moved** to approve the Scope of Work for facilitation services as requested specifically by the Committee. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

Mr. Boyd asked if this was a reduction in the cost as initially estimated. Ms. Palmer confirmed that it was.

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

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE

Charge Statement, Membership, and Organization ALBEMARLE COUNTY LONG RANGE SOLID WASTE SOLUTIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Established April 2, 2014

Charge

The Albemarle County Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee is formed by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors to study solid waste management as a public policy issue and to identify best practices for the management of solid waste in the County now and in the future including the possibility of regional cooperation. The Committee will recommend policy and implementation strategies consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan and the organizational vision of Albemarle County.

This committee's work and recommendations will include public engagement in determining goals and strategies based on the best currently available data. It is not within the committee's charge to evaluate existing disposal practices at the Ivy MUC but to more fully investigate waste management practices that might impact the development of future waste management infrastructure for the County as a whole.

The advisory committee shall work directly with the County's project team including staff and any consultants. Its work shall be coordinated with the County's overall efforts to improve solid waste services and maintain compliance with state and federal regulatory mandates.

General Timeframe

The Advisory Committee will conclude its work when a final recommendation is made to the Board of Supervisors no later than October 30, 2015 in order to be included in the County's Five Year Plan. The Committee shall provide periodic updates to the Board on the progress of their work as appropriate. The following are anticipated milestones for this work:

- July 2, 2014: Board approves formal Committee charge, goals, membership and organization structure
- July 9, 2014: Board appoints three additional members as identified on June 4th
- September 2014: Board considers additional appointments to expand committee membership
- October 2014: Board considers and endorses public engagement plan
- September-December 2014: Committee develops understanding of issues and possible recommendations
- January 2015-April 2015: Committee develops recommendations
- May-July 2015: Committee report completed
- August 2015: Committee report delivered to Board

Goals

Local Goals:

- Identify necessary data and compile facts on the regional waste management system, including market demand, facilities, services provided, and gaps in services or market failure.
- Document the participation of citizens, institutions and local industries in discussion of solid waste policy, and identify public engagement actions which are necessary to inform public decisions.
- Identify methods to incorporate input from the community to advise the Board of Supervisors on solid waste practices.
- Develop working relationships with local government, citizen, institutional and industry resources to accomplish these recommended goals for the county.
- Define specific solid waste management objectives for the County government consistent with the public interest, the Board's strategic plan and the County Comprehensive Plan.
- Establish specific milestones, responsibilities, and performance indicators for meeting solid waste management objectives, noting the distinct roles of local government, state agencies, private industry, institutions, residents, and community groups.

Regional, State, and Federal Goals:

- Investigate regional, state and federal program involvement in waste reduction, market development and financial support and seek ways to incorporate the proven approaches to waste management of these governmental levels into the Albemarle County program if deemed appropriate.

- The defined objectives and milestones may include recommended changes to state and federal law or administrative procedure. The group will recommend linkages to existing advocacy coalitions for Board approval.

Membership

The committee shall consist of approximately twelve (12) voting members appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Appointments will be based on Board and staff recommendations, nominations from community and business groups and individual applications. The committee will initially be composed of the four duly authorized Albemarle County members of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Community Advisory Committee. Members may be added to this committee as its members or the Board of Supervisors sees fit, through the normal Board appointment process.

While the membership of this committee and RSWA Community Advisory Committee may overlap, the charge and scope of the groups differs, and the Albemarle County Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee will not investigate current facilities or management of the RSWA.

Membership Selection Criteria

The Long Term Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee will be composed, at a minimum, of the following representatives:

- The four duly authorized Albemarle County members of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Community Advisory Committee
- One member of the Board of Supervisors to serve as a liaison
- One member of the Planning Commission to serve as a liaison
- One representative from an environmental protection organization
- One representative from the small business community
- One representative from the solid waste commercial hauling industry
- One representative from the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission
- One representative from a rural area
- One representative from a major institutional employer
- One representative from the University of Virginia
- Two representatives from the general public

The Board of Supervisors will appoint members based on their qualifications and interest in serving on the Committee. An individual may be appointed to represent more than one of the above referenced groups. The Board will strive to appoint an overall membership that is diverse in age, abilities, experiences, professions, interests, etc.

Member qualifications include:

- Experience working within a consensus-driven decision-making process, and a commitment to such a process in fulfilling the Committee's responsibilities as outlined in the charge statement;
- Willingness to work within established County procedures and processes;
- Ability to be open-minded; to listen and be respectful of the values, views and opinions of other representatives;
- Ability to share information with, and receive information from the community at large;
- Ability to meet twice a month and possibly more often over the next year; and
- Being a resident of Albemarle County (while every effort should be made to include County residents, this may not be appropriate in all cases)

Advisory Committee Organization

The Committee shall elect a Chair and Vice-chair. County staff and any consultant team shall serve as technical representatives and will support the group by assembling and compiling all information and reports necessary for the Committee's work to progress, including meeting notes.

Meetings will be held approximately twice a month or as otherwise agreed to by the Committee. The date and time of Committee meetings shall be established at the first meeting; additional meetings may be called by the Chair. All meetings will be open work sessions, where the general public is invited to attend to listen and observe, unless public participation is deemed appropriate by the Chair. Active participation will be extended to the general public at open houses, workshops, and public hearings, per the public participation to be established by the committee. In addition to the Advisory Committee, the project will include a public engagement program for the public at large to include active participation at open houses, workshops, and other appropriate venues, per the public participation to be established by the committee.

No quorum shall be necessary to conduct business, but no vote will be taken unless a quorum is present. A majority of the voting members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. Decisions shall be made, if possible, by an indication of general consensus among the Committee members present. Staff (other than appointed members) will not participate as decision makers. When this method does not serve to establish a clear direction, the chair shall call for a roll-call vote. When an agreement cannot be achieved

on an issue, business shall proceed and County staff shall document and present minority positions for future Board of Supervisor consideration.

Facilitation will be provided in those instances when it is considered beneficial in helping the Committee achieve its stated purposes.

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE, VIRGINIA**

Consultant services to facilitate Solid Waste Advisory Committee

Purpose:

The County of Albemarle has issued this Request for Information (RFI) to solicit input, ideas, and recommendations from companies, consultants, and individuals with demonstrated expertise in facilitation of strategic planning for community advisory groups.

Background:

Albemarle County is interested in exploring facilitation services to support the Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee. The committee is charged to consider comprehensive alternatives for a solid waste management program for the County. Members strive to reach consensus concerning problem identification, goals, and recommended policy and implementation strategies consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan and the organizational vision of Albemarle County. We would like to understand your willingness and the resources you would require to facilitate the strategic planning and solutions process of the committee. While some of the exact details are still to be determined, we have tried to lay out the requirements below.

- **Resources:** The projected budget is \$5,000-\$10,000. Facilitation work would be completed by April 30, with additional time and materials costs to support the committee as needed.
- **Partners:** Roughly 10 citizen committee members and 5 relevant County staff.
- **Time:** 8-10 hours of meeting time, perhaps two half-day meetings held within a month, plus additional time for preparation and follow-up research work.
- **Venue:** conducive to strategic thinking. Options include Ivy Creek Education Building, Mudhouse smart room, Boar's Head conference room, or others. County staff can help arrange logistics.
- **Issue:** The policy and program issues of solid waste management in the county have been studied in detail over the past 25 years, and the committee has good data at its disposal. The facilitator will support discussion and decision making specific to problem statements, goal statements, and the preferred and alternative packages of solution.
- **Activities:** The facilitator should create an agenda of activities which help the committee reach consensus and which support critical thinking and problem solving.
- **Follow Up:** The Committee and County staff will use results to develop a final report and presentation material. Facilitator will not be expected to develop presentation materials, nor to attend or make presentations at public meetings. Notes and working papers will be retained by the County after facilitator compilation for use in drafting the final report.
 - Between the two meetings or after the second meeting, the committee may request technical information of the consultant to support the final report and inform the committee's work. Technical knowledge and capacity to complete this research is desirable in the consultant. Previous experience in solid waste or environmental work is desirable.
- **Key Points for Facilitation:**
 - *Problem Statements.* The current conditions in the solid waste system have been well documented. The committee should reach consensus on a set of problem statements. The problems should be ranked and prioritized.
 - *Goal Statements.* The problem statements may be interpreted to goals in multiple ways. The committee should also achieve consensus in reorienting the problems as goal for action by the County. Goals should be consistent with other County policies.
 - *Solution Alternatives.* Many actions are possible to reach the goals. These actions can be compiled into multiple packages for comparison. The committee should reach consensus as to perhaps 3 or 4 packages, which all make progress towards goals but which have varying levels of cost and complexity.
 - *Recommended Solution.* The committee's report should explain a recommended solution and the reasons why it is preferred over other viable alternatives. The committee should reach consensus on the recommendation and reasoning.

Requested Information:

The County would like recommendations for facilitating meetings of the committee, with activities designed to promote critical thinking and consensus. Outlines of the meeting agendas and activities for the committee will be especially valuable.

Please include information regarding your firm's experience with facilitation, strategic planning, and consulting, resumes of personnel who will be assigned to this project, client lists including three references, and your proposed detailed approach to this complete this project.

Desired Outcome:

The desired outcome is for the committee to complete its report to the Board of Supervisors with a meaningful contribution to County policy. The consultant facilitator contributes to this outcome by helping the committee to reach consensus on problems, goals, and alternatives for solutions.

Submissions:

The County requests that interested companies, consultants and persons with expertise in the areas outline in this RFI submit information regarding creative ideas, recommended approaches, strategies, advice and the like. The County seeks input in any form deemed appropriate by the respondent, including but not limited to white papers, lessons learned, etc.

Timeline:

Responses to this RFI are due by 3:00 p.m. on February 20, 2015. One (1) original and three (3) copies will be required. Responses and all communications regarding this RFI should be submitted to:

Kelly J. Okken
County of Albemarle
Purchasing Department
401 McIntire Road, Room 248
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Questions:

Questions with regard to this RFI can be sent to the attention of:

Kelly Okken, Purchasing Agent
Email: kokken@albemarle.org

Disclaimer:

Please be advised that this is a request for information only. This RFI is issued solely for information and planning purposes – it does not constitute a request for proposal or a promise to issue an RFP in the future.

This RFI does not commit the County of Albemarle, Virginia (the "County") to contract for any supply or service whatsoever. Furthermore, the County is not at this time seeking proposals and will not accept unsolicited proposals. Parties responding are advised that the County will not pay for any information or administrative costs incurred in response to this RFI; all costs associated with responding to this RFI will be solely at the interested party's expense. Not responding to this RFI does not preclude participation in any future RFP, if any is issued. Any materials submitted in response to this RFI shall be the sole property of the County of Albemarle.

11b. Transfer Station Location Other than Ivy MUC - Evaluation of Costs and Other Relevant Factors.

The executive summary forwarded to the Board states that during the past year, the Board has supported the evaluation of both near term options regarding the current transfer station facilities and operation at the Ivy MUC and long term solid waste solutions for the County generally. To facilitate long term solutions, the Board appointed the Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee and charged it with recommending a process for solid waste policy consideration. The Committee is requesting a change to its Charge to recommend policy and implementation strategies rather than a process for developing policy. The Committee's request is being presented to the Board as a separate executive summary on February 4, 2015. In either case, the Charge precludes the Committee's focus on near term issues at the Ivy MUC in deference to the more immediate need for the Board, in partnership with the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA), to resolve Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ) compliance issues with the Ivy MUC transfer station.

At its meeting on August 6, 2014, the Board determined that it would not pursue County control of transfer station operations at the Ivy MUC at this time, but left open the option to either work with RSWA to close the transfer station and revert the facility to a convenience center or to work with RSWA to bring the transfer station into compliance with VDEQ regulations.

At its meeting on October 8, 2014, the Board approved retaining Draper Aden Associates (DAA) and Gershman Brickner and Bratton (GBB) to address two specific questions: 1) is the Ivy MUC location an economical place for an upgraded transfer station; and 2) what are the primary factors influencing the determination of economic viability for this location.

At its meeting on December 3, 2014, the Board received the DAA report regarding the viability of a transfer station at the Ivy MUC and deferred action until December 10th in order to receive and consider additional information. At its meeting on December 10, 2014, the Board authorized staff to enter into a contract with DAA to:

- A - Conduct a high level evaluation and comparison of possible collection and transport system alternatives, including a transfer station at Ivy, with an estimate of capital and operating costs, for consideration by the Board of Supervisors no later than March, 2015.

This evaluation will include a review of previous studies conducted by the RSWA and the County; and

- B - As a part of the comparison of possible collection and transport system alternatives, immediately begin a detailed analysis of the Ivy MUC site specific to the construction of a new transfer station on one or more suitable locations on the property. Analysis will include an environmental assessment to determine site suitability and more detailed cost estimates for design, construction, and operations.

At its meeting on January 7, 2014, the Board clarified one aspect of the December 10th action, stating its interest in determining whether or not it should consider further a transfer station facility at any location in the County other than the Ivy MUC at this time and requested staff to bring information to the Board at its February 4th meeting to assist the Board in making this decision.

An additional analysis of transfer station site(s) at the Ivy MUC is currently scheduled for presentation to the Board at its meeting on March 11, 2015.

To address the matter identified by the Board, staff engaged DAA to review information already prepared and presented in 2008 and in 2014 and to assess cost and other factors relevant to construction and operation of a transfer station at a location in the County other than the Ivy MUC. The resulting evaluation and letter report is included as Attachment A. While the assumptions used in each study were distinct because the analyses were performed for different reasons, the conclusions reached regarding costs are meaningful in context, especially the 2008 information, when adjusted for inflation. Moreover, the relevant factors other than cost associated with siting, building and operating a transfer station anywhere in the County are much the same.

In summary, an evaluation of the ramifications of building and operating a transfer station at a location in the County other than the Ivy MUC highlights the many significant issues in addition to cost that will need to be addressed and resolved by the Board as part of any decision to proceed in this way. These issues include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Identification and purchase of suitable property
- Impact to adjacent and nearby property owners
- Zoning requirements
- Environmental concerns, i.e. surface and ground water protection
- Permitting requirements including public participation
- Competition from and with current and future private businesses

Further, as indicated in the recent DAA/GBB report dated November 17, 2014 (Attachment B), it is unreasonable to assume in the current market that the County (or RSWA) will be able to build and operate a transfer station that does not require on-going General Fund subsidy unless the County institutes some type of regulatory measure such as flow control to direct the volume of material to the facility. Even in that case, it is uncertain if economies of scale and operational efficiency would be enough to support a facility able to rely only on fee revenue to cover costs.

There is no identified budget impact at this time. Ultimately, final decisions by the Board to pursue specific short term and long term solid waste management solutions will have financial implications that will need to be considered as part of the decision-making process.

This matter was requested by the Board in order to clarify whether the Board, given the factors identified, desires to pursue consideration of a transfer station at any location in the County other than the Ivy MUC at this time. In doing so, it is understood that, unless otherwise directed by the Board, such a determination is not intended to preclude the Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee from considering long range solutions that may include publicly owned materials management facilities such as transfer stations and/or convenience centers.

Mr. Walker said this particular item was a follow-up from last month's Board meeting whereby they had requested a clarification as to whether or not to consider alternative locations in the County for a transfer station other than at Ivy. He said in response to that staff – working with a consultant – had provided information identifying the many relevant factors, cost and otherwise, that would have to be considered with any transfer station, particularly those outside of Ivy. Mr. Walker said staff would recommend that if the Board is inclined to support the information provided, they should direct staff to focus only on a transfer station at Ivy at this time.

Ms. Palmer noted that this was related to the request she had made at the last meeting, because she really did not want to spend money at this point in time in developing a scope and alternatives to look at other sites at this time. She said she did not think they were in a position to be seeking out buying property in another area of the community and building another transfer station, given what is going on in the private sector, their budget level, and the time commitment. Ms. Palmer said that it seemed to be more reasonable to keep the station at Ivy, and staff has done an excellent job in clarifying that in the language presented: "In doing so, it is understood that unless otherwise directed by the Board, such a determination is not intended to preclude the Long-Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee from considering long-range solutions that may include publicly owned materials management facilities such as a transfer station, or convenience centers somewhere else at some point in time.

Ms. Dittmar asked if they had to have this on radar at all times, as the committee may be looking at facilities in other areas.

Mr. Foley said they are doing an immediate future analysis, but the committee is still looking at long-term possibilities. He said that the committee's report is due in August.

Ms. Mallek clarified that the language is aimed at staff, directing them not to go out and look for places on light industrial land in the urban ring in which to put this – but in 25 years, all bets are off, and that is what the clarification is.

Ms. Palmer said one of the problems is that you must respond to growth and the private industry, and there are other communities that are considering their options, such as the northern part of the County.

Ms. Dittmar said this was about a committee that has a charge to be finished and needs to make some decisions by fall, and the question is whether to include the language referencing the long-term outlook.

Mr. Walker responded that the challenge is the issue related to the Ivy MUC was tied into what to do with the transfer station that was coming out of compliance, and those considerations of that issue are tied to that point, which is for the Board to make and then advise Rivanna. He said the question for the Board was how much they want to direct consideration of the advisory committee as they look at the long term, and he believes that the committee will respect any position on the Board about what they should or should not consider. Mr. Walker said the intent was simply to not tie their hands with regard to other options, while they focus on the Ivy facility only.

Ms. Palmer stated that one of the things they have been talking about is trying to figure out how recycling is going to work, how convenience centers are going to work, and whether they should even be close to the development areas. She said that communities around Albemarle have six to 10 convenience centers that function as collection centers, and what the County is trying to do is not tie the committee down with respect to a transfer station. Ms. Palmer said they are trying to leave the door open for the "what ifs," although obviously the County does not have the money to launch a big transfer station with flow control next year.

Ms. Mallek said that the recommendation may include a long-term strategy to re-evaluate this, at more of a Comp Plan kind of level, but that is separate from the short-term solution.

Mr. Foley clarified that there are two processes happening right now: Draper Aden is doing an evaluation of various alternatives, for the most near-term future, and this action would limit their review in spending on things that are on the Ivy site. He said that there is another process going on, and that is the charge of a committee to evaluate long-term options, and this would not preclude them in that separate process from coming back to the Board with a set of recommendations that might say to look at a transfer station for the future – but they would not spend any money with Draper Aden now to look at that process. He said that the language does provide for a transfer station in the future as part of long-term recommendations.

Ms. Palmer stated that they are also looking at long-term regional cooperation.

Ms. Dittmar said her only concern is that it says to look at Ivy only, but also to look at everything else – and to her it was confusing. She stated she is looking forward to the committee's report in the fall.

Ms. Mallek noted that the process includes tremendous public input throughout the project year, and that will set a different tone.

Mr. Walker clarified that the specific request tonight is in response to earlier action by the Board in directing the consultant to do some more intensive work, so they will not be bringing forward information about specific sites. He said he understands the concern that the language might be signaling to the advisory committee that they can choose their own direction despite what the Board might be supporting.

Ms. Palmer **moved** not to pursue consideration of a transfer station at any location in the County other than the Ivy MUC at this time. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No.12. Biannual Update on FY15-17 Strategic Plan.

The executive summary forwarded to the Board states that the Board of Supervisors has formally engaged in the County's strategic planning efforts since 2001. The Board provided direction and guidance for the development of the FY15-17 Strategic Plan during a retreat held on June 10, 2014. After additional discussion at subsequent Board meetings, the Board gave final approval of eight goals and associated Year One Priorities at its October 1, 2014 meeting.

During the first seven months of the Plan, staff has focused on accomplishing Year One priorities. Attachment A highlights the progress that has been made towards those priorities. At an upcoming Board meeting, staff will seek feedback on proposed Year Two and Three priorities.

The objectives and strategies of the FY15-17 Strategic Plan are being tracked and managed on a regular basis. Reports are provided to the Board on a monthly basis through the County Executive's Monthly Report, with comprehensive updates provided biannually. The Board will receive its next formal biannual update on the Strategic Plan at the annual strategic planning retreat in late summer. As new strategic issues associated with the existing Strategic Plan are identified, staff will bring them to the Board's attention for consideration.

The Strategic Plan provides direction for the County's Five-Year Financial Plan and annual budget processes.

Staff recommends that Board members review the attached biannual update and provide any feedback or comment during the meeting that you feel is appropriate.

Ms. Louise Wyatt, Organizational Development Manager, addressed the Board, stating that she will provide a brief update on the County's strategic plan and progress made in the past year. Ms. Wyatt said the Board had met the previous June to articulate its priorities, and at that time the Board worked to establish eight goals for the FY15-17 strategic plan. In October, she said, the Board had approved a series of year one priorities also. Ms. Wyatt stated that Attachment A includes the highlights of the progress made towards those priorities, which include the citizen engagement goal and restructuring of the County Executive's office to improve support for elected officials and coordination of ombudsman activities; in December there was a work session on community engagement and communications strategies; there has been a lot of time spent around critical infrastructure, and those objectives included the near-term and long-term work toward solid waste. She said that regarding the courts operations, December concluded joint meetings to establish some direction there. Ms. Wyatt said that the goals around development and rural areas were review of the Comprehensive Plan, which is on schedule to be completed in a few months. She stated that regarding the goal of economic prosperity, the major objective for this year is to establish a fully functioning economic development office, and they are very close to doing that – now in the final stages of hiring a director for that office. Ms. Wyatt said that regarding the goal of educational opportunities, they have been working with the school system, especially for the five-year plan, to get input as they look at some funding strategies. She stated that the Board also had heard from Kathy Ralston regarding preschool work, and there are multiple groups working on that as well, with a report from the short-term work group coming before them in March.

Mr. Boyd asked if the School Board has included any money in their budget for early education.

Mr. Foley said that they have not reduced funding, so they have not change the level of service.

Ms. Wyatt said the goal related to natural resources has included the establishment of the water resources funding advisory committee, which has been moving along. Regarding operational capacity, there has been a lot of discussion around the Board's emphasis on transportation priorities, with a transportation planner position approved in November. She reported that staff will be bringing some draft year two and three priorities to the Board for consideration next month, and in the County Executive's monthly report there are updates on each of these projects, and she will not present again until their annual retreat later in the summer.

Ms. Dittmar asked whether this would be refreshed every few years or whether it will be done annually. Ms. Wyatt said staff will recommend having an annual retreat, which is what they have done traditionally, and they will look at the environment, the strategic plan, and what new goals or objectives need to be revised.

Mr. Foley said the intention is not to develop a new strategic plan every year at this retreat, as it is a plan that has a three to five-year timeline, and there are broad goals within. He stated as they complete objectives and new strategic issues emerge within those goals, it would make sense not to talk about them. Mr. Foley said if something major were to change, that would be one thing – but they will not take a full step back except every three to five years, with the annual review just serving as a check-in point.

Ms. Dittmar asked when they might come back and look at dates or formats for the annual retreat. Mr. Foley said it will be within the next few months at the latest, and perhaps August/September will be a good time, as it offers enough time before the five-year plan.

Agenda Item No.13. Bi-Annual Citizen Surveys.

The executive summary forwarded to the Board states that between 2002 and 2011, the County contracted with UVA's Weldon Cooper Center for Survey Research to conduct a reliable and valid County-wide citizen survey biennially (every two years).

In 2011, the County switched to using the National Citizen Survey (NCS), which is conducted collaboratively between the National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). The switch offered two benefits: it allowed the County to significantly reduce costs – from approximately \$40,000 to the current amount of approximately \$13,000, and has

provided the opportunity for benchmarking with other jurisdictions across Virginia and the United States. Staff is able to benchmark with both the entire database of participating jurisdictions (approximately 500), and with a subset of jurisdictions from the database. The County used this tool in both 2011 and 2013 and was able to compare the County's survey results with those of select university communities and peer localities, such as James City County and Hanover County.

After the completion of the 2013 survey, the Board expressed interest in learning more about the various survey options available prior to the start of the 2015 survey work.

The purpose of conducting these citizen surveys is to 1) determine residents' opinions about quality of life in the County, 2) evaluate the importance and relative satisfaction of various County services and programs, 3) identify strategic planning priorities and 4) provide key performance data. By conducting these surveys on a regular basis, comparisons can be made over time to determine trends and identify community priorities. These surveys provide data for budgeting, land use planning, County performance on key goals, community engagement materials, and customer service initiatives, as well as the County's on-going strategic planning process.

To conduct the biennial citizen survey in May in keeping with past practice, staff must commit to a survey tool by March 1st. The table below provides a comparison of the two best options to conduct a comprehensive citizen survey:

	UVA's Weldon Cooper Center for Research	ICMA National Citizen Survey (NCS)
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions are fully customizable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows extensive benchmarking • Significantly lower cost • Allows up to 5 customized questions
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited benchmarking • Costly • Requires significant staff time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited customization possible
Margin of error	+/- 3.8%	+/- 5%
Cost	~\$40,000	~\$13,000

Results from the 2013 ICMA survey (Attachment A) and the 2008 UVA Weldon Cooper survey (Attachment B) are provided as examples of what these two surveys look like.

Beyond these two options, the County also, at any time, has the option to include questions in the UVA Center for Survey Research's "Jefferson Area Community Survey" (JACS). This regional recurrent "omnibus" survey is a relatively inexpensive survey (~\$1,700 for the first question, ~\$625 for each subsequent question) that typically is conducted every 6-9 months as a way for government agencies, non-profit groups, and researchers in the greater Charlottesville-Albemarle region to ask one or more questions on a community survey. While this survey data may not offer the same insight on changing opinions over time or the ability to benchmark with other localities, it can provide a snapshot in time on important issues of interest to the Board that may not be covered in the more comprehensive biennial survey.

The County has \$12,300 budgeted to conduct a citizen survey in FY15. Depending on Board direction regarding which survey tool(s) to use, staff may request additional funding.

Based on the ability to do extensive benchmarking at a lower cost (in terms of both dollars and staff time), staff recommends that the Board endorse the County's use of the ICMA National Citizen Survey and the supplemental use of the regional JACS survey if additional custom questions are desired. At this time, staff also seeks preliminary Board direction regarding what topics the Board might want to be addressed by customized questions.

Ms. Wyatt reported that the County has been conducting citizen surveys for over a decade now to determine residents' opinions about quality of life, to get information about how important they feel certain services are, and to get satisfaction data – all of which is used in budgeting and strategic planning, among other ways. She stated that after completion of the 2013 Citizen Survey, the Board expressed an interest in learning about the various survey tool options. Ms. Wyatt said in the executive summary, she has included a table that describes the two best known comprehensive citizen survey options. She stated that the first option is the UVA Weldon Cooper survey option, which the County has used several times from 2000-2011, with the significant advantage being that it is a fully customizable survey that can include very Albemarle-specific questions. Ms. Wyatt said the drawback of that is it makes it difficult, if not impossible, to benchmark with other places; because it is fully customizable, it tends to be a longer process; and it is significantly more costly in terms of dollar amount and staff time to draft those questions. She stated that the margin of error for both surveys is about the same, with expanding the sample size reducing the margin of error but also having a higher associated cost. Ms. Wyatt said for the ICMA/NCS survey, the major advantage is that more than 500 jurisdictions participate in that, and as a result they are able to do extensive benchmarking with similar communities. She stated that the converse of that is there are more canned questions, which allows for better benchmarking but is not Albemarle County-specific, although there is the option of adding up to five customized questions. Ms. Wyatt said she had provided samples of the survey questions in the Board packets, and said that the County had included five custom questions in their last survey. She stated there is a supplemental tool, the Jefferson

Area Community Survey (JACS), which is essentially a community survey, done by Weldon Cooper for which they can buy individual questions. Ms. Wyatt said those are done every six to nine months, and they have the ability to put questions on that as well.

Ms. Mallek stated that when local organizations have used that, it has not been restricted to Albemarle at all, which completely obfuscated the result because of participation from residents of Louisa and Fluvanna, etc.

Mr. Foley said staff will need to clarify that, as he is not sure that is entirely correct.

Ms. Wyatt said her understanding is that if they request JACS, they can just survey Albemarle residents, but would need to know that.

Ms. Palmer stated that the surveyors use phone numbers and cell phones with 434- calling prefix, and make sure they are dropping people that are not from the area.

Ms. Mallek said the surveys are a fascinating half-hour, and her household had only been called once in 40 years – and that is why the information is so good, as the meaningfulness of the Weldon Cooper approach is much greater, in her esteem.

Ms. Dittmar asked if there are professionals to help frame the questions. Ms. Wyatt responded there are.

Mr. Boyd said it is not an easy process with the Weldon Cooper Center surveys, because Board members have differing opinions as to what to include.

Ms. Dittmar asked how it had been handled in the past. Mr. Boyd responded that they met with Ms. Catlin and Ms. Wyatt, who made the final decision.

Mr. Foley said that Lori Allshouse also spent significant time developing the questions, and that staff understands the desire to get Albemarle-specific questions answered. He stated the question was whether to retain the ICMA, which gave them valuable benchmarking with other localities, but also to have the opportunity to ask 10, 20 and even 30 additional questions through the other method, which they would have to craft. Mr. Foley said they could do that, and realize a cost of approximately \$30,000 instead of \$40,000; if they do the \$40,000, it will be fully customized and they will have to do that on everything, which means they will not have benchmarking data. He reiterated that staff understands the desire to have customized questions, but also that benchmarking is important for them.

Ms. Palmer said her understanding is that they can get the benchmark, by putting the questions in that they want and then calling up the NCS, which keeps all the data. She stated that if they have specific ones they want to have benchmarked, they will put those in the Weldon Cooper survey and have them include them in the call – for a fee.

Ms. Mallek said that a good place to start will be the existing list of questions that have been asked for many years, but her hunch is that many of those are already benchmarkable.

Mr. Boyd stated he feel staff's proposal was pretty reasonable, because it provided the best of both worlds – the benchmark and some customized questions – and then the Board can decide on how many questions they want to have.

Mr. Foley clarified that for \$10,000 less than the \$40,000, they can have 36 questions – and they get five for free with ICMA, \$1,700 for the first question, then \$625 after that. He said this meant they can get about 36 questions beyond the benchmarking data, which only costs about \$13,000.

Ms. Palmer asked if they would do a separate JACS, because they were doing phone calls and the NCS was doing mailings.

Ms. Wyatt said staff's recommendation would be to use them in conjunction with one another, so doing the Citizen Survey to get the ability to benchmark, and adding the custom questions the JACS survey.

Ms. Palmer said that her concern in looking through some of the questions on the National Citizens Survey, a lot of them seemed useless.

Ms. Mallek said a lot of the questions are not appropriate to the area – such as those related to having a subway or a bus.

Mr. Foley said that is the tradeoff with using a national survey, but the majority of them are very pertinent.

Ms. Palmer stated that the solid waste questions were of no value to the County at this point, which is her concern, going forward.

Ms. Dittmar said it seems that two Supervisors are interested in tailoring the questions to specific Albemarle needs, with benchmarking being less important.

Ms. Mallek stated they have a lot of other ways to benchmark, and what is important to her is what her constituents think – not how it compares to what people in Hanover think.

Ms. Palmer said that she would like to know the cost for including specific benchmark questions, how many there are, and how much it will cost to purchase the criteria from the NCS.

Mr. Foley said there is no doubt they can come up with benchmark questions that are valuable and put them into the Weldon Cooper survey.

Ms. Dittmar said the question seems to be whether they want to spend or save \$10,000, and whether it is worth the additional investment and staff time to include the customized questions.

Mr. Foley stated that the County had been doing the ICMA for a number of years and have a track of information that is comparable.

Ms. Mallek said they had only done two ICMA surveys, with four surveys before that from the Weldon Cooper Center.

Mr. Boyd noted that the Weldon Cooper data was inconsistent, and they were not tracking the same questions every time.

Mr. Foley said they could design the Weldon Cooper survey any way they wanted, and could use benchmark questions and so forth – and the additional cost in staff time will be a factor. He stated that the idea with that will be 36 customized questions, at about \$10,000.

Ms. McKeel said that she kind of wants it all, and sees the value in benchmarking but does not want to enter into a survey that allows another community to overwhelm Albemarle, and she is concerned that the survey focus on local residents. She stated that while \$10,000 is a significant amount of money, she is not willing to spend less money on something and not get a result they can really use.

Mr. Boyd stated that staff's proposal resolves the issues, as it allows the County to save \$10,000 and also have up to 37 unique questions, along with the benchmarking.

Mr. Foley said he included the \$10,000 savings as a quick calculation, and \$40,000 will allow for 56 customized questions. He stated that if they spent \$40,000, they can also use Weldon Cooper and put the benchmark questions there and have everything come up customized.

Ms. Palmer stated they are facing challenging budget times, and she wants to ensure that they are spending their money on the things they are supposed to be spending money on.

Ms. Mallek said that the detail of the Weldon Cooper survey questions allows them to go beyond the general questions such as, "How important is clean water and clean air?" and ask, "Do you want to spend tax dollars to improve the situation?" She stated that this is a much more direct question than they will get with the universal one, which is something they can meaningfully use in looking at budget items. Ms. Mallek added that she is slightly alarmed at the exclusion of people who do not have an opinion about a specific item, because that drastically changed the numbers. She said she would like to see that information without having to go to an appendix buried in the document.

Mr. Sheffield stated that his only addition to the conversation is to consider the outcome they are looking for – because one will just provide them a measurement. If they consistently ask the same questions every year, it will be a measure of how well they are doing with that direction; whereas asking more unique questions is taking the pulse of the community and figuring out where they need to go.

Mr. Foley said staff's recommendation attempts to take the best of both of those.

Ms. Palmer said that they can customize the questions to ensure they are measuring the pulse.

Mr. Sheffield said that asking different questions every year takes them away from benchmarking.

Ms. Mallek said that has not really been the case.

Mr. Sheffield **moved** that the County proceed with the staff's recommendation to use the ICMA National Citizens Survey and the supplemental use of the regional JACS survey. Mr. Boyd **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: Ms. Mallek and Ms. Palmer.

Mr. Foley said staff will work with all Board members on customized questions to ensure they get at the things that are important to them.

Ms. McKeel commented that in several meetings, one of them being a joint meeting with the School Board, they suggested questions they felt would be good for the survey, and she hopes that staff has tracked them.

Mr. Foley responded that staff certainly did keep track of those, and said they have also received a lot of input from the community during the five-year planning process.

Ms. Mallek said it is also important to carry forward the questions asked in the years of the Weldon Cooper surveys, to gain the benefit from those.

Ms. Palmer suggested that for the JACS survey, they should also be considering things they could ask that the City might want to know. She also asked how much it cost to get the data from NCS, if they decide to go back to the Weldon Cooper Center in future years.

Ms. Wyatt said she will have to look into that, and they said it will be relatively costly.

Recess. At 3:58 p.m., the Board recessed, and reconvened at 4:12 p.m.

Agenda Item No.14. Route 29 Solutions Update.

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, addressed the Board, stating that the Route 29/250 interchange – the Best Buy project – has been awarded, and construction will begin by the beginning of March. Mr. Graham said the advisory committee is meeting with Hillsdale neighbors to address concerns, and VDOT is assisting with right of way acquisition, with the City, hoping to have it completed by the end of the calendar year or beginning of next calendar year, with construction commencing once that is in place. He stated the notice of award has been given to the Rio Road/Route 29 and Berkmar project, with all three bundled into one contract, and it will be going to the Commonwealth Transportation Board later in February with a notice to proceed slated for March 4. Mr. Graham said VDOT is beginning to approach property owners about potential construction easements, and they have identified some with staff. He stated these easements will require removing some of the business signage that currently exists. They are working on some possible temporary sign solutions, as well as, answers for the businesses regarding permanent signs. Mr. Graham said there is now a drive-through simulated video that gives the perspective of driving a car through the Rio Road interchange from each direction. He stated it is on the Route 29 Solutions website and he will try to provide a more easily accessible link. He stated that there is ongoing discussion about VDOT signage, to assist businesses and drivers in getting around, and it will likely take a few more meetings before they get to the signage discussions.

Mr. Boyd asked when the utility relocation is going to start. Mr. Graham said it will probably start in the second half of this calendar year, and VDOT has to get it done in advance of any other work.

Mr. Joel DeNunzio, VDOT Resident Engineer, stated that the easements they are putting offers out for this week, are for the utilities. He also stated, part of the design-build plan was that VDOT would do 50% utility plans in anticipation that the contractor would take it over. Mr. DeNunzio stated the utility relocations should start sometime in May.

Ms. Mallek asked if any of the utilities can be buried. Mr. DeNunzio said the water and gas lines will all be buried, and some of the fiber will be above ground, some of it will be under ground.

Mr. Boyd asked if VDOT will be able to provide the total cost when they award the contract, because they have obviously already spent money surveying. Mr. DeNunzio responded that the preliminary engineering started with VDOT staff doing conceptual drawings, and that is part of that process. He said the contractor will take over after he receives notice to proceed, and will take what VDOT has done so far and refine the drawings to make final drawings. He noted that the proposal will be public as a “notice to proceed,” on March 4.

Mr. Graham said on the Route 29 Solutions website, for each separate project, the project cost and construction cost are provided, with the difference between the two being all the preliminary and engineering design and everything else that goes into the project.

Ms. Dittmar said she has noticed in the news release from VDOT that they are going into phase one with the synchronized lights.

Mr. DeNunzio said the signal upgrades from Hydraulic up to Rio Road are almost in place and should be online this month. While that will not be the adaptive system, they should still have much better control over actively monitoring signals and making changes to better manage traffic. He said the second phase will be online from Rio to Airport Road in June, with adaptive starting after the October date in 2017.

Item No.14a. Draft Communications Plan.

Ms. Catlin addressed the Board, stating in January when they discussed Route 29 Solutions communications, staff provided the “backward” look – what has happened in the past several months – and this is their opportunity to look forward so the Board has a sense of what will be coming in terms of the communication plan. She said this has been a great joint effort including the staffs of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, the City, the County and VDOT, who have been meeting together regularly to put this plan together. Ms. Catlin noted the milestone schedule presented to the

Board as part of the plan for each of the projects for the next several years, so they can see when things are happening for each of the projects. She said they used that to align with the communications plan, and that is a breakdown by quarter of 2015 along with the different communications strategies planned in that time period as they align with the construction milestones. Ms. Catlin said the plan also includes a very detailed media plan.

Mr. Boyd asked if the business assistance program is part of any of this. Ms. Dittmar and Mr. Foley said that is scheduled for March.

Mr. Lou Hatter, Route 29 Communications Manager, addressed the Board and stated that VDOT's focus on this in working with the County and the City and Planning District Commission as partners is that these projects will affect everyone who uses the Route 29 corridor in any way – in the Charlottesville community up to Northern Virginia, and as far south as Danville and southern Virginia. Mr. Hatter said that they are cognizant of having a plan that reaches everyone, and they are most concerned with now is what is going to be happening here in 2015. He stated it is important to note this is a draft plan, and there is no contractor on board yet, and they will present the design-build projects to the Commonwealth Transportation Board on February 18 with a recommendation for approval, but until the contract is awarded the three projects are not yet in the pipeline. Mr. Hatter stated they do have the Route 29/250 interchange project that has already gone to award, and the contractor will be starting out there the last week in February or first week in March. He said they have the adaptive signal technology already underway, which means some nighttime lane closures but thus far has not affected people too much and does not have the kind of visibility that will be seen once the 29/250 project goes to construction. Mr. Hatter said the first three pages of the project activities report lay out all three years of the projects, and this is a draft schedule so the contractor will come back to VDOT with a final schedule to be approved.

Mr. Hatter presented a list of the various communications activities they are looking at doing through 2015. They have it broken down into a number of different pieces, broad reach activities designed to reach the entire community, a paid advertising campaign, and targeted reach to various parts of the community, along with various support tactics they are planning to use throughout the construction. He stated the other two years drafted out are much more dependent on how the projects evolve and how VDOT gauges the results of the first phase of the advertising and communications efforts. Mr. Hatter said they are trying to be very flexible with this plan to accommodate shifts in communications focus as needed. He referenced a preliminary draft of the media plan advertising effort they will be doing through 2015 and into 2016, which utilizes a variety of media platforms, stating that this is in support of other communications activities being done by VDOT, the City, the County and the Planning District Commission. Mr. Hatter said there will be radio ads running throughout the year, some TV spots on both cable and the broadcast channels, print advertising in the newspapers, etc. He emphasized this will be a broad education effort to tell people what will be happening, to give them the information they need and encourage them to go to the website and use the various information sources available; to avail the information they will need on a daily basis so they can minimize the impacts of these construction projects as they are out and about on Route 29 and the associated roadways. Mr. Hatter said that is the key message they are getting out there, and they have a variety of platforms which will do that. He stated they are planning on doing some outdoor advertising with billboards for a month or so later in the spring, which will be seen by people several times a week or even every day. Entering 2016, he said, they get deeper into advertising and mix up the various platforms, as they enter the heavy construction phase of the 29 widening project and the Rio intersection project – to inform people of their options to manage their activities on and around 29.

Mr. Hatter stated he thought it might also be useful for the Board to see how all of the activities will be integrated, and the different ways the various advertising platforms has the opportunity to touch people's lives. He said they will be doing some social media and banner ads on Google searches, email, and gas pump toppers for people to read while they are pumping gas. Mr. Hatter stated the advertising will be coupled with news releases and other methods of disseminating information, adding that they want to talk to people about what is going on. He said it typically takes a person hearing something a number of times – four or five – to have something register, and VDOT wants to ensure that everyone out on Route 29 will hear the message and get the information.

Ms. Mallek asked how they will address the truck traffic, and whether there will be sign alerts ahead of time noting that there is construction ahead. Mr. Hatter said they are working with the trucking industry to get that message out, and a lot of truckers use satellite radio, so that is an effective way to communicate with truckers. He stated VDOT can target its news releases to Sirius, because then they do not have to worry about retuning the radio.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there is an inspection station on 29 North. Mr. Hatter said there is not, although there is a pull-off station in Warrenton where they do truck inspections, but it is not a permanent manned station.

Ms. Palmer said one of the frustrations expressed to her by constituents regarding the John Warner interchange, even though VDOT did not manage it, is that you can be going down Route 250 and do not have a place to get off before finding out there is a 20-minute backup. She asked if VDOT can use temporary signs to let people know that they are about to get to more serious problems.

Mr. Hatter said they will definitely have temporary signs advising of the construction ahead, and they will be working with GPS and navigation vendors to ensure that current traffic information is plugged in so they are aware of where construction zones were. He noted most of those applications now feed

information in real time about traffic conditions, so they do give people that information, and VDOT will have the temporary signs up as well.

Ms. Palmer said a lot of people do not have GPS capability, or do not use it when they are doing something they do every day.

Mr. Boyd stated this is a hugely unpopular project, at least the grade-separated interchange at Rio, and wants to make sure that Mr. Hatter is still around for that.

Ms. McKeel asked if this information is located somewhere else. Mr. Hatter said it is not posted yet, but he will make sure it is available.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there will be a graphic of a timeline available to the public. Mr. Hatter responded there will be, once there is something concrete and official from the contractor.

Ms. Mallek said she walked past a demonstration of a digital sign being looked at by the ARB and County staff, and the fact that the message can change every 15 seconds or so will really allow people to get good information – which may allow for fewer installations and more message. She asked if that is something that VDOT uses.

Mr. Hatter said VDOT is somewhat limited by regulations as far as what kind of information they can put on signs, and currently they have a multi-agency team that is working specifically on signing. He stated, as Mr. Graham mentioned, the advisory panel is working on that, and VDOT is working with the County and the “Tourist-Oriented Directional Signing Program,” which establishes directional signs – brown, green and blue – that are visible along roadways. Mr. Hatter said they are all working together to figure out the best way to sign both during construction, and the permanent signing after construction. He noted that representatives from the business community who serve on the advisory panel are helping to figure out the best way to manage signage in the construction areas.

Ms. Mallek said those are elements where the message will be changing, so they do not want to make a sign and put it up, and then have to replace it completely in a few days.

Mr. Hatter agreed, stating the fact there is construction and will be differences within the right of way and the area on the shoulders gives VDOT the opportunity to put something in during construction that would also be useful afterward, so they would not have to change it out.

Mr. Boyd said he has heard from constituents that getting information from VDOT has been very difficult and have had to file Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests to get it, they have indicated that it is very convoluted data. He asked if Mr. Hatter can tell him how to get the necessary information, and asked if there are radio-activated traffic counts that VDOT has that might help indicate the level of service. Mr. Boyd said the constituents feel that they are getting stonewalled.

Mr. Hatter stated he is not aware of any specific radio-generated information on the 29 corridor, but there are corridors in Virginia that are using cellphone data to track traffic speeds in order to get information on commuting data.

Mr. DeNunzio said what he is referring to is continuous count stations, which monitors traffic daily on 29, and those are used to compare short-term traffic counts so that data can be normalized. He stated that is a federal program that determines allocation of funding to localities in order to be consistent. He explained the data is used for vehicle miles traveled, for the allocations, and that continuous count data is monitored for time of year and conditions. They can use the data to get factors that can be applied to short-term counts. Mr. DeNunzio noted that the “tubes” that are placed on roads are rotated every three years, and those factors are applied based on when the count was taken so they can normalize the data and get the average yearly traffic. He said the daily count is not published, nor is it confidential data, and it is not taken at every intersection – only at certain points along the corridor, with the closest one to Charlottesville being on Airport Road on 29. Mr. DeNunzio noted that the information from summer and fall of 2014, which included 44 locations, is all public information – and people can contact him directly for that information.

Ms. Mallek asked if the continuous count data is designed to be used to extrapolate up and down the corridor, or for a particular snapshot window. Mr. DeNunzio said what is important about that data is to know that VDOT only counts a section every three years, and the two in-between years, they use historical data to project it and then count the third year again. He explained that every third year counted is when the data is compared to the continuous count station to get the time of year adjustment, and the in-between years is projection. Mr. DeNunzio said that VDOT started the program in 1997, and has counts every three years since then.

Item No. 14b. Small Area Plan for Route 29/Rio Road Intersection Improvements.

Ms. Dittmar stated there is a request to consider a motion proposed by a Board member, and that is incorporated into the agenda for later discussion, as there are a number of people anticipated to be attending in the evening. She said she has worked with VDOT and County staff to bring herself up to speed on Comp Plans, and asked Mr. Boyd to explain the nature of his concern.

Mr. Boyd said his concern is there is a groundswell of people who are not in favor of moving forward with the grade-separated interchange at Rio and 29, nor do they feel it is the cheapest and best solution to the problem. He stated there have been consultants who have reviewed the plan and said this is not a valid approach. Mr. Boyd said that Places 29 was a \$6 million project, and that plan would not have been approved without the grade-separated interchanges being moved out beyond 2017, and after a small area plan had been done for that area – particularly the Rio and Route 29 intersection. He stated the plan specifically states they were to maintain the at-grade intersection for as long as possible, and the information provided can be interpreted differently on both sides. Mr. Boyd said what he is proposing is to pause the project and do the small area study to make sure that this is the right thing, before moving ahead with the project. He stated that despite claims that the project has been studied for 20 years, it has not been, and this solutions package – which includes two very positive things – was put on the table in April 2014; up until then, there was a bypass in the picture. Mr. Boyd said the grade-separated interchange has been studied to the point they know it is the most economical and best use of tax dollars here, and he assumed that it was hatched in Richmond.

Ms. Dittmar asked if they can frame the discussion, because she thought his concern was that they had violated the Comp Plan, at least based on the tone of the emails she has received.

Mr. Boyd said that he had also included links in those emails, and the Places 29 listing of implementation projects references the second document to which he is referring, and states, “We should prolong the useful life of the current at-grade intersection at this particular intersection for as long as possible.”

Ms. Dittmar asked him to clarify that what he wants is to discuss what is in the Comp Plan. Mr. Boyd indicated that it is.

Ms. Dittmar asked Mr. Graham to come forward and state the context of this item in relation to the Comp Plan, and whether they are on track with the things they are supposed to be doing.

Mr. Graham said they did have this in the Comp Plan, and as far as Places 29 is concerned, it is important to recognize that the transportation network included therein came out of the US 29 North Corridor Transportation Study, and is actually an appendix to Places 29. He stated the study was done jointly with the Planning District Commission, the County, and VDOT, and was jointly funded by the latter two. Mr. Graham said it looked at a number of things, including solutions, and he clarified that the Planning District Commission included the MPO. He stated this was a starting point for Places 29 in terms of a transportation network, and it did identify all of the projects that have been discussed here. Mr. Graham said there were decisions on Places 29 regarding order and prioritization, and decisions were made, but it did not go so far as to actually specify that there had to be any particular order for these things. He stated that there was intent, but it was based on what they saw as the available funding at that time – and when the Federal Highway Administration stepped in and said the Western Bypass was not a viable option, VDOT was looking for what the viable options were and started this process.

Mr. Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning, addressed the Board, stating that the Board had passed Places 29 and had identified six intersections that might be subject to improvements – including the potential for interchanges. He said that it was decided that those sections would be reconsidered during the update of Places 29, with the focus of the first five years on “doable” projects, such as Berkmar, Hillsdale and other improvements that were not part of the 29/H250 study that had previously been done, and widening to six lanes on 29 north of the river. Mr. Cilimberg said that those projects were considered as possibilities for the first five years, and the intersections were deferred until the update of Places 29, and the reference to the Rio/29 interchange that came out in the project listings was for the context of that consideration of that intersection for improvements would be part of a small area plan. He stated that the context at the time was a much different funding scenario, and anticipation that a small area plan – looking at the larger combination of land use and transportation considerations in the 29/Rio area, which was identified as “midtown” in Places 29 and was a priority area in the Comp Plan, as well as being called a UDA under the state’s requirements for urban development areas. Mr. Cilimberg said that was back as a potential consideration under HB2, and the priority area identity was important as well.

He stated what was before them now was what was within the process that evolved after the determination that the bypass was not going to be a viable project from the FHWA, and there was a real context change. He explained that no longer were they working within the context of the identification of the interchange as part of the larger context of a small area plan with land use and an overall transportation network; they instead had the identification of \$200 million that had been slated for the Western Bypass now available for projects in the 29 corridor. Mr. Cilimberg said that a new process got underway that involved interests along the entire corridor, and there was a panel that looked at the various considerations for what could be done that might replace the bypass in serving this area, and the ultimate outcome of that was the panel’s decision on several different projects, including this intersection for an interchange. He stated the result of that was that the local MPO requested that project to be part of the Long-Range Transportation Plan; and the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB), in approving the 29 Solutions package last June, subsequently approved an amendment to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that reflected the interchange inclusion. Under the operation of the Comp Plan, he said, the decision to include this interchange and other projects in the Long-Range Transportation Plan became the local transportation plan. Mr. Cilimberg explained that what they had in Places 29 as guidance was, in effect, superseded by the decision to make the Long-Range Transportation Plan’s inclusion of this interchange part of the package of projects that would move forward. He said that from the standpoint of what the Comp Plan calls for, the Long-Range Transportation Plan is the lead document from a transportation projects standpoint.

Ms. Dittmar asked him to clarify that the Long-Range Transportation Plan is the guide for the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Cilimberg clarified that it is, with that decision, the overall Comp Plan's transportation plan. He said that decisions associated with the 29 Solutions package do not supersede the desire and the need to have a small area plan done for that area, but if the plan moves forward it would be with the inclusion of those things identified in the transportation plan for that area being studied. He stated that this is not any different from where they ended up once the Western Bypass was decided to be a Long-Range Transportation Plan project; as long as the bypass was in the transportation plan, it was in the Comp Plan even though that document did not specifically identify it.

Ms. Palmer stated that it took a while for the Western Bypass to get in the Comp Plan after it was approved by the Board.

Ms. Mallek said that it never got in, because they are redoing the Comp Plan now.

Ms. Palmer said that Mr. Cilimberg had stated that the Long-Range Transportation Plan had become the guide for the County's Comp Plan.

Mr. Cilimberg said that is because for many years, the County has reflected in its Comp Plan that the Long-Range Transportation Plan – as part of the MPO – was their transportation document. He said by state law, which was changed several years ago, they must say that the Comp Plan reflects projects and plans that were part of the state's transportation planning.

Mr. Davis said it was made state law five years ago.

Mr. Sheffield said the legislation stemmed from the same reason that there are projects approved by the state that are in conflict with the Comp Plan.

Mr. Boyd asked which document trumps the other. Mr. Cilimberg stated that the Long-Range Transportation Plan is the County's transportation plan.

Mr. Boyd said that he would take exception to the statement made that the panel had voted on this option, because the panel was not given a vote.

Ms. Palmer asked for clarification as to when the Long-Range Transportation Plan was adopted.

Mr. Cilimberg said the latest version was July 23, 2014.

Mr. Boyd stated that the Long-Range Transportation Plan has been on the table six months, it has not been studied for 20 years.

Mr. Cilimberg stated this version was the latest of many over the years.

Mr. Sheffield said they do a Long-Range Transportation Plan every five years or so now.

Mr. Cilimberg stated there is an update of the overall plan, and then there are amendments in intervening years.

Mr. Sheffield noted that a Long-Range Transportation Plan is required by the federal government, as part of the MPO.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that in 2000, the Citizens Advisory Council – which used to be called CHART and is now called CTAC – was brought to life because it had to be there in order to qualify for federal funds under FHWA. She stated for the entire eight years they met, it was to work on the Long-Range Plan 2025, and then the update that is now 2030, until something new happened. Ms. Mallek said that the process included extensive citizen outreach, with meetings held all over the community to get input from citizens.

Mr. Boyd asked when the 2025 plan was adopted.

Ms. Mallek said it was adopted in 2007.

Mr. Boyd said this meant it was a 5-10 year old document.

Ms. Mallek said it was a 20-year plan, so, of course, several years have passed.

Mr. Cilimberg said the current plan was the 2040 plan, and the Long-Range Transportation Plan was under review with the City and County comprehensive plans, and as it was under review and close to being adopted, the decision was made to remove the Western Bypass as a viable project. He stated the plan had originally been adopted with the bypass included, then there was an amendment made to remove it and replace it with the interchange.

Ms. Dittmar said there are a lot of people in the community who need to understand the roles of the Comp Plan and the Long-Range Transportation Plan, and the Board needs to determine whether or not the process is good. She said she only just learned that the federal government requires a Long-Range Transportation Plan, and the state – under Governor McDonnell – insisted that it be part of the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Mallek said the administration decided that it must be the overriding transportation document.

Mr. Cilimberg said the County must have its Comp Plan reviewed by VDOT in its development and adoption process to make sure that it is consistent with state transportation plans, and he cannot cite verbatim the language. He stated that many years earlier, the County had identified the Long-Range Transportation Plan in the Comp Plan as the transportation plan, for the MPO.

Ms. Dittmar stated it is important to know when each element was studied and how thoroughly.

Mr. Boyd said there has been a lot of talk about “misinformation,” and the first bullet on the document before them was misinformation. He stated he could show them a letter from Ms. Rizzo, Regional Director of the FHWA that refutes the statement that they killed the bypass; what they did was ask for a demonstration of the project’s purpose and need. Mr. Boyd said they could have chosen to do that, had the Governor chosen to, and simply stated the purpose and the need of the project. He added that the world was upside down, with him asking for further study and environmentalists asking for exclusion to do any kind of environmental impact study.

Ms. Palmer stated she needed to understand what the process is.

Mr. Chip Boyles of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission and the MPO addressed the Board, stating that the Long-Range Transportation Plan was amended and approved in July, and had previously been approved for the 2040 plan in May 2014, as required. He said the plan is required to be approved by the MPO for use of any federal funds for transportation, and that is the real reason for the Long-Range Transportation Plan – to be able to use federal dollars through the state for transportation. Mr. Boyles stated the projects that were within the plan approved in May and again in July covered a 20-year period, and some of them have been in there for a number of years. He said the Route 29 projects, including Rio and Hydraulic, have been in there since 2009 – and it was only approved for the most current plan in July 2014, but the projects have been in there for a number of years. Mr. Boyles said even with the letter and notice from the state that they would not be pursuing the bypass, the bypass is actually still in the Long-Range Transportation Plan because there is federal money being spent on selling the properties back to the original owners. He stated to spend money up front only to have it returned later, it still has to be in the plan.

Ms. Dittmar stated she has received emails from constituents that claimed the County is violating its code – in other words, law – and asked Mr. Cilimberg to explain what a Comp Plan is.

Mr. Cilimberg explained that the state requires localities to adopt and review every five years a Comp Plan, which is essentially guidance for how they see their future and how they want to address land use, transportation and other kinds of public facilities, human services, housing, etc. He said that it is not code, but can be reflected through code with vehicles such as the zoning ordinance, consistent with the Comp Plan’s land use recommendations, or subdivision ordinances, and can be implemented through the Capital Improvements Program and through transportation plans. He emphasized that it is not in and of itself “code” as defined in the traditional sense; it is guidance.

Ms. Dittmar asked how they get from Comp Plan to the Places 29 Master Plan. Mr. Cilimberg explained that the Master Plan is a component of the Comp Plan, so it has the standing of a Comp Plan in terms of providing guidance.

Ms. Dittmar asked about the purpose of the small area plan, pursuant to Mr. Boyd’s concerns. Mr. Cilimberg stated that the small area plan as described was to look at both land use and transportation systems in that geographical area – called “midtown” in the plan work. He said that it also identified and emphasized the need to engage businesses and residents in the area as part of its process, as well as updating transportation data and information to determine how the transportation system was working and how any particular features that might be recommend could affect the system, including land use changes. Mr. Cilimberg said if you look at Project 18, as Mr. Boyd had mentioned, there were bullets within that of things that should be part of the work on the intersection as part of the small area plan work, that have been underway, as part of the Rout 29 Solutions process. He stated the Comp Plan provides a 30,000-foot view, with Places 29 getting down to 15,000 or 20,000, and the small area plan would be 10,000 feet – much more specific to the particular area of interest.

Ms. Palmer asked if what he is saying is that part of the reason for a small area plan would be that they would not want to develop in a way that would preclude the transportation improvements, such as the interchange.

Mr. Cilimberg stated you would want to identify in the small area plan where improvements would need to be, as well as how land use would develop in the future. He said when they had the discussion of Colonial Auto and the additional land they want to develop and pursue a rezoning for, the Board and staff talked about wanting to ensure that at least the potential for extending Myers Drive over to Berkmar could remain unaffected by anything that was done there until the small area plan was done.

Ms. Mallek said when this was adopted, there was no money available for any kind of intersection improvements or for Berkmar, or for the County’s section of Hillsdale, until 2025 – and so the small area plan was important to preserve some possibility of right of way in the future.

Mr. Cilimberg stated when Places 29 was finished, the small area plan was considered to be the best mechanism to take up the intersection for possible improvements, to which Mr. Boyd was referring.

He said because they were not recommending any particular improvement at the time Places 29 was adopted, they wanted to make sure the small area plan was looking at that – and this was the mechanism by which to do it.

Mr. Boyd read from the Comp Plan, stating the language was referring directly to the Route 29 and Rio Road intersection: “The concept/designs for the intersection improvements should be established through a small area plan process in which adjacent nearby property owners and key stakeholders are expected to be participants. The following principles should guide the evaluation process for any interim or long-term improvements to this intersection.” He stated he appreciated not wanting to go too far back into history, but Places 29 would never have passed with the Board at the time, without that language in it.

Ms. Mallek said that was “the Board at the time,” and there was a dramatic difference in opinion for the previous four years as well, and trying to get it passed was why some of these really important elements that had been important for 10 years had to be removed.

Mr. Boyd said his contention is that the step was skipped, and they did not sit down with the constituents in that area, which he has been doing now.

Ms. Mallek stated that County staff has also.

Ms. Dittmar said the previous Board would not have allowed this to get in the way of a major investment, and the Comp Plan is a guideline – which is not capable of anticipating allocation of \$200 million of infrastructure, when they were expecting to get that in dribs and drabs over about 20 years. She emphasized it is not meant to keep them from being nimble and taking advantage of something for the community, and she wants to make sure from their professionals and VDOT that their process has been spot-on, and they have not violated any code, rule or process – and thus far she has not discovered anything that has made her feel uncomfortable.

Mr. Boyd said that up until about 10 months ago, there were no improvements being considered for the intersection, so they were not in violation of it with the previous Board’s plan.

The other five Board members stated they were not in violation now.

Ms. Mallek said what is important to keep in mind is the history that Mr. Cilimberg and Mr. Graham talked about – that the state transportation plan is the default plan in the locality. She said she was very upset when they passed that change five years ago to basically push everyone else out of the way, because from 2000-2010, the plan had been bottom-up, which meant localities developed their citizen long-range transportation plans, which were then sent to Richmond to become part of the state Long-Range Transportation Plan. Ms. Mallek said the previous Secretary of Transportation then said the process would need to start in Richmond and go downward, which was a shock to her having spent 15 years working on the process in the other direction. She stated the County has had to adapt and make the rules conform to what they were doing at the time.

Mr. Graham provided an example of another issue in which the County has had to follow a similar process – and that was with the long-range water supply plan, which was a jointly developed effort between the City, the County, Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority, and Albemarle County Service Authority working together. He said all of the parties were working on that plan, but it did not match at the time what the Comp Plan said – and everybody was supporting it, so they got the water supply plan done and then caught the Comp Plan up to it. Mr. Graham said this was similar to what is going on with the Route 29 Solutions package, with the whole corridor working with VDOT on the plan, and now the Long-Range Transportation Plan has been caught up – so the next step is catching the Comp Plan up to that. He stated that this is not unusual for the County, as they have done similar things in the past.

Ms. Palmer said in this process over the last several months, they have actually checked off a lot of the things that are in the small area plan, so there are a few things left, but not many.

Ms. McKeel said she has learned a lot in this discussion about state law, the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the Comp Plan, but it seems they need to look at the small area plan with the intersection there, and start figuring out the details for which they have not yet connected the dots.

Mr. Graham responded that what has happened now is that the Long-Range Transportation Plan has accelerated the need for the small area plan.

Mr. Sheffield commented that this is déjà vu, because he had just asked the same thing when they were talking about the CMA property rezoning.

Mr. Foley said it is critical that they move forward and do a small area plan because it is about a lot more than just a road, although the road drives some of the decisions around it. He stated that staff intends to have the money in the proposed budget to do the work necessary to develop a small area plan, which would guide the development and all of the activities in the area.

Ms. Palmer asked if staff could recap what has already been done related to the small area plan.

Mr. Cilimberg said in looking at the bullets under Project 18 and what has been done or is underway, there is current traffic data that has been used as part of the consideration of the improvement

and what must be included in that improvement, which is now the interchange project. He stated there has not been any changes identified for during their Comp Plan review, staff has recommended not changing anything in Places 29 except a few isolated properties, with the understanding that an overall update to Places 29 would be coming soon – but that has not been part of this process. He added that levels of service are a major aspect of the improvement project, and he and Mr. Graham have talked about the level of service VDOT has considered to be necessary to make the project work. Mr. Cilimberg said phasing is certainly part of the project in terms of how the road system will be dealt with during the construction project, and this spoke to phasing in terms of prolonging existing at-grade intersections, and for at least the construction period it is another consideration, and another component of the project to try to better handle access and at-grade needs was the temporary crossover and intersection for Berkmar that will be built. He stated ultimately, there are two at-grade intersections that will no longer exist after this is built – at Albemarle Square and Fashion Square.

Mr. Cilimberg stated the intersection improvements will be known during the work on the small area plan, and options for the improvements will be considered, so if the project moves forward the interchange will have already been identified – but they will still need to look at the other components, such as Myers Drive. He said that there was an interest in trying to pursue all concepts that were feasible and practical to maintain at-grade relationships of roads to businesses, and his understanding is that all businesses and properties will retain their immediate at-grade access to Route 29, but what will be lost are those two intersections. Mr. Cilimberg stated from the standpoint of the access as it exists today for Albemarle Square, they will have a right-in and right-out, but not a crossover. He said there is an effort to minimize the need for additional right of way acquisition, and his understanding is that the acquisitions will all be temporary construction easements.

Mr. Graham clarified that there is very minimal right of way acquisition, just thin strips for some widening.

Mr. Cilimberg said they have spoken about strategic construction phasing, and development of a parallel local road network for alternative access is another part of Route 29 Solutions that will be occurring in the next two plus years. He said there is preparation of a business impact plan that should be considered during the small area plan process, and there is now a lot of emphasis on how to assist businesses during this construction project. Mr. Cilimberg stated bicycle, pedestrian and transit users should be accommodated during the road improvements, and there are pedestrian crossovers incorporated into the interchange – but to his knowledge, there are no bicycle lanes incorporated, despite efforts by the County to get them included. He said this will continue to be part of the overall transit routing area, but it is not known how routes might ultimately change. Mr. Cilimberg noted that the challenge for bicycle lanes is the way the design has to accommodate so many lanes of turning traffic, left turns in particular.

Mr. Graham said it is certainly something that the advisory panel has spent a lot of time looking at.

Ms. Mallek said the bicyclists could certainly walk the pedestrian connections and take off on the other side.

Ms. McKeel she has had several bicyclists express to her that it will be so much better than what they have right now, even though they are not dedicated lanes.

Mr. Cilimberg said in the ultimate work accomplished by a small area plan, staff has identified some other items for consideration – including neighborhood street networks, which staff feels are as important as this interchange. He stated some of the ways they will identify parallel and perpendicular road improvements will be important to moving traffic in the area and supporting land use development. Mr. Cilimberg said some of the things identified in the charrette for this project as concepts had been discussed before and would likely come up again under the small area plan.

Ms. Dittmar stated that Mr. Boyd's email the previous week asked for a Board motion to do something with the MPO and delay this project until there is a small area plan, because they have not followed their Comp Plan. She feels very confident, however, that the process followed has been legal according to federal and state government directives. She also stated the County is on their way to a small area plan that will need to be finished before finishing the interchange so they can figure out the best way to develop the area. Ms. Dittmar asked when they can get that done.

Mr. Foley said it will start with the new fiscal year.

Mr. Boyd stated he does not agree with Ms. Dittmar's statement, because the community has not been involved in a small area plan.

Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Palmer and Ms. Mallek said they will be involved in that process.

Mr. Boyd said it is obvious to him that the majority of the Board has stopped listening to the people of this community.

Mr. Sheffield and Ms. Palmer stated this is not true.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Boyd to stop with his assertions

Ms. Dittmar asked that they stick to the matter at hand, and said the Smart 29 folks have encouraged people through flyers and other advertising to be at the Board meeting this evening, and they have an expectation to speak to the Board at that time. She asked if Mr. Boyd is prepared to make a motion.

Mr. Boyd said he is not prepared to make a motion until they hear from the people.

Ms. Dittmar stated it is important to have the professionals explain the process, because it is really complicated.

Mr. Boyd said he hopes they will stay and listen to what speakers will have to say at the evening portion of the meeting.

Ms. McKeel stated that she wants to make sure VDOT officials, Chip Boyles or County staff members do not have anything they feel they must say as part of this discussion.

There is no additional input provided.

Agenda Item No.15. Closed Meeting.

At 5:34 p.m., Mr. Sheffield **moved** that the Board go into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3.711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection (1) to consider appointments to boards, committees and commissions in which there are pending vacancies or requests for reappointments; and under Subsection (7) to consult with or be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice relating to the negotiation of easements on the County Office Building property. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No.16. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 6:10 p.m., Mr. Sheffield **moved** that the Board certify by a 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 meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

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

Ms. Palmer **moved** to appoint/reappoint to the following individuals to boards, committees and commissions:

- **reappoint** Mr. Jean Lorber to the Acquisition of Conservation Easements (ACE) Appraisal Review Committee with said term to expire December 31, 2015.
- **appoint** Mr. David Shreve as the Jack Jouett District representative on the Economic Development Authority with said term to expire January 19, 2019.
- **appoint** Ms. Erica Castillo to the Historic Preservation Committee with said term to expire June 4, 2018.
- **appoint** Mr. Manuel Lerdaу to the Natural Heritage Committee with said term to expire September 30, 2016.
- **reappoint** Ms. Julia Monteith as the UVA Liaison to the Planning Commission with said term to expire December 31, 2015.

Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

Ms. Dittmar noted that earlier in the meeting, the Board had agreed to change the order of the Board agenda to consider the Branchlands item first, then to hear "Matters from the Public".

Agenda Item No.19. SP 2014-00010 Branchlands Assisted Living Facility

The executive summary forwarded to the Board states that on August 19, 2014, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the application and recommended approval with conditions. The Commission also recommended that, when the application was before the Board of Supervisors, the Board consider a revised "building design that maximizes the privacy of the adjoining property owners on Lilac Court."

After the August 19, 2014 public hearing, the applicant sought to resolve the concerns of neighbors and address the Commission's recommendations. The applicant submitted a revised concept plan, and requested that the community and the Planning Commission review and discuss the project revisions before the applicant proceeded to the Board of Supervisors for public hearing. At its December 16, 2014 meeting, the Commission considered the revised project, received comments from the community during the public hearing, and recommended approval of the special use permit with conditions.

The staff report for the August 19, 2014 Commission public hearing (Attachment D) provides a complete analysis of the original application. The staff report for the December 16, 2014 Planning Commission public hearing (Attachment C) highlights the changes to the project proposed by the applicant after the August 19, 2014 Commission meeting. The staff-recommended conditions in the December 16, 2014 staff report were further revised after the staff report was distributed, and the Commission was provided the conditions it ultimately recommended for approval at the December 16 Commission meeting. Those conditions are attached to the proposed Resolution (Attachment A).

Staff recommends the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment A) to approve this special use permit, with the conditions attached thereto.

Ms. Claudette Grant, Senior Planner, addressed the Board, stating that the proposal – Branchlands Assisted Living Facility – was located on Branchlands Drive, approximately 125 feet north of the intersection of Lilac Court and Branchland Drive. Ms. Grant said the property was zoned Planned Unit Development and was part of the Branchlands retirement community. She stated that the Places 29 Master Plan designates this property and its surrounding parcels as Urban Density Residential, which allows 6-34 units per acre, and supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools, commercial, office and service uses. Ms. Grant said the applicant has requested a special use permit to establish an assisted living facility with up to 90 units. She stated there was an approved site plan in place for a congregate care facility in this location, which could be provided by-right – but the applicant wished to construct the proposed assisted living facility, and has had several meetings with adjacent residents regarding the proposal.

Ms. Grant stated that the Planning Commission had held two public hearings for this request, the first on August 19, 2014, at which the Commission recommended approval of the special use permit with conditions by a 6-1 vote. During that public hearing, she said, the Commission recommended that the Board consider a building design that maximized the privacy of adjoining property owners on Lilac Court. She said that the applicant had worked on resolving concerns raised by the neighbors and the Commission to provide a revised site layout and building design. Ms. Grant reported that before bringing this information straight to the Board, the applicant brought the revised information to the community and the Commission, resulting in a second public hearing on December 16, where the Commission by a vote of 6-1 recommended approval of the SP with revised conditions.

She stated the building footprint and site had changed in the following ways: the western corner of the proposed building closest to the Lilac Court property line was now five feet further away from the property line; originally, the distance from the property line was 15 feet, and the distance was now 20'6". She said that the other corner closest to the property line was 22'6", and the upper floors of the building had been set back further, a combined distance of approximately six feet from the lower floors and from Lilac Court than was originally proposed. Ms. Grant read the proposed conditions: development shall be in general accord with the revised plan; the development shall be limited to no more than 90 units; proof of licensure by the appropriate state agencies shall occur prior to requesting a certificate of occupancy; construction shall commence within three years of approval of the permit, or it will expire; construction traffic shall enter primarily from Incarnation Drive, unless it is not practicable; employee traffic shall primarily use Incarnation Drive, with a few exceptions; and the Albemarle County Service Authority shall work with the applicant to provide landscaping and fencing on the southwest side of the assisted living building, between the building and the townhouses on the adjacent Lilac Court. Ms. Grant noted that there had been an eighth condition regarding signage for delivery trucks that had been removed because it would be difficult to enforce, and the Branchlands property owners association did not want the sign located on their property. Ms. Grant said staff believes the revised concept plan addresses the concerns raised at the Planning Commission public hearings, and recommends that the Board adopt the resolution as presented, with the revised conditions.

Ms. Mallek asked what "where practicable" meant, and whether there would be specific rules or just left up to driver discretion. Ms. Grant responded that the intent was that there may be situations when they are constructing the building that require construction traffic to come in from Branchlands Drive. The site has topography that might necessitate that – but they did not want to stipulate that all traffic had to be from Branchlands Drive, because that may not be possible.

The Chair opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to speak first.

Ms. Valerie Long of Williams Mullen law firm addressed the Board, stating that she was representing the applicant – Cambridge Healthcare Management, which owns the Branchlands facility. Ms. Long said that Cambridge CEO Graham Adelman was present at the meeting, along with Craig Kutarski of Simmons Group, the civil engineering firm for the project; administrative staff and residents from Branchlands. Ms. Long asked all in support of the application to raise their hands, and thanked the Board for accommodating their schedule adjustment. She noted the location of Branchlands on a map provided, and said that the retirement community includes congregate care senior apartments, and townhouses or condos – all of which are represented by the Branchlands Property Owners Association. She presented slides showing the existing project site, which has always been a part of the original master plan for Branchlands, and a copy of the original master plan – which was an attachment to a 1996 staff report, whereby the County Supervisors granted a special use permit for an assisted living facility in this exact location. Ms. Long stated that the applicant was asking for the same thing, and the permit was approved in 1996 but the facility was never constructed so the permit lapsed. At the time, she said, the Branchlands owner decided that instead of an assisted living facility they would build another apartment building, and there is an approved site plan for the building – which is five-story building with a basement, senior apartments, and it is a by-right building.

Ms. Long stated the original proposal brought to the first Planning Commission meeting in August, which was recommended for approval 6-1, with recommendations that the applicant spend a bit more time on the design of the building, particularly the Lilac Court Side. She stated that they also added some articulation of the building to approve the massing and the building design, and at the request of the homeowners association they moved the back corner five feet further away from the property line. Ms. Long said that the applicant has committed to the residents to work with the ACSA in hopes of erecting a privacy fence, as well as some landscaping, and that must be conditioned that on the service authority because there is a sewer line straddling the property line. She stated that the authority has indicated that if Branchlands gets the special use permit approval during the site plan process, they will work with them, but there is no guarantee that landscaping will be allowed to be planted. Ms. Long presented images of what the applicant had in mind for the site, noting the style of fence intended should the ACSA allow it. She said some of the residents have expressed concern about the amount of parking proposed and whether there would be sufficient parking, and noted the location of the sergeant house, the manor house, and other buildings. Ms. Long said the Timmons Group engineers conducted a parking study and confirmed that there were large amounts of available excess parking from the existing Branchlands, and the applicant has done actual counts in a less formal fashion over a four-day period in November to demonstrate that on average there were 57 available spaces, depending on the time of day and the day of the week. She presented an aerial view of the site, noting that there were 10 parking spaces that would be removed from one area of the front but would be replaced with five more there, as well as five more in the back. Ms. Long mentioned that the building by design was set up to accommodate deliveries from the back – not from Branchlands Drive, but from Incarnation Drive. She said there had also been concerns expressed from HVAC systems and other equipment, and the applicant has committed to having that roof-mounted rather than ground-mounted, as it is in other Branchlands buildings.

Ms. Long presented a map showing the location of the current buildings, the project site, and the roads accessing the site, with Branchlands having a deeded access along Incarnation Drive through the parking lot to reach the project site. She said that Mr. Adelman has volunteered to require all new employees of the facility to use that access road and park in the back parking lot, which has vast amounts of available spaces, and to direct all deliveries to be made using that access point. Ms. Long said the applicant had also volunteered to coordinate with the general contractor during construction a traffic management plan for their workers, to have the construction occur off of Incarnation Drive as much as possible – although it was reasonable to expect that some construction traffic would need to be in the area to help construct the portions of the building that front on Branchlands Drive.

The Chair then opened the meeting for additional public comments.

Ms. Nancy Hunt, President of the Branchlands Property Owners Association, addressed the Board, stating that ages ago, a compliant but inappropriate five-story building was approved, and this proposed assisted living facility was smaller than what is currently approved under the existing site plan, but still dwarfs the surrounding one and two-story townhouses. Ms. Hunt said they have done the best they can with a four-story building that is an average of 22 feet away from these small townhomes, but development pressures will only increase in Albemarle – particularly in the Rio District – and while a mix of commercial and high-density residential makes for a vibrant community, development should also respect single-family houses, unless the County does not value single-family homes, which she trusts is not the case. Ms. Hunt emphasized that Branchlands PUD did not get it right, and the Board has done an excellent job of protecting rural properties in Albemarle, but it's time to apply the same principles of height, step and setback to the urbanizing core. She noted that she served on the Arlington County Planning Commission for eight years. Ms. Hunt said that the homeowners also seek help in slowing down traffic on their private road, and said that she would be meeting with Mark Graham – but they would also like to have a condition that the applicant should assist with restriping and signing Branchlands Drive to slow traffic. She stated that the speed limit was 15 mph, and 40 miles per hour was really too fast. Ms. Hunt said that the residents and guests exceed the 15 mph speed limit, and there were inexpensive ways to slow traffic that would improve pedestrian safety for all who use the road.

Ms. Muriel Grim addressed the Board, stating she has requested that a three-dimensional rendering of the proposed assisted living be created, showing the facility in place and including all of the adjacent buildings. She said this would let residents see whether the proposed facility would be out of scale with the existing Branchlands community buildings, and said that before making their final decision – especially regarding the conditions pursuant to the construction of the facility – she requested that they

get a copy of such a rendering. Ms. Graham said if the building fits in and does not overwhelm the community that would be wonderful. On the other hand, if it is so large that it destroys the quality of their small, quiet neighborhood, she hoped they would require plan changes to address that. She stated she would envision changes such as redesigning the building and having the roof line at the same height of the adjacent apartment building, or creating vegetative screens that would block the views of the building. Ms. Graham said if screening were chosen, she would request that they make sure the plans for the facility clearly define and preserve the locations where trees would be placed, and require plantings that would be mature enough to screen the building within just a few years. She said she would also request that the Board legislatively ensure that the screening does not disappear in an accidental mistake that occurs during construction.

Ms. Margerie Fox addressed the Board, stating she was a resident of Branchlands, and stating they are an apartment complex but are more than that: they are a family. She stated they eat together, they play together, they cry together, they shop together, and probably spend more time with one another than most do with their own families. Ms. Fox said the residents appreciate the give and take that has gone on between the homeowners and appreciate property values, but she was before them to plead for human values. She stated when people age, they find it more difficult to get around, and if they do not have transportation – as a lot of Branchlands residents do not – it is hard to get out and see people who have had to move into assisted living. Ms. Fox said it would be great to have a nice facility onsite for people moving into assisted living, and everyone living in the independent townhomes would eventually be in her shoes.

Ms. Sue Lieberman addressed the Board, stating that she had been executive director of the Branchlands rental community; a current involved with the senior community for more than 13 years. Ms. Lieberman said there was a shortage of assisted living beds in the community, and it was a normal progression for people to move from their homes to the manor house – which was the whole philosophy behind having assisted living on the same property. She said she has been a proponent of the project from the start, and it is a community service, not just a business.

There being no further public comment, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Mr. Sheffield stated this was a special use permit application – not a site plan review – and the applicant has spent a great deal of time looking at the site plan to work with the residents. He said the applicant had been bending over backwards to work with the community, and these issues would be coming up increasingly – especially in the Rio District – with infill and redevelopment. He said he was aware of three other smaller issues that were by-right and were infill issues, right up against people's back doors. He also stated, they did not have any guidance to give landowners and developers as far as how to help mitigate these impacts. Mr. Sheffield said the Board had held a strategic retreat about a year earlier, and it was something that needed to make its way up to the top because more of these applications with potential adverse impacts on people's properties and homes would be coming forward.

Ms. Mallek asked if there were additional conditions he envisioned to help address that.

Mr. Sheffield said staff had covered those in their proposed conditions, adding that the residents have legitimate concerns about traffic on Branchlands Drive, but it was not a public road so the Board cannot really dictate too much there. He said the applicant had agreed to deter as much traffic as possible off of that and put it onto Incarnation Drive, and any damage he would be held liable for.

Ms. Mallek said if there were two different owners, there would be a construction easement that would have to be given to have those vehicles on Branchlands Drive, but since it is common ownership, it was a different matter.

Ms. Palmer asked if there were an opportunity to address the speed. Mr. Sheffield said they cannot really control the speed on Branchlands Drive, because it is a private road.

Ms. Palmer asked who maintained the road. Mr. Sheffield said that it was the homeowners association.

Ms. Hunt said there was a deed that gave the manor house the right of ingress and egress, and there are a series of conditions including the applicant's obligation to fix the road if they damage it during construction. She said that they were not asking to control the speed limit, and they have posted 15 mph but were suggesting that the road be restriped and re-signed, with some road-narrowing technologies that could be implemented. Ms. Hunt said they were hoping to get some expertise from the County as to which of those would work best, and they would need to implement this and would ask the Manor House to pay some of the cost as well.

Mr. David Benish, Chief of Planning, stated staff could provide some guidance and assistance, and the question was whether the Board wanted to make that a condition, although the applicant has indicated his willingness to help.

Ms. Long said the applicant had been discussing the issue with Ms. Hunt and other HOA board members, and has offered to work with them on the types of accommodations and mechanisms as described – especially striping and additional signage to remind everyone of the speed limit. She stated it was hoped that by diverting the vast majority of new traffic from Branchlands to Incarnation – deliveries, employee traffic, construction traffic – the number of new trips would be nominal.

Ms. Dittmar said it was gratifying to have neighbors come and speak for projects, and she thanked the applicant and neighbors for getting this to a point where it was appealing to everyone.

Mr. Sheffield **moved** that the Board adopt the proposed resolution to approve SP-2014-00010 with the seven conditions as presented in modified form. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

(**Note:** The resolution as adopted is set out in full below).

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
SP 2014-10 BRANCLANDS ASSISTED LIVING FACILITY**

WHEREAS, WIAL LLC (the "Owner") is the owner of Tax Map and Parcel Number 061Z0-03-00-005A0 (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, the Owner filed an application for a special use permit to establish an assisted living facility with up to 90 units, and the application is identified as Special Use Permit 2014-00010 Branchlands Assisted Living Facility ("SP 2014-10"); and

WHEREAS, on December 16, 2014, after a duly noticed public hearing, the Albemarle County Planning Commission recommended approval of SP 2014-10 with the conditions recommended by County staff; and

WHEREAS, on January 14, 2015, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors held a duly noticed public hearing on SP 2014-10.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, upon consideration of the foregoing, the staff report prepared for SP 2014-10 and all of its attachments, the information presented at the public hearing, and the factors relevant to a special use permit in Albemarle County Code § 18-33.8, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves SP 2014-10, subject to the conditions attached hereto.

SP-2014-00010 Branchlands Assisted Living Facility Special Use Permit Conditions

1. Development and use shall be in general accord with the following revised plan prepared by Timmons Group Sheet(s) C1.0 (SUP Conceptual Plan), dated March 17, 2014, revised October 20, 2014 (hereafter "Layout Plan"), as determined by the Director of Planning and the Zoning Administrator. To be in general accord with the Layout Plan, development and use shall reflect the following major elements as shown on the plans:
 - Building location, orientation and mass.
 - Location and general character of parking, loading area and garden.Minor modifications to the plan that do not otherwise conflict with the elements listed above may be made to ensure compliance with the Zoning Ordinance, and minor modifications may be made to the building location as determined by the Fire Marshal to ensure compliance with the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code.
2. Development shall be limited to not more than 90 units containing not more than 120 beds;
3. Prior to requesting a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall present to the Zoning Administrator proof of licensure by the Virginia Department of Health and the Virginia Department of Social Services for the permitted use;
4. The construction of any structure required for the use shall commence on or before February 4, 2018 or the permit shall expire and be of no effect.
5. All construction traffic shall enter the site from Incarnation Drive; provided that during construction of the site, any construction vehicle may enter the site from Branchlands Drive if it is not practicable for the vehicle to enter the site from Incarnation Drive.
6. The site shall be designed and constructed so that all employee traffic may enter the site from Incarnation Drive. Employees who work exclusively at the Assisted Living Facility shall not enter the site from Branchlands Drive.
7. If permitted by the Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA), the applicant shall provide landscaping and fencing on the south west side of the Assisted Living building between the building and the adjacent townhouses on Lilac Court. This shall be coordinated with the ACSA, and the applicant shall consult with the Branchlands Property Owners Association on such landscaping and fencing.

Agenda Item No.18. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Ms. Dittmar introduced County staff.

Ms. Dittmar stated that early in the meeting, there were presentations from VDOT officials and Community Development staff to answer a lot of questions, but the Board took no action.

Mr. Lynwood Bell of the Rivanna District addressed the Board, stating he would like the grade-separated interchange to be put on hold for a while, and asking why nowhere up and down Route 29 from Danville to Gainesville there was another GSI – they all have bypasses. He asked how is it that Albemarle has it right and everyone else has it backwards, and said maybe we are not as smart as we think. Mr. Bell asked the Board to imagine having three more of these, at intersections like Hydraulic and Greenbrier. He stated he was not willing to pay the extra taxes to fund this less than perfect solution. He added that the Best Buy ramp was another boondoggle waiting to happen, as there would be four lanes feeding into two.

The audience applauded.

Ms. Dittmar reminded the public of the ground rules, and said she would recess the meeting if they were not observed. She stated there were some people present who were in favor of the GSI, and the Board did not want them to feel intimidated.

Mr. Peter Chandler of the White Hall District addressed the Board, stating he works for a small business at Rio and 29. Mr. Chandler said now that word was getting out, thousands of residents from the County and surrounding counties have expressed their distaste for the GSI that has been proposed. He stated the numbers were growing daily, and the Board has those, with signed petitions now turned over to them. Mr. Chandler appealed to the Board to listen to the will of the people and put the brakes on the GSI, and subject it to additional study. He asked why the Board should not agree to a moratorium until the project could be studied for credible alternatives, and asked how they could justify its obstinacy when alternatives had been offered, and in view of the large public outcry against this project. Mr. Chandler asked the Board to change their position in the interest of the community, and said that “those who cannot change their minds cannot change anything.”

Mr. Carter Myers addressed the Board, stating that he was a resident and business person in Albemarle County. Mr. Myers said he served on the CTB for eight years and worked on the now-abandoned Alternative 10 Western Bypass. He said he had no part in the route selection, which was before his time and now more than 23 years ago. He stated even 20 years ago, the route was not perfect and not long enough. Senator Mark Warner was on the CTB at the time and voted against it because when it was selected, it was inadequate. Mr. Myers said he fully agreed that the bypass route was way past its time, and the right of way should be sold back to individuals immediately. He stated this road will not be built and should not see the light of day again, but with the bypass gone, the community could come together with new and creative ways to improve traffic and improve the livability of the area at the same time. Mr. Myers said they should begin the process of building the parallel roads now, allowing more time to study the interchange concept. He stated they have a great community and many well-connected citizens, and do not have to accept a project that still has questions marks surrounding it, in order to get the projects they all know are good. Mr. Myers said they could come together as a community, and if they do and work as one, they can accomplish whatever they want – and do not have to lose the money.

Mr. Mac Lafferty of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board, stating that the FCC Chairman had recommended earlier that day that cable carriers such as Verizon and AT&T be considered Type Two – which would mean that the internet would be secure and open to everyone; the final vote on that would take place on February 26. Regarding the grade-separated interchange, Mr. Myers said this was not something that just came up – it has been in Places 29, and in the Long-Range Transportation Plan, which took two years to develop and included many public meetings. Mr. Lafferty said he was appalled that Delegate Bell was trying to put this under HB2; while it is a law, the policies and procedures of that law have not yet been developed and probably won't be until 2016.

Mr. Grant Gamble addressed the Board, stating that he works for ACAC, which employs 500 people locally and serves over 20,000 people in the community. Mr. Gamble said ACAC at Albemarle Square would be severely adversely impacted by a grade-separated interchange at Rio. He wanted to state publicly that ACAC supports the Solutions 29 package in its entirety with the exception of the GSI. He stated that a friend told him that his father said, voting for your local Supervisors is more important than voting for the President, and on many levels he was correct because what they decided today would affect people on a daily basis and in a local sense. Mr. Gamble said in 1982, the revenue sharing agreement was entered into, and the effects of that still have impact on the County, and the Route 29 Solutions projects are of similar magnitude. He stated the interchange at Rio was a massive project, right in the heart of the community's Main Street, and it would create a lot of disharmony and adversity, and people would lose jobs as a function of this. Mr. Gamble said they were challenged by Philip Shucet to come up with some positive solutions, and they reached out to a nationally acclaimed designer, who came up with some great solutions that align with much of what is in Places 29 – so the Smart 29 group would like to see them given due consideration. He stated there were 13,344 people who have reached out and made a statement through postcards, emails, etc. Mr. Gamble said this is not a done deal, and he was asking the Board to change their position today. He emphasized the bypass was not Smart 29's agenda and was not intended to be; they simply want the best thing for the community and believe that the best thing for the community was to put the GSI at the back of the projects.

Mr. Larry Howard addressed the Board, stating he was a resident of Earlysville and also owns Specialty Guitars Plus at Rio and 29, a store which has owned since 2006 – and 2014 being the first year they were in the black. Mr. Howard said if the GSI goes through, they would be out of business, and they are one of the few guitar stores left in town. He said two have closed, one has stopped selling guitars, and one has cut way back. He also said the only one left was Music & Arts Center, part of Guitar Center – which would declare bankruptcy in a few weeks. Mr. Howard stated it was not a fun business for money, but it was a fun business for people. With Charlottesville having a lot of musicians, if his store closes, the community has lost the biggest guitar store in town. Mr. Howard said they have 350 guitars in stock, and he built the business with his retirement dollars. He stated it would be a shame to close them down and build something that saves 60 seconds of time for \$84 million, which does not seem logical to him. Mr. Howard said he has four full-time and one part-time employee, who would be out of work if this goes through. He stated the community seems more against this than for it, and as the former mayor of Washington, NJ, he would be run out of town if he had done this.

Ms. Margaret Van Winkle of the Rivanna District addressed the Board and asked them to pass the motion put forth by Mr. Boyd to require VDOT to adhere to the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan before moving ahead with changes to the Rio Road/US29 intersection. Ms. Van Winkle said they owe it to their constituents to thoroughly examine the facts as they exist today, and not rely on 23-year-old data. She stated she has lived in her home for almost 10 years, but has been visiting the area since 1988, when she lived in Northern Virginia and her daughter was at UVA. She said she had nearly 30 years of experience in traveling on Route 29, and had personal experience negotiating its traffic at all times of the day. Ms. Van Winkle said Route 29 had become a lifeline for her – and for most other County residents – to access most needed business services and participating in other activities of daily life. She stated these included transporting grandchildren to their various activities, shopping, socializing, medical appointments, and volunteer work. She stated that from her perspective, traffic on the six-mile section of Route 29 between Airport Road and Angus Road was lighter than it was when she first visited her daughter at UVA in 1988. Ms. Van Winkle said the part of Route 29 that needed serious attention was the Hydraulic Road intersection, and the intersection with the Route 250 bypass. She stated with 90% of Route 29 traffic being local in this stretch of the road, this seems like a costly solution to a problem that does not exist today and likely will not exist in the future. She encouraged the Board to hit the pause button and take another look at this before moving forward.

Mr. Charles Lebo addressed the Board and stated that he had lived in Albemarle County for more than 40 years. Mr. Lebo stated he serves on Philip Shucet's Route 29 Solutions panel, along with 11 other people – five of whom had been appointed as members of the business community; all six of them oppose the Route 29 grade-separated interchange, and feel that it is a waste of money and a harm to the community. Mr. Lebo said Mr. Sheffield had sent him an email the day before accusing him of confusing and twisting the facts and polarizing the community, an assertion that he resented. He stated he had lived and worked in the community for more than 40 years and had volunteered thousands of hours of his time to councils, panels and boards, and paid more than \$16,000 annually in real estate taxes to the County. Mr. Lebo said that as a constituent of Mr. Sheffield's, he did not respect the way he treated him.

Mr. Timothy Hulbert addressed the Board, stating that he worked for the Chamber of Commerce but was not a member of Smart 29 and was not orchestrating anything with that group. He said the rumor had been circulating that he was some kind of "Gepetto," but that was not the case. Mr. Hulbert stated that the Chamber for at least 10 years has supported the network of roads – expanded lanes at 29 and 250, Best Buy, north of the River, construction of the Hillsdale connector, the Berkmar extension, and the synchronization of lights on Route 29. He said they have been consistently against grade-separated interchanges at Rio and Hydraulic, and would continue to be against those. Mr. Hulbert stated that he, as an individual, and the Chamber, urged the Board to remove consideration of the GSI at Rio and US29, and urged the City not to consider one at Hydraulic. He said if they cannot do that, perhaps they can re-sequence the order of improvements.

Mr. Charles Bakewell of the White Hall District addressed the Board, stating he had made a recommendation to the Board earlier in the afternoon, and after the meeting got a "punch to the gut," as he had been given incomplete County information and the situation was not quite what he had been told. Mr. Bakewell said that much of his first 13 years in business involved restructuring operations, businesses, and the loss of jobs, and his company bent over backwards to obtain input that could help them make the best decision to get it right. He stated in 25 years of management consulting to state and federal agencies, he never saw a contract that could not be modified to benefit the customer with a more efficient, more effective technical and cost solution. Mr. Bakewell said each of these three anecdotes involve new information received after the basic idea was in place, and an open mind benefitted everyone. He asked the Board to fully and openly consider the new information they are receiving, irrespective of what has been decided previously. Mr. Bakewell said it appeared that an improved solution may be possible, and as inconvenient as it may be, the Board must engage and work with this new information, as constituents deserve that.

Mr. Gary Albert addressed the Board, stating he was a resident of Albemarle County and has a State Farm agency on Rio Road. Mr. Albert said he was 100% in favor of work to be done to improve the traffic and safety of the areas in which they live, and was grateful for the attention that VDOT was giving Charlottesville and Albemarle County. He stated he felt somewhat bullied into these four projects being

mushed into one and presented as “take it or leave it,” especially when a quarter of the project was supposed to take up the majority of the budget. Mr. Albert said he had read a book in college entitled *The Goal*, and he felt it should be required reading for everyone involved in the process. He stated if the goal was truly to alleviate traffic and increase through-put, they should work through the projects in order of which provide the greatest impact with the least cost. Mr. Albert said they could widen the bottleneck by adding the lanes at Polo Ground Road, give traffic an alternative route by extending Berkmar to the Airport – with less traffic on 29, increasing through-put, and re-sequence the lights; and then, if it as determined that these three projects did not achieve the goal of reducing the bottleneck and increasing through-put, then a standalone study would show that a grade-separated interchange or some other similar alternative was necessary and would deliver additional quantifiable benefit. He said the first three items were part of the Comp Plan anyway, so if the goal was to improve through-put, then each of these items should stand alone – especially the most costly and intrusive of the four. Mr. Albert stated he was at a loss as to why they cannot move the GSI to the last step. He said by lumping these four projects together it will be impossible to determine the impact of the true additional impact of a giant hole in the middle of Rio.

Ms. Diane Weber addressed the Board, stating she was a resident of the Rivanna District and was before them to urge them to join Mr. Boyd in his efforts to table the grade-separated interchange, which looks like a super-highway. Ms. Weber said she found it horrific that this super-highway would be built through the center of town, and every other city has a bypass that protects their cities. She stated that Charlottesville is one of the most beautiful cities, and she thought that there would be a super-highway with interchanges going straight through the heart of the City was shocking. Ms. Weber asked who benefitted from turning Charlottesville’s Entrance Corridor into an unsightly super-highway – not the lively business community that serves local residents, or the residents who rely on those businesses; not the neighborhoods off of Route 29, who would have to navigate service lanes underneath and alongside this super-highway; and not the taxpayers, who would have to make up for the loss in revenues when these businesses disappear; and not the City and County residents, who would have to live with the blight of eventually boarded-up businesses and empty parking lots that will line Route 29. Ms. Weber said they have one of the loveliest cities in the state and in the country, and she hoped elected officials would protect it from a super-highway that would turn the Entrance Corridor into a wasteland.

Ms. Karen Weiner addressed the Board, stating she was mall manager at Fashion Square, which employed thousands of local citizens and served millions of customers from Albemarle County and surrounding counties, and supported hundreds of local ancillary businesses annually, traveling through and around US29 and around Rio Road. Ms. Weiner said she was asking the Board to pause, review information and alternatives, and engage community input before allowing the grade-separated interchange project to commence. She said she would also like to have them reconsider the project sequencing of the entire Route 29 Solutions projects, and review the doable and livable solutions for the community and their main street.

Mr. Travis Pietela addressed the Board, speaking as a resident of Charlottesville and offering his support for the Route 29 Solutions. He stated the improvements would greatly benefit both local and through traffic in the corridor, and the Rio interchange was no exception. Mr. Pietela said he had heard many opponents try to undercut this project by citing the 10% through-traffic figure that was pertinent to discussions of the western bypass, but that figure did not make sense to apply here. He stated it was intended to cover those drivers who had no desire to stop anywhere in the Route 29 Corridor north of Charlottesville; in contrast, many local drivers would be able to use the through-lanes at the new interchange to make their way to Stonefield, the U.S. Post Office, and any number of other destinations along the corridor. Mr. Pietela said that those making turns and using the local lanes at the new interchange would also benefit by having less traffic to contend with in each light cycle; a driver making a left turn from Rio would no longer have to rely on a tiny window of time to do so. He stated these projects have been studied and included in local transportation plans for a number of years, and public and business owners have had extensive opportunities to provide input. Mr. Pietela said the community has what was likely the best chance they would have for a long time to move these key projects forward, and he urged the Board to continue to do so.

Mr. Chris Craytor of the Samuel Miller District addressed the Board, stating that a few months ago Mr. Shucet was asked the question as to why they were doing Rio first – and why not Berkmar, Hillsdale and the Polo Grounds widening. Mr. Craytor said Mr. Shucet’s response was, “Because that is the way I think it should be done,” but the people disagree. He stated that the leadership they need is not from a consultant based in Norfolk who earns more in an hour than a minimum wage person earns in a week – they need it from the Board, which the citizens have elected. Mr. Craytor said there was a great division in the community regarding transportation, which has been going on for longer than he has been alive – and certainly longer than he has lived in Albemarle County – but they know have a chance to heal those divisions. He stated there was agreement on so much: on the lights, on Polo Grounds Road, on the Best Buy ramp, on Hillsdale and Berkmar – and there was an opportunity here for the Board to lead. Mr. Craytor said they now have a chance to listen to the public, and if they did not listen to them today, they would have to in the future, in line at Bodo’s or on the Downtown Mall, and eventually at the ballot box.

Mr. Jeff Deal addressed the Board, stating that he was a resident of the Woodbrook neighborhood in the Rio District. Mr. Deal said as he was driving from UVA north recently, it took him three light cycles to get through the intersection at Hydraulic and 29, and every day he went through the Rio intersection but never had to wait more than one light cycle. He stated he has lived in the community for 23 years and has followed local politics closely for a long time. He said several Board members were elected because they took a courageous stance against the Western Bypass, and the irony should not be lost on them now that the perceived bullying by the establishment has shifted to the GSI project. Mr. Deal said he urged the Board to consider their position, why they were elected, and what their legacy would be, because this was going to be a major event that would affect a lot of people very directly for a very long time. He stated they needed to listen and pause, and sequence the projects.

Mr. Phil Jaderborg addressed the Board, stating he was owner of PJ Networks, which had locations in Ruckersville and in Charlottesville at the intersection of Rio and 29. Mr. Jaderborg said the big question people have been asking about the interchange are why, how and who – and why it needed to be built. He stated the community has been told by Mr. Shucet and VDOT that it would improve traffic flow and make the intersection safer, but nobody has really been able to explain how that would be accomplished. He stated they should at least take some time to conduct a small area study of the project before they rush forward. Mr. Jaderborg said that they have been told that the intersection improvements must happen as soon as possible, at least that seems to be Mr. Shucet's idea, and the residents have been told that "it just does" have to happen that way. He stated this would be a great hardship to local businesses in the area, both during and after construction, and some of them would not survive the interchange. Mr. Jaderborg said Mr. Shucet has said on multiple occasions that this was not his problem, as he was hired to get the job done, and said that Mr. Shucet had been hired to see that the project goes through, and to see it to completion. He emphasized that the people own the roads and have paid the taxes to have them built in the first place, and all they are asking is for the Board to represent only the people who elected them, and hit the pause button. Mr. Jaderborg stated if they must accept the interchange in order to get any of the other projects through, then perhaps they would be better off without any of them at all.

Mr. Peter Cefaratti addressed the Board, stating he was a resident of the Rio District and has concerns about the proposed GSI, citing loss of access to homes and businesses around the project, with the resulting failure of businesses and loss of jobs, and the cost of mitigating those results; new driving patterns that cause more increased traffic in the residential neighborhoods; interruption and delays of emergency vehicles; loss of sales tax revenue when residents choose other places to shop and dine; potential loss of property tax revenue, particularly with commercial parcels whose value is generated by how much income they generate; and being stuck with a permanent monstrosity that would be a monument to the decision of the Supervisors. Mr. Cefaratti said that it was in their power to request that the small area plan take place, as requested by Mr. Boyd, and the Board can inform VDOT that concerned residents want the GSI put on hold until its effects are completely known. He stated that they had the opportunity to do a good thing, so they should not be in a hurry to just do something – they should slow down and do something they can all be happy about. Mr. Cefaratti urged the Board to do the right thing and to listen to the public, not to VDOT and Mr. Shucet.

Mr. Mike Basile of the Jefferson Area Tea Party addressed the Board, stating that for those who feared additional traffic from the John Warner Parkway, it was not good policy to make decisions based on fears. He said that the parkway would open tomorrow and would help a lot of people get to their destinations without having to get on Park Street, which was a really good thing. Mr. Basile said that the roads and drivers could handle it, and over the next few weeks drivers would adjust and figure their best course to travel to and through Rio and 29. He stated that it was imperative that they monitor the changes in traffic patterns and adjust the lights to allow more time for traffic on Rio as required, and it was critical that they do this in order to prevent unnecessary backups at the intersection. Mr. Basile said that the U.S. was \$18 trillion in debt; Governor McAuliffe has said the state has a nearly \$2 billion shortfall in Virginia, and the GSI planned for Rio and 29 was unnecessary consumption of state tax dollars. He said that in light of additional spending requirements for Albemarle County, they needed to keep people working and shouldn't disrupt employees that live and work around Rio and 29 and those that will be delayed in their commutes by reconstructing the Rio/29 intersection. Mr. Basile said that the community is adamant that they proceed in the best manner possible, and new alternatives presented by Smart 29 must be evaluated. He stated that due diligence has not been done and better options were available, and the JATP was calling on the Board of Supervisors to take action to stop the planned reconstruction of the Rio and 29 intersection. Mr. Basile asked the Board to call on the Governor to stop this, so they can work on a new and better solution, and said that citizens fully expect the Board to open the discussion and pursue a better alternative.

Dr. Greg Degnan of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board, stating that he was a physician at Martha Jefferson Hospital and the medical director at ACAC, and he was before them to address the impact of the grade-separated interchange on emergency medical services and their ability to provide a rapid response time to the Route 29 corridor and their ability to provide safe transport to MJH. He said that ACAC, the Albemarle Family Practice, and his practice on the corner of Rio and 29 are relatively frequent users of emergency medical services, and when they call the squad, minutes can make a big difference in terms of patient outcome – and eliminating those access points has significant potential impact on emergency medical services. Dr. Degnan said that two weeks earlier, he had the misfortune of accompanying his father in law on an ambulance ride to Martha Jefferson Hospital, and he was able to talk

to the driver and the squad about their perception on the impact this might have – and they echoed his concerns about response time to that area of Route 29, but also raised the issue of transport of patients to MJH. He stated that currently, patients from the Earlysville area or certain areas of the 29 corridor are transported via Rio Road to the bypass, and then to Martha Jefferson. What they were proposing to do in the future, he said, was to use Proffit Road – which is probably not the safest route for an ambulance at high speed in inclement weather. Dr. Degnan said that he would like to see further study with input from fire and EMS personnel, and would again support Mr. Boyd's motion for further study in this area.

Mr. Eddie Giles addressed the Board, stating that the grade-separated interchange should be held off, and no one should be dictating to them how they have their highways. Mr. Giles said that the Board was elected to represent their constituents, and their job was to listen to the many constituents who had sent them letters and emails opposing this. He stated that Supervisors ran on a platform that they would support business and the community, and this was an opportunity to stand with their constituents. Mr. Giles said that it was very important that they do, because the community will not stand down.

Ms. Nancy Adams addressed the Board, stating that she had been a Rio District resident for five years and had been to many big cities, and the proposal for the GSI reminded her of that. Ms. Adams said that if they did enhancements on the roads that intersect with 29, synchronize the lights and go on with the plans to extend Berkmar, it would work – and could be beautiful, as it was done in her home town of Winter Park, Florida. Ms. Adams said that the interchange put people's jobs at risk, and explained that she drove on Route 29 seven days per week – for personal travel, and as a bus driver for UVA transit. She stated that if she had to go a mile before she could turn around to come back, she wouldn't stop and shop, she would keep going.

Mr. David Mitchell addressed the Board, stating that he had moved here seven years ago despite his wife's caution that "they had been fighting about the same stuff for 30 years." Mr. Mitchell said that this fight had been a lot of distrust and tit for tat, and finally the bypass died. He stated that a lot of people feel that the grade-separated interchange was the last nail in the coffin, and a last shot at the other side of the community. He said that there was a bit of distrustfulness to be putting this thing in at the last minute; it wasn't necessary and it didn't benefit the community in general, nor did it help the future – it was just going to perpetuate the fight.

Mr. Henry McHenry of the White Hall District addressed the Board, stating that coming into this meeting he had not heard a reason to delay construction of the GSI that made any sense, but at this meeting he had heard some, including lost jobs, closed businesses and lost revenue. Mr. McHenry said that he would like to hear some facts about the experiences of other communities in similar situations, as he has heard conflicting information about impacts. He stated that resequencing may be good, and he appreciated the comments made about the arrogance of outsiders, particularly Mr. Shucet, and also the comment made about having a super-highway put through our own special place here. Mr. McHenry said that the point made that was most impactful to him was the inhibition of emergency fire and rescue services, and he hoped they would take that into account.

Mr. John Bunch addressed the Board, stating that he grew up in Los Angeles in the 1950s, and these solutions do not work – they just create more fancy and elevated gridlock. Mr. Bunch said that for the residential communities on Huntington, Northfields, Old Brook, and Westmoreland that feed into Carrsbrook, opening Hillsdale and jamming the traffic at Rio/29 creates a perfect storm to destroy all of those family community neighborhoods because they are a natural sacrifice for all the traffic that's going to try to avoid going up in the general area of Rio and 29. He said that Hillsdale alone was a particular problem because it just dumps cars onto Rio, so the problem is just being moved from one place to the other, and that is not really a solution. Mr. Bunch stated that there was supposed to be a phase two of the John Warner Parkway that went up the back across from CATEC behind Forest Lakes and out beyond Airport Road onto 29, and for some reason that plan had gotten scrapped – so he would like to see that energized. He asked the Board to please consider the residential neighborhoods, the quality of life factors, and to consider that they are just making neighborhood roads the arteries that will be jammed and opened in other places.

Mr. Bob Brust addressed the Board, stating that he was a resident of Albemarle County, and stating that they needed to build the Rio/29 grade-separated interchange because it was currently at a very poor level of service. Mr. Brust said that when the John Warner Parkway opens there would be more cars, and that would make it worse. He stated that the GSI has been discussed in their plans previously, and he recalled that there was a unanimous vote by the Board of Supervisors for a plan on Route 29 that include the interchanges. Mr. Brust said that he sensed a lot in this community against any kind of change, but change toward improvement would be as painful as change from a mistake – and this change would really be an improvement. He stated that the Board of Supervisors had reached out to the businesses in this area, and he has heard them say in other meetings that the County would be willing to discuss financial assistance to these businesses. Mr. Brust said that there had been a zoning change in favor of one of these businesses already, and he believed that the Board was supporting them as they went through his change. He asked that they please make it as quickly as possible.

Ms. Clare Johnson addressed the Board, stating that she was representing the interest of a homeowners association that is in the Rio District, and her understanding that the only two Supervisors who could put the pause on this project – Ms. Mallek and Mr. Sheffield. Ms. Johnson said that she wanted them to know that this was a horrible project to have put through, and the presenters at Mr. Boyd's meeting had good alternatives. She stated that she would not vote for her Supervisor if he did not listen.

Mr. Sheffield asked Mr. Boyd if he had told constituents at his meeting that the decision was up to Ms. Mallek and himself. Mr. Boyd responded that he had informed them that they were the two Supervisors who represented the Board on the MPO.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he felt he was being targeted specifically, and Smart 29 had sent out postcards with his name on them.

Ms. Dittmar said that she would like to stay on task and hear from everyone who wanted to speak, then they could have a dialogue.

Ms. Susan Reed, a resident of the Woodbrook subdivision, addressed the Board and said that it concerned her that a study had not been done in regard to this project, despite the fact that the Comp Plan said it was a good idea. Ms. Reed said that Secretary Layne said that he might be willing to do the study after ground has been broken on this project, at which point it would be too late to do anything about it, which adds to the "suspicious nature" of the project. She stated that the speed with which this project has been progressing was alarming, and it seems there is someone behind the scenes pushing this. Ms. Reed said that the Toole Design Group that looked into this was a well-respected firm, and if they could fix the intersection better than with a GSI, in a manner that would look and work much better, and cost much less than \$84 million being proposed, it was incumbent upon them as representatives of the people to at least investigate the possibilities. She stated that this was the people's money being thrown around, and they would like to see it being spent wisely. Ms. Reed said that the Route 29 intersection rarely causes a problem for those who transverse it regularly, unless there has been an accident. She stated that there were doctors' offices in Albemarle Square, and the new library that would be moving in March won't be accessible off of Rio Road for three months. Ms. Reed said that if this was a colossal failure – as it appears it will be – it will be their legacy, and she knew both staunch Democrats and staunch Republicans who were vigorously opposed to this road, and it should not be a political idea to have a road. She stated that the road should serve the people and do the best for the purpose it was intended, and once it was done it would be too late to undo, so she pleaded with them to look at it carefully.

Ms. Diane Berlin addressed the Board, stating that she lived on the east side of town and used 29 many times during the week, and had a lot of the same views as many other speakers. Ms. Berlin said that offering a loan to people who were not able to get to their stores for a few months was not a solution, and three months without income or with less income would put a lot of people out of business. She said that she was also concerned about cars that don't know the area, coming from both north and south, speeding up in a highway situation and then all of the sudden approaching a light – which could mean more accidents.

Ms. Carol Harold addressed the Board, stating that she and her husband moved here 15 years ago from Dallas, and they had an interchange built in their area exactly as what is being proposed here, and all of the businesses along that corridor are gone. Ms. Harold stated that they needed to really consider the economic impact, and she had not heard of any economic advantages the road was going to provide.

Mr. Vic Penia addressed the Board, stating that he and his wife are residents of the Samuel Miller District, and their daughter lives close by. Mr. Penia said that his family shops on Route 29, especially at Toys-R-U's, Dick's Sporting Goods, and Gander Mountain, but shopping along Route 29 was a chore – and with the disruption they were bringing in, it would no longer be a chore, it would be an avoidance. He stated that they could drive easily on I-64 to Short Pump, which only involves three synchronized stoplights and was a pleasure at which to shop.

Ms. Peg Toscano addressed the Board, stating that she and her husband have lived here 40 years, and lived through the expansion of Route 29. She said that she lived through the study, the study of the study, et cetera, and stated that there was an article in the *Daily Progress* recently about the history of Route 29 projects. Ms. Toscano asked why they were redoing the one improvement that has been made on the corridor, and said that it did not make sense.

Mr. Jeff Kilmer of the White Hall District addressed the Board, stating that he was President of Photoworks Group, which was about 500 feet off of the intersection. Mr. Kilmer said that he felt his business could live through the construction period, but he does not feel that the grade-separated interchange was a good long-term solution, and felt it was ill-conceived and would be ugly. He stated that it would cut off access to businesses that it shouldn't and felt it was a waste of money, and he asked them

to reconsider their position on it while doing a study and the other improvements. Mr. Kilmer added that the community would be a better place for it.

Mr. Mark Hammond of the Rio District addressed the Board, stating that he worked at the intersection of Rio and 29 as an employee of a small business, and was concerned about the economic impact of these improvements. Mr. Hammond stated that he had a degree from UVA and 15 years of business management experience, and even a 10% decrease in business activity would put him in jeopardy. He said that it would also impact his wife and five kids, his friends and their families, and could literally throw hundreds of people into poverty. Mr. Hammond stated that he appreciated Mr. Boyd's town hall and the fact that Ms. Mallek attended, but wondered why other Supervisors did not. He added that this was a chance for Mr. Sheffield to stand up for his constituents and say this would do more harm than good, and stop the project before people are put out of work.

Mr. Morgan Butler of the Southern Environmental Law Center addressed the Board, stating that the community was growing and they were feeling some of the pain that went along with that growth. Mr. Butler said that some of their most valuable and important infrastructure was breaking down and needed upgrading; they see it with their stormwater system, their sewage pipes and their roads, and Route 29 was no exception. He stated that there was just no way to make the necessary upgrades without some impacts, so they try to find the best possible solutions that offer the greatest long-term gain for the least amount of pain. Mr. Butler said that SELC has been working to improve the Route 29 corridor and their home community for over two decades, and strongly supported the Route 29 Solutions package, including the Rio overpass. He stated that in looking at the totality of the circumstances and knowing the long and complex history here, the tremendous work the community had done to develop the sensible transportation strategies these improvements would bring to life, the importance of the Rio overpass to the functionality of the parallel road network, and the fact that the need for these projects and the challenges of constructing them would only increase with time, it is clear that they need to keep moving forward. Mr. Butler said that VDOT was working hand in hand with the community to minimize impacts, and would continue doing so moving forward. He stated that this was the best opportunity they may ever see to make meaningful and much needed improvements to their section of Route 29, improvements that would provide benefits to the broadest array of County residents, and to neighbors to the north and south. Mr. Butler added that they should keep the focus on minimizing impacts, but should stay the course and continue moving the community forward.

Mr. Peter Ray of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board, stating that he represented and had owned and developed property along Route 29 – and its financial benefit to Albemarle County cannot be understated. Mr. Ray said that the majority of business owners up and down the corridor have major concerns and questions about the grade-separated interchange, and they need to listen to the business owners – especially the retailers that understand access, impulse buying, and what goes into getting customers in the door. He stated that he owns the property where Goodwill Industries is located, and they were so excited when they were able to locate on a one-acre parcel on Route 29 in Albemarle County at a traffic light, with northbound and southbound access. Mr. Ray said that the store was one of their top two stores out of 36 stores in their entire region, and the hundreds of people benefitting from that store was tremendous – and he urged the Board to take a moment and get on the ground and study the proposal a little bit more. He stated that there was no relief for the property and Goodwill, and if they took away the light and the northbound access, there was no other way to improve that property.

Mr. Jim Plotkin addressed the Board, stating that he was President of Dunbarton Properties, which represents the Albemarle Square Shopping Center. Mr. Plotkin said that he knew something was not right when last February or March, he was told that at least one Supervisor said that the shopping center – which over the past 39 years had paid millions of tax dollars to the County – was believed to be dead. He asked if it was wise to bite the hands that feed them, and said that the Rio grade-separated interchange would be a divisive and destructive blow to 40% of the community's tax base, and they had the power to evaluate alternatives that would be non-destructive. Mr. Plotkin asked the Board to defer the GSI and Rio to do just that, in order to ensure a positive impact on the economy and quality of life of this very special community.

Mr. Jeff Werner of the Piedmont Environmental Council addressed the Board, stating that the PEC had been working on Route 29 for at least the 15 years he had worked there, and had been pushing for solutions there. Mr. Werner said that he had been involved for a long, long time with the traffic studies and analysis and evaluations that have gone into where they are tonight. He stated that he has heard many comments that this was a "last-minute decision" that was forced upon the community, but that was simply not true. Mr. Werner said that he has sat through many meetings and discussions, and there was some very detailed technical analysis with Places 29 that led to some of the decisions being made. He stated that people have said that people would not be able to make a left-hand turn for a mile, but that was simply not true – and very little was actually going to change. Mr. Werner said that the Chamber of Commerce was now saying that they supported this network of streets, whereas just a few years ago the businesses and the Chamber were coming out screaming that they did not want this network of streets, and the things Mr. Lockwood had shown on a map at the Smart 29 meeting a few nights ago were the same things the Chamber had demanded be removed from the map. He added that the comment that

the library would not be accessible off of Rio Road was also not true, and while he respected a lot of the opinions and points being made, he wanted everyone to work from the same set of facts.

Dr. Ed Akiel addressed the Board, stating that he was a dentist who lived and worked near the intersection of Rio and 29. Dr. Akiel said that he did not know much about the studies, but just believed in common sense – and common sense told him that a GSI in this area would destroy a lot of businesses, including his. He stated that they paid a lot of taxes and support the community, and he thinks he might lose patients if this goes through. Dr. Akiel said that he felt sequencing would be a good thing to do, rather than making it an all or none proposition.

Ms. Beth Cox addressed the Board, stating that she worked at ACAC as a personal trainer. Ms. Cox said that she was the parent of three boys, one who was 16, and she was not at all comfortable with them learning to drive in an area where they have to merge into high-speed lanes coming down the center, as it was bad enough already. She stated that she had gone through the intersection six times that day, and had never had to wait at a stoplight more than one cycle, no matter what time of day it was. Ms. Cox said that she grew up in Northern Virginia and had been back there many times, with her children participating in travel soccer, and she had driven over a lot of roads there – enough to know that when you do these kinds of improvements, traffic does not get better, it gets worse, because you increase the traffic flow through the area and create more congestion on the areas around it. She stated that while this may not have been a last-minute decision for the Board, their constituents learned about it last-minute and from their perspective this was being railroaded on them at the last minute.

Mr. Gerald Long addressed the Board, stating that he was a resident of Bentivar and indicating that he and his wife had emailed the Board in support of a small area study at a minimum, which seemed to be the least they could do to comply with their own rules and regulations in terms of how they could conduct their business.

Mr. Jim Hall addressed the Board, stating that he was a resident of Woodbrook and had lived there since 1987. Mr. Hall said that he had attended Mr. Boyd's meeting the previous week and wanted to ask a question about the comments made by Piedmont Environmental Council representatives. He stated that there had been comments made about the fact that these projects had been talked about over time, but the sequencing was not that way. He stated that the sequencing now has the grade-separated interchange as the first thing, but common sense tells you that you do the side parallel road extensions first to help relieve the congestion on 29, and while that was going on, it appeared they could do more study. Mr. Hall said that the community was being told it was "all or nothing," and he did not feel that was right. He said that as a taxpayer and member of the community, he was asking the Board to reconsider – and if nothing else, to reconsider the sequence. Mr. Hall stated that the McIntire Road interchange now has created all kinds of bottlenecks, which will go over to 29 and create major problems for businesses, which is where revenue comes from, and right now they were looking at a school budget that would be \$3 million in the whole.

Mr. Chip Earl addressed the Board, stating that his first visit to Charlottesville was in 1949, and his family had resided here for well over 100 years and had been involved in many of the major projects and happenings during that time. Mr. Earl said that he understood the objections to the "midnight vote," but it brought realization to the bypass project, which the community and the west decided was not for them. He stated that they went through an election cycle and made their feelings known and voted it out, and he respected that. Mr. Earl said that although the project being proposed now may have been around for many years, it was never really a serious consideration for anyone in the public, and no one thought it was ever going to go through. He stated that it was just now becoming a serious project, and they need the time – just like the residents of the west had – to study it and how it would affect the community. Mr. Earl said that he personally felt it would be disastrous and divisive, severing the neighborhood and fracturing the community. He stated that he supported Mr. Boyd's amendments and hoped that they would pause and look at the sequencing, and give the residents of the area the same courtesy that was given to the residents of the west.

Mr. Kevin Carson of Charlottesville Power & Equipment addressed the Board, stating that there had been an abundance of zoning issues his industry has had to go through for the last 17 years with the County. Mr. Carson said that he could not understand why they didn't hold VDOT and themselves to the same standards that they held every business man on an Entrance Corridor to, in this County. He stated that this is a beautiful County – he was born here, owns a business here, and employs people here – but in looking at this project, he sees no brickwork, and little in the ways of trees and shrubbery. Mr. Carson said that he paid a premium to have 29 visibility, and a further premium to adhere to the ARB guidelines, and he wondered if they would also grant the same courtesy and request that the ARB be involved with this project – because if they did, it would no longer be financially feasible.

Ms. Bonnie Falbo addressed the Board and asked them for clarification as to whether they had the ability to renegotiate this with VDOT and whether that was a viable option.

Ms. Dittmar stated that the Board would address her question following the “Matters from the Public” section of the agenda.

Ms. Yanna Gamble of the Rio District addressed the Board, stating that the community became aware of this project going forward, less than a year ago. She thanked Mr. Boyd for looking out for the community instead of personal political interests, and wished she could expect the same from her Supervisor. Ms. Gamble asked all of those in support of the project to stand, and said that she would like them to stand until her two-minute time was up.

Mr. Barry Dofflemeyer addressed the Board, stating that he was a resident of the White Hall District but owned property off of 29. Mr. Dofflemeyer stated that he was a lifelong resident of Albemarle County and the son of two parents who worked hard in this community – one of whom was an educator, who told him that one of the best courses you could take was a civics course, tonight being a grand example of what a civic experience is. He said that it was a privilege to be able to vote, and the most important person you would ever vote for is your local representative. Mr. Dofflemeyer said that while it was a privilege to vote, it was an even larger privilege to serve your constituents, and they have the given right to act – not for, but with the people. He stated that it was really the Board’s duty to act in a civic manner and represent the people in the will of the community, and it was obvious that this was not the will of the community to take the project on in the order that it has been given. He urged the Board to listen to the people and ask themselves whether this is how they wish to be remembered.

Recess. At 8:29 p.m., the Chair closed the “Matters from the Public” section of the agenda, and recessed their meeting. The meeting reconvened at 8:44 p.m.

Ms. Dittmar stated that earlier in the day, the Board had a presentation on Route 29 Solutions, then looked at a draft communications plan, then discussed the role of small area plans. She said that the Board decided that they did not want to entertain a motion until they had heard from the community, and what they want to do now is collate all of what they have learned, and then consider the item at their meeting the following week.

Mr. Boyd said that he would bring up the motion at their February 11 meeting, but said that he did wish to make some comments. He stated that regarding the comments made about two Supervisors being able to stop the grade-separated interchange, what he said at the town hall meeting was that the Board had two representatives on the MPO – and his motion was going to be to direct those two to bring this up at the MPO level, because that was the body that would need to change this in the Long-Range Transportation Plan. Mr. Boyd said that he also wanted to comment on the assertion made by the PEC and SELC that they had been “working on a solution,” when in fact they had been litigating to stop the bypass all these years. He stated that this discussion was not about something he has done or instigated; this was about the issue of the grade-separated interchange; and while they might have mentioned his name from the town hall meeting he hosted, what they were there to do was to let the Board know that there was huge sentiment against doing the GSI. Mr. Boyd said that they may not want to do away with it altogether, but common sense was telling them that it should be left to the last of the sequence rather than making it the first. He suggested that the projects be resequenced to do the parallel roads first, which were designed to take traffic off of Route 29. Mr. Boyd said that Mr. Sheffield felt this would create a confluence there, but common sense did not indicate that – and people who would use John Warner Parkway would not create an extra trip there. He stated that what he has been trying to convey to his colleagues on the Board is that the community was tremendously opposed to the GSI, and the petition signatures total over 10,000 names against doing the interchange first. Mr. Boyd noted that he was not necessarily trying to stop it – he was agreeing with the Smart 29 people to push the pause button or resequence it, and to further study it. He also asked if there was level of service information available on that intersection today, as he has heard it was an F, but also a D, and he wondered where the data was to back that up.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Foley to address the fire rescue safety issue as raised by several speakers, as she felt it was important to have clarified for the public.

Mr. Foley said that staff has done a lot of work on that particular issue, and it was raised for concern a long time ago, so County emergency personnel have been working directly with VDOT on solutions and have developed some for the beginning of this project, and continue to meet to look at other changes necessary going forward to ensure that public safety officials were able to respond in a timely manner. He stated that they had volunteer and career staff both involved in working with VDOT on solutions and that process continues, with solutions already developed to be able to maintain response times in part of that continuous process. Mr. Foley said that staff could provide information on the County’s website on some of those types of things, and would follow up as to how to disseminate that information.

Mr. Boyd stated that he had no doubt that Mr. Foley, County staff and VDOT would work on the best strategies for this, but the “common sense” rank and file guys who run those calls are worried about it, and he was hearing from some of them.

Ms. Dittmar said that the station in question would be from Seminole Trail.

Mr. Foley said that the Chief of Seminole Trail had been involved in these meetings, so perhaps word had not gotten out the station members, and that was probably something else staff needed to do.

Mr. Boyd said that he was fearful that they were saying that these things were going to be figured out.

Mr. Foley said that there was more to it than that, and there were already plans in place for crossovers for emergency services personnel, so they did not have to drive a mile down the road to turn around and come back; and VDOT has allowed some temporary crossovers to avoid that situation as one specific measure. He stated that as the phases of construction change, the conditions on the road would change, so they need to continue to look at that and be sure there is a plan for each phase of the project.

Mr. Boyd said that the best laid plans of people can go amiss sometimes, and it would be problematic if there were problems with an accident that made it so EMS could not get through. He stated that he had no doubt those personnel would do the best possible job to maintain the response times expected in the community, but they cannot figure out all the unknowns out there.

Ms. Palmer said they could not figure them out now either.

Ms. McKeel agreed.

Ms. Mallek said that all of those things would be worked out in advance so there is a whole series of protocols to follow, just as they would do for any other storm event.

Ms. Dittmar stated that it would be wonderful if the Seminole Trail Volunteer Fire Department chief would come talk to them to help reassure them that these measures would be put in place. She stated that any road could experience a shutdown, and Route 250 is a concern to her because it was only two lanes in some spots. Ms. Dittmar said that at one point this year, there were incidents on two different parts of I-64, and those were things they could not predict.

Mr. Boyd said that he and Ms. Mallek were on the Board during the great windstorm one February.

Ms. Mallek said that was "Black Sunday," February 10.

Ms. Dittmar stated that they just want to make sure that people are not in harm's way due to their projects.

Mr. Boyd acknowledged that there was no perfect solution.

Mr. Foley said that the two chiefs could come and answer questions for the Board, and provide specifics about the things that were already in place.

Ms. Dittmar stated that there had been a question about what the authority of the Board was in making decisions like this, and she explained that the funding designated for the Route 29 Solutions package projects was not strictly Albemarle County tax money – it was a compilation of a whole lot of funds from the state and federal government, and was money that could go somewhere else. She said that she had visited the CEO of Luck Stone, Inc. recently in Goochland, and as she was admiring the roads he said that they were built with Albemarle County road money. Ms. Dittmar stated that Albemarle was famous in the Commonwealth for giving away their road funds, and they reaffirmed just this week that the projects were being given to them as a package – which means they cannot just pick and choose the Rio intersection. She said that they could instead say to the state that they want them to take the \$200 million and put it into HB2 and see where it goes. Ms. Dittmar stated that in her district, she was very concerned about Route 250 East and Route 20 South, and it would be many years before there was any money for that. She said that she had asked the MPO how the allocations were made, because she was not able to communicate it due to its complications. Ms. Dittmar said that she was given a package that showed what percentage of funds was in the future that would go to the entire Culpeper District compared to other districts in the Commonwealth, and found that the level was 6.2%, which was the lowest-funded in the state. She said that they would continue to get a trickle, but while they are sitting here trying to figure this out, she still felt a huge risk in losing the funding. Ms. Dittmar said that in June they voted to accept the \$200+ million allotment, and currently they were still working through how to make this the best thing possible for the community. She stated that they would take a vote next week on Mr. Boyd's motion, and they will have had time to think about this. Ms. Dittmar noted that she and Ms. Palmer were heading to Richmond tomorrow, and if they had an opportunity they would talk about this and see if the answer would come back differently – although it had not yet.

Ms. Mallek said that one speaker had asked about who owned the roads and who would control them, and explained that VDOT controlled the roadways and makes decision about them, although localities like the County have prioritization responsibility – but whether those got acted upon in a timely fashion was up in the air. Ms. Mallek stated that the money for Berkmar and the other smaller projects was in the 2025 range, which was a long time from now, and that was because that is how long it takes for those projects to come up to be fundable in the normal sequence of things. She said that the same dynamic held true for the secondary roads in the County, and when she was first on the Board in 2008, the County was getting \$5 million from the state for secondary roads. Ms. Mallek noted that it took years to accumulate the funds necessary to actually do the project, and when it was actively in process and had been approved, it took that long to get the money together and get the project done. She said that she

takes very seriously the concern that they will lose the stake they have today, so she wanted to make sure the other questions regarding that were answered. Ms. Mallek said that someone had also said that roads like Route 29 were considered by the Federal Highway Administration to be “arterials,” and the description of the task of those roads in all 50 states was “mobility.” She stated that in the Route 29 Solutions package, they have the greatest amount of federal dollars going to non-arterial tasks of any project that she is aware of. Ms. Mallek emphasized that they have tremendous focus on side roads, which has shocked representatives from localities further south, and her fear was that if the one intersection that actually qualifies for federal funds, the funding for the roads that were on the fringes of qualifying now such as the Berkmar extension and Hillsdale would not qualify any longer.

Ms. McKeel said that it was important that the Board talk about the relationship between the Comp Plan and the Long-Range Transportation Plan, and how they layer into each other, because it was important for people to understand when they vote on Mr. Boyd’s motion the following week, the Board was not going outside of its process.

Ms. Dittmar explained that one of Mr. Boyd’s concerns was that the Board was following an improper process, and the question was whether they needed to do a small area plan prior to approving the Rio Road grade-separated interchange. Ms. Dittmar stated that staff has explained to them the following: the federal government requires a Long-Range Transportation Plan, which trumps everything pertaining to decision-making because it comes through a process they have done; the state requires that the LRTP be acknowledged in the Comp Plan; the reason that this was important was because the Comp Plan functions as a guideline – not a rule or an ordinance or a law – that suggests how development should take place in the County. She said that there was also a master plan, called Places 29, and in that master plan was to be found something called a small area plan. Ms. Dittmar said that they were in the works of having the small area plan, which was not intended to change the LRTP, but was instead to determine how development around the transportation plan would take place – so they were very interested in how things would develop in the years to come around the Rio Road intersection. She noted that Mr. Foley had shared with the Board that he already had included in his budget the funding for the final portions of the small area plan, and Community Development Director Mark Graham had taken the Board through the things that have already been accomplished.

Ms. McKeel said that if people wanted more information on that discussion, they could listen to the podcast, which started at 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Boyd stated that his takeaway from that discussion was quite different from Ms. Dittmar’s, and there was a way around all of it – just as they had done with the water plan – and they could change those things and mold them, and adjust them accordingly. He said that they did have the right to do that through their representation on the MPO, through long-range planning, etc., and noted that the prior Transportation Improvement Plan did not include the bypass – a prior Board put it on and then it came off. Mr. Boyd said that one of the things that was most discouraging to him was that they would be working around the Comp Plan, because it called into question why they should even have one.

Ms. Palmer said that one of the things he had said was that they were supposed to do the small area plan first, but that was not the case as they could do it concurrently. She emphasized that the purpose of the small area plan, at least in part, was to discourage them from building something that would preclude them from doing those transportation improvements in the future. Ms. Palmer noted that they had actually already done some of the small area plan, part of it through the Route 29 Solutions process, and would continue to work on that – but they were not doing something that was out of their process.

Mr. Boyd said that less than a year ago, there was an entirely different solutions package on the table, but that had all changed and they have adjusted the LRTP and have undone all of that – and that was when this particular solutions package came on board, which now no longer includes a bypass but now includes a grade-separated interchange. He stated that in eight or nine months, they have unraveled the prior solutions package, and they could unravel this if they wanted to listen to what the community said. Mr. Boyd said that the reason he was focused on the small area plan was because this Board was very high on public engagement, but in this case they skipped the process and did not engage the people who live and work in that area in this decision.

Ms. Dittmar stated that they can do things and undo things, but her real focus was whether or not they followed good process – and in this case, they held all of the public hearings required plus more to go through each of those steps.

Ms. McKeel noted that there were seven public hearings.

Ms. Dittmar said that she was aware that some of the people who were before the Board tonight did not come to those public hearings, but those meetings were properly noticed and held – and people came and they spoke. She stated that there were things that they have authority over and things that they don’t, but before they unravel an entire solutions package again, she wants to make sure they will ever see money for roads here.

Ms. Palmer stated that this was actually their third unraveling, because in 2011 the previous package was quickly unraveled, jumping onto the bypass with these associated other parallel roads.

Ms. McKeel said that her thought was isn’t it great how nimble they were to grab \$230 million.

Mr. Boyd stated that the \$230 million was put onto this by the previous administration, based on the previous plan, which they unraveled. He said that it was on a solutions package for which they took out one piece and inserted another, and the \$230 million was still there. Mr. Boyd emphasized that he was not willing to put a perpetual blight on the community for the sake or rolling over for VDOT and agreeing to do whatever they wanted to do.

Ms. McKeel stated that the reality was that VDOT was the transportation department for the state, and Ms. Dittmar had made a really good point about how little money this area had been able to get over the last few years. She said that they needed money for transportation infrastructure, and to continue to convince VDOT or contractors or the powers that be that this community cannot come together to make decisions to move transportation decisions forward plays into the points Ms. Dittmar had raised, and it was very concerning.

Mr. Boyd said that the reason the funding had dwindled down so much was because they would not approve the bypass, and they could verify that by talking to General Assembly members.

Ms. Palmer said that they went through 10 years of nobody in the state getting any money, and they had very bad gridlock with respect to transportation.

Mr. Boyd said that Albemarle was getting \$4-5 million per year, and that dwindled down to \$300,000.

Ms. Palmer said that it was not because of the bypass. She stated that she had a tremendous number of constituents who were in favor of this project, but they did not come out tonight, and they were not on the email list for the Smart 29 group.

Ms. McKeel said that the Secretary of Transportation had said at one point that between Short Pump to the east, Staunton to the west, Danville to the south, and Gainesville to the north, no section of highway carried more traffic than US 29 between 250 and Rio Road, not even I-64. She stated that the Commonwealth Transportation Board has committed \$230 million for a total package of projects, and she would be very concerned if the community decided to band together and jeopardize that amount of money.

Ms. Dittmar asked how much time they might have at their meeting the following week, so that people might be able to listen and come.

Mr. Foley said that there was just one public hearing, along with four items on the agenda, and a few community presentations including the YMCA and the airport director, and then the Community Development Work Program. He stated that 7:00 p.m. would be a good time for people to come. He reiterated that people should go to the website and click on "Solutions 29," which would take them to a page that gave a lot of background on some of the issues raised at this meeting, including the emergency services collaboration with VDOT in developing strategies during construction.

Ms. Dittmar stated that in March they would be looking at the business assistance program recommendations and the ideas that have been researched nationwide and in the Commonwealth, and through one-on-one meetings with a number of business people, as well as a stakeholders meeting that was held.

Ms. Mallek commented that the Weldon Cooper Center had come out with its population projections for the area, which expects that they will continue to grow at about 1.5% population per year, which means about 30,000 people by 2035. She said that the National Highway Transportation Research Council also came out with their projections, which showed a 31% increase in traffic in the corridor. Ms. Mallek said that there were questions about the level of service at the intersection, and she was pretty certain that it was an F.

Mr. Boyd said that there were traffic engineers and people who understood how to read those numbers who said that was not true, and asked if they could produce that information.

Ms. Mallek said that she was certain someone could get that, and stated that whether they were looking at the status quo today or trying to be thoughtful and be ready for new people who come to town, and mitigate the impacts on current residents, the population statistics were facts they needed to consider. She also stated that she was interested to see at the committee meeting she had attended at the legislature the previous Monday to see how gleeful some of the representatives from Northern Virginia were when they saw a disagreement going on in the community, and she heard someone whisper to his neighbor, "My CTB member is getting a call, because I want him ready to grab this money on the 18th of February."

Ms. McKeel noted that the package intends to address issues beyond five or ten years – out to 2040 – and the package goes very well with the population figures that Ms. Mallek had presented.

Mr. Boyd asked if the Board would be willing to hear the presentation from Ian Lockwood, who was an international transportation expert.

Ms. Mallek said that she had shared the presentation with other Board members.

Mr. Boyd said that was not the same as seeing the whole presentation.

Ms. Dittmar stated that she had already attended his briefing.

Mr. Boyd said that was a charrette, which was the beginning of his process, and he had since come up with some alternate plans that are much less costly.

Ms. McKeel noted that his alternative plan would be very destructive for her neighborhood and the Jack Jouett District because it sends all of the traffic down Hydraulic Road, Georgetown Road and Barracks Road.

Mr. Boyd stated that those were just some sketches.

Ms. McKeel said that was what was on paper.

Ms. Dittmar said that she would look at the slides again.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he was not able to rebut some of the misinformation being provided.

Ms. Dittmar suggested that they move on.

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

Item No. 20a. Consideration of Town Hall Meeting Policy.

Item No. 20b. Discussion of Legislative Issues before the General Assembly.

Ms. Dittmar reported that she and Ms. Mallek had been to Richmond to support the business property tax changes and testified on behalf of the County. She noted that Tim Hulbert was present as well. Ms. Dittmar stated that Henrico County had taken exception to what Albemarle was doing, and Mr. Davis along with the Senate committee attorney and Tim Hulbert all worked together, and the legislation was now moving along handily.

Mr. Davis said that it had come out of the Senate committee, and Delegate Toscano's bill had been amended to be the same as Senator Hanger's, and that was being heard this afternoon so he has not heard the result yet, but no problems were anticipated.

Ms. Dittmar reported that three bills were forwarded related to DNA database expansion, all from Albemarle County representatives – Steve Landes, David Toscano and Rob Bell.

Ms. Mallek said that they were debating the funding portion now.

Ms. Dittmar said that a Senator from the eastern part of the state had introduced a bill that would give counties the ability to have a cigarette tax, an admissions tax, and the transient occupancy tax. She stated that the Finance Committee had said that it could not go forward this year, but Henrico County Senator Stosch suggested that they just put a penny on the tax rate. Ms. Dittmar said that she and Ms. Mallek had spoken with Jeff Smith, who was the head of the agency that actually did the stamping on cigarette tax, and his opposition was because each jurisdiction was setting up its own way of doing it, so it was too difficult to administer, but they were working on a model for Tidewater that may be more attractive to the General Assembly.

Ms. Mallek reported that she had spoken in committee regarding Loudoun Delegate Minshu's bill to recognize land use valuation when determining the composite index for funding for schools. She said that it was voted out of committee 4-3, but when it got to the full Education Committee it died, and the big lobbyists from Fairfax and Hanover counties stood up and slaughtered the whole idea. Ms. Mallek noted that the difference in Albemarle's budget would be \$2.9 million for schools just this year.

Ms. Dittmar said that last month when Commonwealth's Attorney Denise Lunsford had come before them about the state's lack of funding for her office and the Board decided to fund those positions, they said that they wanted a letter written to the state every time something like that happened – and the template was done, so she and Ms. Palmer would be delivering that to the General Assembly the following day.

Ms. Mallek asked them to mention during their visit to the capital to mention the importance of being able to grow hemp in Virginia, and Jim Politis of Montgomery County had come before the Board a few years ago when he started this campaign. She said that hemp was a wonderful crop for farmers and was a perennial crop, that did not require plowing up every year, and has a very high return – used heavily in clothing, car interiors, hand lotion, etc. Ms. Mallek said that Congress had approved it at the national level, so now it was up to the states.

Ms. Palmer said that Delegate Farris had sponsored that bill and they were meeting with him in the morning, so they would be sure to congratulate him on that.

Ms. Mallek noted that about eight years ago, JABA was responsible for starting the whole local food discussion, as they were trying to bring more fresh food into their kitchens for their meal plans, and

from that whole study it was determined that an aggregator was needed, and that was how the food hub was born. She stated that this was one of the many things spun off for the community by JABA, as well as the Planning District.

Ms. Mallek asked when the Earlysville Road truck ban was coming up again for discussion. Mr. Foley said that staff would follow up on that.

Ms. Mallek said that she had also received panicked calls from constituents in Crozet whose Comcast phone service had been out for days.

Mr. Davis said that there were two issues: the County did not have a franchise with Comcast, but even if it did, a franchise only regulate the cable television service under federal law, so there is no local regulation of the telephone service of Comcast. He stated that this would be a State Corporation Commission issue, and there was a complaint line on the SCC site that the public could utilize.

Ms. McKeel stated that she has chaired Adopt a Highway for 18 years, and they had held a cleanup event the previous Saturday, and she asked Mr. DeNunzio of VDOT for an inmate clean-up crew for a stretch of the 250 Bypass, which had become so bad that turkey buzzards were flying in to get the garbage. She explained that Mr. DeNunzio told her that the facility they had used to get inmates had been closed, and they were not allowed to use the local jail.

Mr. Foley said that staff would look into it.

Mr. Walker clarified that the closed facility was Camp 10, Craigsville – a state correctional facility – and they had been using an inmate labor force from that facility.

Mr. Boyd and Ms. Mallek asked why they couldn't use the local jail.

Ms. McKeel said that Mr. DeNunzio had told her they could not use them.

Ms. Mallek said that Mr. Boyd could push that at the Jail Board level.

Mr. Boyd said that he would look into that, because Parks & Rec used them a lot and he didn't see why it would be any different.

Mr. Walker said that he would look into it.

Ms. McKeel said that Mr. DeNunzio had indicated otherwise, but regardless of that outcome they needed someone else to help the Adopt a Highway crews.

Ms. Palmer said that Route 20 South has also been bad, and she asked Mr. Foley if litter fine signs could possibly be put up.

Mr. Foley said that the program at the Regional Jail had not been discontinued, but whether VDOT was accessing it was what they could follow up on.

Agenda Item. No. 21. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Foley said that in his report was their schedule for their budget work sessions, including one for February 24 and 3 p.m., but that was now in conflict with an RWSA meeting, so he suggested that the budget work session be moved to 5:00 p.m.

Board members agreed to move the meeting up to 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Foley stated that they would also need to hold a closed session the following week, which was currently not on the calendar, and the Board would need to come in an hour earlier – so they could come in Tuesday at 4:00 p.m., or on Wednesday at 5:00 instead of 6:00 p.m.

Board members agreed to hold the closed session on Wednesday at 5:00 p.m.

February 4, 2015 (Regular Day Meeting)
(Page 65)

Agenda Item. No. 22. Adjourn to February 10, 2015, 5:00 p.m., Auditorium.

At 9:39 p.m., Ms. Palmer **moved** to adjourn the Board meeting to February 10, 2015 at 5:00 p.m.
Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 09/09/2015
Initials: EWJ