

**FINAL ACTION MEMO**  
**Joint County/City Planning Commission Meeting of September 18, 2012**

<u>AGENDA ITEM/ACTION</u>	<u>FOLLOW-UP ACTION</u>
<p>1. <b>Call to Order.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint County/City Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m. by Calvin Morris, Chair– County and Dan Rosensweig, Vice-Chair – City in the County Office Building, Room 241, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA.</li> <li>• Other County Commissioners present were Mr. Dotson, Mr. Franco, Mr. Lafferty, Mr. Loach, Mr. Morris, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Smith, and Ms. Monteith (UVA Architect – Ex-officio).</li> <li>• Other City Commissioners present were Kurt Kessecker, John Santoski, Dan Rosensweig, Michael Osteen, Natasha Sienitsky, Lisa Green, David Neuman (UVA Architect – Ex-officio) and Genevieve Keller, Chair. (Ms. Keller arrived at 5:32 p.m.)</li> <li>• City staff present was Missy Creasy, Planning Manager.</li> <li>• Matt Weaver, Amanda Burbage, and Summer Frederick, with Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission were present.</li> <li>• County staff present was Wayne Cilimberg, Elaine Echols, Greg Kamptner, and Sharon Taylor.</li> </ul>	
<p>2. <b>Other Matters Not on the Agenda</b></p> <p>Carole Thorpe, with the Jefferson Area Tea Party of Charlottesville, spoke in response to an article published in Charlottesville Tomorrow on Friday, September 7 (written by Sean Tubbs) entitled “TJPDC livability planners to be let go early”. (See Attachment A – letter submitted by Carole Thorpe, Jefferson Area Tea Party dated Tuesday, November 18, 2012 – date on bottom Tuesday, September 18, 2012 AOL: Patriotista)</p>	
<p>3. <b>Consent Agenda</b></p> <p><b><u>Approval of Minutes of County Planning Commission</u></b> – June 26, 2011</p> <p><b>APPROVED CONSENT AGENDA</b>, by a vote of 7:0.</p>	<p><u>Staff:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize Minutes for Signature</li> </ul>
<p>4. <b>Work Session</b></p> <p>a. <b>Joint City/County Planning Commission - Livability Project - Joint Goals (Summer Frederick)</b></p>	<p><u>Staff:</u></p> <p>Refer to comments and suggestions noted in <b>Attachment 1</b> in further work on the Livability Project Joint Goals. No formal action required.</p>

<p>The Commissions received staff's presentation, took public comment, and commented on the information provided. Staff was asked to take the Commission's comments into development of joint goals for public review at community meetings in October. No formal action taken. The comments and suggestions are outlined in <b>Attachment 1</b>.</p>	
<p>5. <b>The joint meeting of the City and County Planning Commissions was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.</b></p>	
<p>6. <b>NEW BUSINESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
<p>7. <b>OLD BUSINESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
<p>8. The Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting adjourned to September 25, 2012, 6:00 p.m., Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.</p>	

**Attachment 1 – Joint City-County Goals for One-Community/Livability Project**

## Attachment 1

### Joint City-County Goals for One-Community/Livability Project

The Planning Commissions held a work session to set general direction and obtain feedback on the following issues: Livability Questionnaire and Joint Goals.

#### Questionnaire Discussion

Matt Weaver made a presentation on the findings of the Livable Communities Questionnaire Report. Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- Is there was a link between the questionnaire and the joint goals to be discussed later in the meeting? Staff replied that the comments from the workshop series and the questionnaire were used to help shape the joint goals.
- Is it possible that the data is skewed? The small sample size may not be a representation of the population.
- Focus on the City and County data only, rather than include data from the surrounding localities.
- Don't eliminate the outlying counties – their residents have an impact on transportation in the Albemarle/Charlottesville area.

The joint commissions thanked Mr. Weaver and TJPDC staff for the information.

#### Joint Goals Discussion

Summer Fredrick gave a presentation about work leading to the creation of the joint goals and said that she would be asking the following questions for each of the eight areas:

*Is goal language appropriate?*

*Does proposed language cover all areas we discussed?*

Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- The goals need more detail and should reflect more specifically the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County.
- The “high level” view is appropriate.

Staff commented that all of these goals are in the Comprehensive Plans now. They were provided for context with the strategies.

- Have a section in the comp plans to address “One Community” and the statements about what this joint effort means for the City and the County.
- Perhaps formation of subcommittees of the Commission should work through specific wording in each goal area. There was general agreement with this suggestion.

The Joint Commissioners thanked staff for providing the information.

#### **Economic Development**

Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- Provide a better definition of economic “connections” as the relationship between the City and County. The following example was given: Agribusiness in the County is about growing the crops and maintaining the open space where as in the city agribusiness refers to the marketplace or where the goods are sold.
- Provide a goal pertaining to the upward mobility of the workforce, allowing people a path out of low wage jobs.

Change the term, “environment” as it can be construed as “natural environment” or “context for everything we do”. For clarity, commissioners offered a suggestion of “foster a culture of growth.” replace “foster an environment that supports a range of businesses in targeted employment sectors.”

### **Entrance Corridors**

Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- Change to the term “visual integrity” to something different in order to be clear on the principles of the Entrance Corridors, emphasizing functionality.
- Find ways to articulate more shared guiding principles in the Entrance Corridors rather than just providing similar language.

### **Environment**

Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- Change the term “Urban Areas” to Development Areas to better associate the developed portions of the County with the City.
- Include the Watershed Protection areas of the County into the joint goals given the importance of drinking water supply to both City and County residents.
- Add a goal for energy efficiency.
- Consider expanding the list of shared waterways to include all of Albemarle County and the City rather than just the Urban Areas.

Several Commissioners noted that UVA, the City, and the County were working well together on the TMDL issues.

### **Land Use**

Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- Provide a better definition for the term “destination” in relation to the Rivanna River. This phrase can mean different things to different people.
- Add “Limit Rural Area Development” to the Land Use goals as it was stated as a priority in the Questionnaire findings.
- Efforts to coordinate land use and infrastructure should be applied to all City-County boundary neighborhoods not just in Woolen Mills.

### **Parks and Recreation**

Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- Include a statement about where parks should be located and how people will access them.
- Add a statement that acknowledges federal, state, and private facilities and coordination efforts with those entities.
- Why do the joint goals only address Parks and Recreation and not Community Facilities as a whole?
- Look into possible coordination with UVA to use university facilities.

### **Transportation**

Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- Community education on transportation options are needed such as an upgraded CHART slideshow.
- End the vision statement after the word “option” as there are many reasons to promote regional multimodal transportation options.

- Add a bullet noting the need for improved rail and air travel options.
- Mention UVA in promoting multimodal opportunities as the university has a large impact on traffic and transportation.

### Public Comment

The following comments came from the public:

Tom Olivier, - representing the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club, said that Albemarle County and City of Charlottesville are one community. The joint goals should have sustainability as a high level goal. Mr. Olivier said that population growth is not sustainable and there should be support for local assessments of biological capacity. Mr. Olivier said that economic development should focus on better career paths for the under privileged. (Attachment B – Statement From the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club to a Meeting of the Albemarle County and City of Charlottesville Planning Commissions Regarding Goals for Comprehensive Plans of Both Localities dated 9-28-2012)

Diane Weber – resident of Keswick, stated that no conclusion can be drawn from the questionnaire report. The report cannot be used because it's not scientific. There was a narrow list of priorities and there was no way to reject the priorities on the questionnaire. If the participant was allowed to reject or give a negative score to the priority it would have allowed a comparison against the favorable priorities. None of the goals should be taken seriously. She said that she believed the survey should not be used.

Dr. Charles Battig – said that the American Planning Association's article on the Benefits of Growing Sustainably/Smart Growth demonstrates that this pattern of development is not appropriate. He said that the questionnaire was based on HUD's and TJPDC choices of topics. He said it was shallow and statistically lacking, the sample size was ludicrously small, and the questionnaire was seriously flawed. (Attachment C – Statement to Planning Commission Members of Charlottesville and Albemarle County from Charles Battig, M.D., VA-Scientists and Engineers for Energy and Environment Albemarle County dated September 17, 2012)

Charles Winkler – city resident and representative of the Tea Party, said that he has concerns over lack of scientific validity. He said he attended a meeting of the Sierra Club where an individual supplied people with pre-filled out questionnaires. (See Attachment D – One Community Priorities Questionnaire that Mr. Marshall passed out for public use submitted by Mr. Winkler.)

Carol Thorpe, former chair of the area Tea Party said that the sample size is miniscule. She said that she was a champion for the protection of property rights. She asked how the commissions would integrate to protect private property rights into the Comprehensive Plan.

Jim Moore – business analyst and city resident, said that the questionnaire was defective and should not to be used for establishing priorities. He said that the collection of data was flawed.

Bill Emory – said that he embraced the idea of the waterfront. Richmond is undergoing a revitalization effort focused around the James River. He said there needs to be more specific language for the Rivanna River. Objectives and policies protect resources, goals do not. The City staff has an example of work flow.

Audrey Wellborn – county resident and member of the community team for the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, said that she has been concerned all along about the 1998 Sustainability Accords. She wondered how the proposed goals and strategies tie into sustainability plan. She said that the questionnaire could have been easier to fill out. She was concerned about the sampling size; small size and where the questionnaire was distributed. She said that she has spoken with many County residents who have been alarmed about the Sustainability Accords. She said that she is a strong proponent of private property rights.

### **Conclusion**

The Commissioners asked for stronger language for the goals and for the goals to represent the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County. Interdependence of the goals of two localities is to be emphasized

in order to create goal language that complements one another rather than providing verbatim language for both localities.

Next Steps:

- **Fall Outreach Series**

**save the date!** 

# one community conversations

Join staff from the **Livable Communities Planning Project** for a discussion about shared community planning goals for Charlottesville and Albemarle County. The same information will be discussed at each meeting, so pick the location that is most convenient for you! **All meetings will run from 6-8 pm and are open to all.**

**Visit [1-community.org](http://1-community.org) for directions and more detailed information.**

**Wednesday, October 3**  
CitySpace (100 5th Street NE)

**Thursday, October 11**  
JABA (674 Hillside Drive)

**Wednesday, October 24**  
The Lodge at Old Trail  
(330 Claremont Lane, Crozet)

**Thursday, October 25**  
Martha Jefferson Hospital  
(500 Martha Jefferson Dr.)

many plans  
**one COMMUNITY**  
1-community.org

- **Continued conversations**
- **Winter Joint Planning Commission Meeting**

Attachment A  
PC Meeting 9-18-2012

Respectfully submitted by Carole Thorpe  
Jefferson Area Tea Party  
Tuesday, November 18, 2012

I am here to speak in response to an article published in Charlottesville Tomorrow on Friday, September 7 (Sean Tubbs) entitled "TJPDC livability planners to be let go early".

Written by reporter Sean Tubbs, I would like to credit him as much of my this information included in my statement comes directly from his article.

Reported Sean Tubbs stated; *"Two temporary employees of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission hired to help update the Albemarle and Charlottesville comprehensive plans will leave their jobs seven months earlier than expected as money from a \$1 million federal grant begins to run out.*

*A third has already left the TJPDC to take another job."*

TJPDC Executive Director Stephen Williams told the TJPDC that he and Chief Operating Officer Billie Campbell made a math error when they factored how much TJPDC staff time would go to the project.

Mr. Williams said the TJPDC has spent 85 percent of its allocation to date.

From the beginning, this has been advertised as a 3-year project, which the project's own web site bears out.

No doubt this is an embarrassing situation for Mr. Williams, and I suppose it is human nature to seek a scapegoat. Apparently, he thinks he has found one in the Jefferson Area Tea Party. I was the chairwoman of the JATP during the time he cites as a "four-month controversy", so I am here to set the record straight for you.  
|

The article continues: *"When the grant was announced, members of the Jefferson Area Tea Party expressed their opposition to the plan. Williams told the board that the controversy resulted in additional internal expenses.*

*"We had some issues in the first four months where we had quite a bit of controversy here in the area with regard to the project," Williams said. "We ended up charging a good bit of my time beyond what we had originally proposed to charge."*

*In all, Williams said he allocated around \$15,000 from the grant to cover the extra time he spent dealing with the controversy..."*

Presuming if by "the first four months", Stephen Williams means roughly from February 1, 2011 (when the \$999,000.00 HUD grant officially went into effect) until

Tuesday, September 18, 2012 AOL: Patriotista

June 8, 2011 (when the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors held a public hearing and actually VOTED to give their approval for the grant), then Mr. Williams is very mistaken about the "controversy" he attributes to the Jefferson Area Tea Party.

As the chairwoman of the JATP during that time, I can state with authority that our group was not even aware of the grant until April. Yes, we made statements opposing the agenda of Sustainable Development to the Board of Supervisors and the media during February and March (and also held a public forum with American Policy's Tom De Weese and Dr. Charles Battig on March 17), but our focus was on U.N. Agenda 21 and ending the County's dues-paying membership in ICLEI - International Council for Local Environmental Issues.

At no time during the first two of "the first four months" were we engaged with anyone about the HUD grant.

By record and according to BOS meeting minutes, Dr. Battig first made mention of the HUD grant in his remarks at their April 4 meeting. And I received my first knowledge of the grant via an invitation to the 1-Community "Kick Off" event in the County Office Building (which I attended) on April 27.

So with JATP involvement occurring from April 27 through June 8, Mr. Williams may only accurately claim a total of 43 calendar days of "controversy" during the time he states in the article.

But even if he COULD attribute explanation for a full four months of charged time related to the JATP, his stated amount of extra charged salary time still seems wildly unbelievable.

The article states --

"We had some issues in the first four months where we had quite a bit of controversy here in the area with regard to the project," Williams said. "We ended up charging a good bit of my time beyond what we had originally proposed to charge."

In all, Williams said he allocated around \$15,000 from the grant to cover the extra time he spent dealing with the controversy..."

\$15,000.00 allocated to cover Mr. Williams extra time spent? Really?

On TJPDC's "Many Plans" web site, you can see among the various grant-related documents that Mr. Williams, as Executive Director, was down for a pay rate of \$59.40 per hour plus benefits.

Tuesday, September 18, 2012 AOL: Patriotista

For the sake of illustration, let's round it to \$60.00 per hour. Mr. Williams would have had to charge 250 hours of work - or over six weeks of 40 hours per week! - to add up to \$15,000.00. That six weeks is the total of our actual 43 calendar days of involvement...or six full weeks, including weekends, plus one day.

Without diminishing the effectiveness of the JATP, this is inconceivable.

I think it is reasonable to expect an open accounting by Mr. Williams to both the County and City governments as well as the public to back up the claims he makes in this article. We all deserve to know more about his "math error" and we should be concerned about how this federal grant has been administrated.

I believe that HUD and the Federal Government will not be amused.

Tuesday, September 18, 2012 AOL: Patriotista

Attachment B  
PC 9-18-12

**Statement From the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club  
To a Meeting of the Albemarle County and City of Charlottesville Planning Commissions  
Regarding Goals for Comprehensive Plans of Both Localities  
9-18-2012**

Good evening. I'm Tom Olivier and I am speaking on behalf of the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club. Our organization's membership area includes both the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County. With many members from both localities, we are keenly aware of the both the shared needs of the City and County and the complementarity of landscape resources the two localities provide.

We see Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville as components of a single community. We support a joint vision and goals for the two localities. Last year we proposed a joint vision for the comprehensive plans of both communities. A copy our vision is reproduced on the reverse of our statement. Today we would like to offer a few recommendations on joint comprehensive plan goals:

1. Sustainability should be a high-level goal. Without sustainability we have no good future.
2. Research by Advocates for a Sustainable Albemarle Population (ASAP) shows that the existing Albemarle-Charlottesville population already consumes more biological productivity than local open spaces can provide. ASAP research also has shown that population growth reduces ecosystem services generated by our landscape and reduces water quality. Ongoing growth of our population is not sustainable. If we truly plan to be sustainable, stabilization of the local human population should be a goal.
3. We urge that local comprehensive plans support regular assessments of the state of our pursuit of sustainability. In particular, we recommend that our plans call for 1) regular estimates of our community's ecological footprint relative to our landscape's 'biological capacity' 2) regular evaluations of ecosystem services generated by our landscape. The ASAP studies I have mentioned describe methods.
4. Finally, we urge that economic development policies explicitly focus on providing better career paths for lower income residents. We believe our economic policies should focus on the acute needs of our working poor, not the high-tech sector, which seems so exciting to some segments of our community.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to future comprehensive plan work sessions.

June 14 2011



**Proposed Comprehensive Plans Vision Statement  
For the City of Charlottesville and County of Albemarle**  
*From the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club*

---

## **A SUMMARY OF OUR VISION**

### **Underlying Values**

We value a community of diverse individuals and groups who adhere to principles of sustainability, justice, equity and respect for free speech. We cherish individuals, our cultural environment and our natural environment. We recognize our obligation to live within limits of the natural environment. We believe governments, businesses and voluntary organizations should promote access to the necessities of life for all residents. We regard the values and elements of this vision as interconnected and necessary.

### **Our Envisioned Community**

We envision our community as one in which the values above are realized in:

- 1) The lives of individuals with:
  - a) Respect for residents of all races, nationalities, religions and sexual orientations.
  - b) Safety and equal justice for all residents.
  - c) Equal opportunity for all residents to help plan and implement this vision.
  - d) Promotion of healthy communities by minimizing the use of toxins.
  - e) Availability of safe, healthy food for all residents.
  
- 2) The cultural environment with:
  - a) Open and accountable governments.
  - b) Recognition by all of obligations to the common good.
  - c) Quality educational opportunities for students of all vocations and ages.
  - d) Good health care for all residents.
  - e) Provisions for ample affordable housing for low-income residents.
  - f) An economy that provides meaningful and rewarding jobs for all workers.
  - g) Provisions for efficient public transportation and alternatives to the automobile (including bicycles).
  - h) Diverse recreational opportunities for all.
  
- 3) The natural environment with:
  - a) Active protection of essential natural resources (including air, water, natural areas).
  - b) Maintenance of stable or near-stable human population size.
  - c) Commitment to reduction of per capita energy consumption.
  - d) Strong reliance on renewable energy resources.
  - e) Promotion of sustainable agriculture.

Attachment C  
9-18-2012  
PC Minutes

Planning Commission Members of Charlottesville and Albemarle County:

I spoke before you at your joint meeting last April 18, 2012. In the interim, the American Planning Association published a paper which, according to its authors, was a first time, scientific examination of the "taken-for-granted" benefits of smart growth planning. The Journal of the American Planning Association published the May 2012 paper "*Growing Cities Sustainably*" by M. Echenique et al which concludes that:

*"The current planning policy strategies for land use and transport have virtually no impact on the major long-term increases in resource and energy consumption. They generally tend to increase costs and reduce economic competitiveness. The relatively small differences between options are overwhelmed by the impacts of socioeconomic change and population growth...*

*Smart growth principles should not unquestioningly promote increasing levels of compaction on the basis of reducing energy consumption without also considering its potential negative consequences. In many cases, the potential socioeconomic consequences of less housing choice, crowding, and congestion may outweigh its very modest CO<sub>2</sub> reduction benefits."*

This evening you are being presented the results of a HUD funded, TJPDC grant seeped in sustainability and smart growth dogma from the 1998 era. The results of the APA paper were too late to influence the mind-set of the TJPDC effort; however, you now have the benefit of more objective evidence and reasoning.

The results of this livability survey represent their conclusions to date, based on their pre-selected and defined menu of choices. They are being offered as valid evidence to implement the 1998 "Sustainability Accords," make changes in the comprehensive plans, and enact changes in zoning and other codes. In your consideration of their evidence presented to you, please note how shallow and lacking in statistical sampling validity the results are.

The population of Albemarle County is 100,553 (2011 est. U.S. Census). The number of County respondents to the livability survey, as reported, is 244. This represents a sample size of 0.24%. The population of Charlottesville is 43,511. The number of Charlottesville City respondents to the livability survey is 183. This represents a sample size of 0.4%. Not

only are these sample sizes ludicrously small to be accepted as legitimately representing County or City views of their citizens, they are internally flawed.

The public participation mechanism was open to all who wished to take part. This was literally democratic, but did not generate a statistically valid, un-biased, representative cross-section of public opinion. Most anyone could go on-line and complete the survey; most anyone could contact like-minded friends and request that they also complete the survey. Do you want more bike trails? Just make sure your bike buddies take the survey and check yes on that item. Do you value private property rights? Just make sure that your buddies take the survey and check yes to that option. The survey results are no more than the sum efforts of random survey-voters and special interest group lobbying. I myself participated as a representative for a special interest group. The definition of livability in this open-ended process was limited only by the imagination and number of people motivated to take part. No one spoke for or represented the average citizen burdened with more mundane daily affairs, and unable or unwilling to take time out to participate.

The TJPDC livability report touts the number one finding as "limit the rural area development." Buried in the charts and graphs, and the slicing and dicing of survey responses are those results putting "*protect private property rights*" and "*decrease regulation*" at the top and near top. These two categories were added during the survey process at the request of survey participants. Could one be for protecting private property rights and decreasing regulation while at the same time voting to limiting rural area development?

*Charlottesville-Tomorrow* reported recently that the TJPDC is now running low on its appropriated funds for this grant. The original, official-grant timeline worksheet shows tasks 3 and 4 continuing into winter 2013. Will the lack of funds now result in a truncating of these essential components? Will a considered analysis process be replaced by a rush to pre-determined conclusions and recommendations? Even though the comprehensive plans are advisory only, any proposed changes deserve reasoned consideration.

The draft comprehensive plan "joint vision" submitted for your consideration by this group is worded broadly, and loaded with planning platitudes. Who shall define such terms as "a more compatible appearance," "green neighborhoods," "ensure an appropriate range of housing choices," "create neighborhoods and places which allow for residents to live...", "provide community education regarding transportation options."

The person responsible for adding "increase tree canopy in the urban areas" seems to have not noticed what happens when that city tree canopy crashes down in a storm, and takes down roofs and power lines.

Although "protecting private property rights" and "decrease regulation" were top rated items in the survey, not one mention appears in the "vision" of the TJPDC. The **Land Use** section tellingly uses the word "allow." It calls for Land Use to "enhance quality of life." Who is deciding what quality of life is and who is deciding that it needs enhancing? Yesterday we celebrated "Constitution Day." That Constitution defined the right of individual responsibility and freedom of choice.

Private property owners are taxed off their land, though the State does offer the lure of conservation easements and some up-front cash to deprive future generations of freedom of choice in land use. Private property owners are relegated to serfdom in the service of the State or environmentalist ruling class. The current law suit in Fauquier County illustrates what happens if a tenant on a conservation easement property dares hold a birthday party without paid permission from the authorities, or sell produce from a neighboring farm. What may one do on one's nominally own property without permission from the "king"?

In closing, I ask how shall the public evaluate any claims being made by a group of planning experts who seem not to be able even to plan ahead with their own funds? How can you make legitimate policy decisions based on this pseudo-survey? UVA does offer a course on working the "grant money machine,"...time for a refresher course?

Charles Battig, MD  
VA-Scientists and Engineers for Energy and Environment  
Albemarle County September 17, 2012

Community Priorities Questionnaire

Attachment D  
Charles Winkler PC 9/18/12 Monday

This questionnaire was created by the Livable Communities Planning Project to determine what issues are most important to local residents in planning for the future of our community. Please take a moment to let us know what you think. All three sections must be completed to be included in the final results.

1. Where do you live? (circle one) Charlottesville Albemarle County Other \_\_\_\_\_

2. The following issues have been identified as important by local residents who have participated in the Livable Communities planning process. From the entire list below, please rank the top ten issues you believe are most important in planning for our community's future, with 1 being most important. Use the additional space provided if you wish to include other issues in the ranking. Use each number 1-10 only once.

Community Facilities

- \_\_\_ Expand Police Force
- \_\_\_ Expand Fire Department
- \_\_\_ Expand Emergency Response
- \_\_\_ Improve Library Facilities
- \_\_\_ Improve Water and Sewer Utilities

Historic Resources

- \_\_\_ Increase Community Education
- \_\_\_ Coordinate Preservation Activity
- \_\_\_ Adopt Historic District Ordinance
- \_\_\_ Encourage Re-Use and Rehabilitation of Historic Structures

Transportation

- \_\_\_ Create Connected Transportation Network
- \_\_\_ Improve Road Condition
- \_\_\_ Expand Transit Network
- \_\_\_ Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips
- \_\_\_ Improve Pedestrian Facilities
- \_\_\_ Improve Bicycle Facilities

Economic Development

- \_\_\_ Increase Workforce Development Efforts
- \_\_\_ Increase Business Opportunities
- \_\_\_ Diversify Regional Economy
- \_\_\_ Promote Small Business Development
- \_\_\_ Increase Tourism
- \_\_\_ Encourage Public/Private Partnerships

Housing

- \_\_\_ Increase Low-Income Affordable Housing
- \_\_\_ Increase Workforce Affordable Housing
- \* 7 Develop Balanced Housing Type Mix
- \_\_\_ Promote Housing Accessibility for All Ages and Abilities

Other

- \_\_\_ Improve Transportation Network Safety
- \_\_\_ Promote Regional Transportation Projects
- \_\_\_ Increase Downtown Parking
- \_\_\_ Improve Streetscapes
- \_\_\_ Promote Rideshare and Travel Demand Management

Environment

- \_\_\_ Improve Water Quality
- \_\_\_ Improve Air Quality
- \* 8 Increase Energy Efficiency
- \* 9 Preserve Biological Diversity
- \* 9 Maintain Rural Tree Canopy
- \* 9 Preserve Rural Forested Areas
- \* 5 Protect Natural Resources
- \* 2 Encourage Sustainable Development
- \* 6 Expand Trails & Greenways
- \* 6 Protect Open Space
- \_\_\_ Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Land Use

- \* 4 Limit Rural Area Development
- \_\_\_ Promote Mixed Use Development
- \_\_\_ Increase Urban Residential Densities
- \_\_\_ Encourage Non-Residential Development
- \_\_\_ Create Vibrant Urban Centers
- \_\_\_ Promote Rehabilitation and Re-Use of Existing Structures
- \_\_\_ Encourage Strong Neighborhoods
- \_\_\_ Promote Infill Development
- \_\_\_ Align Zoning and Designated Future Land Uses

3. Please initial to confirm that to the best of your knowledge, you have completed this survey only once. fm



Thank you for your input! Please mail or hand deliver completed survey to the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, 401 East Water Street, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

- \* 3 Protect Private Property Rights
- \* 10 Limit Regional Growth
- \* 10 Create Measurable Goals
- \_\_\_ Consider Economic Feasibility of Goals
- \_\_\_ Decrease Regulation
- \* 1 Incorporate "sustainability" as a major theme
- \* 2 identify an optimal sustainable population size (city?) to guide planning