

Public Meeting on Boundary Adjustment
Questions (Q), Answers (A), and Comments (C)
July 7, 2015

The meeting held at the County Office Building on Fifth Street began at 5:30 p.m. Lee Catlin presented information on the general area under consideration for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Faith McClintic explained why a community gets involved in economic development and the benefits it can bring. Wayne Cilimberg explained the process used for amending the Comprehensive Plan and the expected review schedule. There were approximately 60 members of the public and 10 staff members in attendance. One Planning Commissioner was present. Four Board of Supervisor members were in the audience to listen. None of the Board members spoke.

Q: In the past, the County has rezoned for certain companies and then we didn't get the company. Will this happen?

A: We are suggesting this place because we need the land to satisfy the needs of our existing businesses. We are trying to set the stage for a future rezoning. Whether the land gets added to the Development Area will be potentially decided at the Sept. 8 Board of Supervisors Public Hearing.

Q: Why wasn't this expansion addressed during the recent Comprehensive Plan update?

A: The new Comprehensive Plan has a strategy to study our inventory of sites which we know has some limitations. We have a business interested that has caused us to need to look at this area sooner.

Q: The Route 29/I64 area is already congested. We need to fix the existing traffic problem. There will be chaos if more traffic is added.

C: VDOT is analyzing this request and will look at it based on the overall system. Once we have a rezoning proposed, a traffic study will be needed.

Q: What's the County's position on building vertically?

A: There are industries that need horizontal space and industries that need vertical space. Our Plan promotes building vertical space and R&D, especially, can use vertical space. If a facility is for production and distribution, most likely it will use horizontal space.

Q: Are we talking about Tyson (poultry processing) or a Google campus?

A: Although food processing is a target market, we aren't thinking about a chicken processing facility. We are talking about our target industries that build on our existing labor force and are dealing with locally produced products. The area lends itself more to small individual sites than one large campus site.

Q: If the optimal tax base is 70% residential and 30% non-residential how does that square with only 52% of the cost of services being provided by residents?

A: While there are more residential than non-residential property owners paying taxes, the residential properties can only pay for about half of what it takes to provide residential services.

Q: How does the state TMDL relate to Moore's Creek into which this property drains? Why not redevelop properties before proposing to expand the Development Areas? We had a lot of industrially designated land, but it was rezoned for residential use.

C: It is true that the Board rezoned a number of properties from industrial use to residential use recently. But, we did an overhaul recently of our zoning regulations to allow for industrial use possibilities. We are ready when owners are ready to talk about redevelopment.

Q: Has the County looked at Tax Increment Financing for redevelopment?

A: We will be looking at all these things in the future. We will have to figure out how to make redevelopment attractive to property owners and business prospects.

Q: Why is the Development Area boundary being considered for expansion without a specific plan? Has that ever been done before?

A: While most Comprehensive Plan amendments, have included specific plans, the Development Area was expanded in the 1990s for NGIC.

Q: If VDOT were to say that the result of this development will create intolerable roads, would the Board still decide to go through with the expansion? The interchange is really bad and so is traffic. No one seems to be taking into consideration the development at Wegmans and what it will do. Can you reassure us that traffic is not going to be worse?

A: We will analyze the impacts at the interchange. As we said, VDOT is also analyzing the request and has to provide comment.

Q: What will ingress and egress be to the area?

A: Access will be from Route 29.

Q: Why are we not looking holistically and community wide at this issue? Why isn't the community involved in the larger area discussion?

A: We are doing this as a parallel process, both this area and overall. These opportunities don't come along every day. In an ideal world, we should do one process rather than two. But right now, we need to be a little more reactive to a business opportunity.

Q: How much of the area is undevelopable?

A: The Planning Division is doing that work right now.

Q: Isn't all of the area going to be flattened if it is designated for industry?

A: Part of our analysis is to find sites that stay out of the environmental resources.

Q: How do we provide for these possibilities without impacting nearby residential properties? Screening would be nice.

A: The property is in the Entrance Corridor and will have to receive ARB review and approval.

C: The transportation system at Stonefield is dreadful. On-street parking makes it impossible for traffic to move. Parking is far away from the stores. This kind of thing is what we could get.

C: We had a lot of concern back in May when it looked like this was a "done deal". Thanks for not rushing it.

C: We are talking about expanding down Route 29 South. We haven't even talked about the inevitable first stop light. We should not jump for this "great" business when we can't even evaluate a tradeoff. This is a big, big decision for the community.

C: As someone who lives in Sherwood Farms and fought over the Redfields expansion, I must say that one of our main concerns is viewscape. We don't want something that is going to impact resale of our properties. We don't want the things we love to be destroyed. All we have is your word. It seems like a food processing company is being considered. If it is a bottle and distribution facility, ok. If it is wheat processing with smells and lots of traffic, that is a problem.

Q: Will you put the maps you showed us on the powerpoint on the web or send to us?

A: Yes.

Q: Are there any objective metrics used to review this proposal?

A: Yes. We evaluate potential impacts to our natural, cultural, and historic resources. We look at availability of infrastructure. We look at transportation impacts. We look at both onsite and off site impacts.

Q: The list of target industries is so broad how could one tell the impact? Can you break down the industries by impact?

A: We will be looking at the variety of potential industries and how they impact the area.

C from Karen Firehock, PC Member: We will be looking at everything that would be allowed at this location.

C: The LI zoning category is way too broad. It would be a lot more useful if we knew what we were talking about. Are we talking about agricultural support or a brewery? What are we talking about?

A: I wish we could share with you more information about the prospect, but, we can't. With a Comp. Plan amendment we can identify who the types of users should be.

The meeting ended at 7:00 p.m. Planning Commissioners and staff invited those present to provide comments to the Planning Commission in addition to attending the July 21 Planning Commission meeting.

**COMMUNITY MEETING ON PROPOSED BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT
JULY 30, 2015 – 5TH STREET COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING**

Presenters: Faith McClintic, Economic Development Director
Elaine Echols, Principal Planner

Staff Present: Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive
Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive
Mark Graham, Director of Community Development
David Benish, Chief of Planning
Susan Stimart, Economic Development Facilitator

Planning Commission: Cal Morris
Rick Randolph
Tim Keller

24 members of the public.

Faith McClintic presented on the economic development aspects of the proposal. Elaine Echols presented on the staff report.

Questions:

- Truck traffic turning onto 64W is dangerous, trucks wind up blocking the left-lane during rush hour. We've been told there's no money to fix the interchange. How can we deal with new trucks in the area if we cannot address the truck issues we already have here?
 - VDOT will advise on a short-term way to address this
 - Long-term there is funding from the General Assembly where transportation projects compete for funding; two heavily-weighted criterion are safety and economic development.
 - Improvements to this interchange are #1 on our funding priority list.
- How would funds (for interchange improvement above) be generated – a tax increase?
 - No, it would be funded by state funds that have already been allocated. The primary source of those funds are the gas tax revenue.
- What is the chronology of this process? When did the first phone call get made? How did we get here?
 - Initially, the scale of the operation was smaller, so a smaller site was being looked at. Over the past two years, the business' needs have changed and now require a larger site, which is why this property is now being looked at.
- Did the County send them this site outside of the Development Area?
 - No.
- Why can't we just bring in businesses that want the Development Area properties we already have?
 - The size and nature of the existing Development Area sites zoned for Light-Industrial do not work well for all industries.

- What about telecommunications and financial firms?
 - Mergers and acquisitions in the baking industry have resulted in a non-stable environment for those firms. Manufacturing also provides more multiplier spending locally, which is not seen as much in financial firms.
- What is the expected average hourly wage at this prospective employer?
 - In line with or above \$25 per hour.
- 70% of the land under study is critical slopes – why is this not seen as a negative for this site?
 - A lot of companies want flat land, some actually like the mountainous terrain. This business likes the proximity to the future park and wants to preserve those slopes.
- How much would water use per day be?
 - ACSA and RWSA confirm that current and future need is within the current capacity.
- Why wasn't this land part of the Comprehensive Plan Update process?
 - The Comprehensive Plan Update is a multiyear process; this business' interest came about so late into the process, it felt too late to include in the main update process. That's why a separate amendment process is being taken.
- Why didn't the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process catch this [need for LI lands]?
 - The County's Economic Development Office is only 6 months old and did not have the opportunity to study land use needs from its perspective.
- How much will taxpayers pay in to utilities, etc?
 - County is quantifying the cost of utility infrastructure needed. Not unusual for a County to provide those basic, core infrastructure. The County will analyze costs and also projected revenues to ensure there's a balance.
- How will this impact our 95% rural/5% urban make-up?
 - There will be a marginal increase.
- When would the analysis of costs vs. revenues occur?
 - During rezoning, this this company doesn't locate here, the County could still choose to this infrastructure piece in anticipation of a future company.
- Are we also looking at sewer capacity?
 - Yes.
- Average wage in Albemarle County is low according to the information Faith presented; it would be helpful to see what the average wage in localities with more LI land is. Is it higher?
- How are staff ensuring due diligence is used in reviewing this proposal while it is part of the same organization as the applicant [the County]?
 - The Planning Commission has looked at this land before. Staff is maintaining its standards of objectivity in the review of this land.
- Can you provide more detailed information on sewer capacity at 10 years out?
- What other raw materials will be needed and where will they source them?
 - It's primarily agricultural products. Staff is working with the business to locate local sources for certain ingredients, where local supply exists. The business is also interested in environmental ways to locally re-purpose its by-products.

**COMMUNITY MEETING ON PROPOSED BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT
AUGUST 12, 2015 – 5TH STREET COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING**

Presenters: Karen Firehock, Planning Commissioner for Samuel Miller District
Liz Palmer, Supervisor for Samuel Miller District

Staff Present: Faith McClintic, Economic Development Director
Elaine Echols, Principal Planner
Jody Lewis, Communications Specialist
Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive

Rick Randolph, Planning Commissioner for Scottsville District, was present also

There were 27 members of the public present.

The following information was provided by Ms. Firehock:

- the process for review of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment from Planning Commission to Board of Supervisors and the role of Planning Commission,
- the reason for the meeting – to get public input and comments about the project, and
- the location of the site, its relationship to the County's Jurisdictional Area for water and sewer, the existing zoning, and the existing land use map
- the issue will come before the PC next week. The PC may approve adding all of the proposed area, some of it, or none of it.

The following information was provided by Faith McClintic:

- When the business prospect came to Albemarle County "shopping", we showed them what we had.
- This company wanted transportation access to get raw materials to facilities and finished products shipped. Their market is UVA and other places.
- The business is very interested in proximity to Hedgerow Park – it has an "outdoor" culture
- Staff talked to the Planning Commission & Board of Supervisors members about jobs and equipment investment
- These things translate into tax dollars

Questions and comments from the public and answers, where they could be provided, are below:

Q: Why even consider changing growth area boundary since we just completed the Comprehensive Plan?

A: The quality of the land – business interest.

Q: Have we looked at the company's balance sheet? Are we certain they have the cash flow?

Q: What incentive has the State offered?

A: This information is not public, but we are aware that the State has offered a package.

Q: Why not just put the property out to bid and see if what we get?

Q: When did the acreage needed go from 25 to 80 acres? Will it continue to snowball?

A: We showed the prospect all of our options in the Development Areas. They asked for land near the interchange. We showed them what was in the Development Area at I-64 and Rt. 29 South. They asked for more land. We showed them the acreage that was adjacent to the Development Areas and told them this might be a possibility, but it would take a Comprehensive Plan change. They came back and said they would like land near there, but further down on Route 29. All of that property is owned by Sweetspot of Albemarle. Sweetspot of Albemarle is the owner, not the developer. The Board initiated the Comprehensive Plan change to consider extending the Development Area whether the prospect was interested.

Q: How much land does this Company need? Is the area for one business or more?

A: The company needs about 30 - 35 acres. More businesses would be expected in this area

C: But you told the Planning Commission that this company wanted the entire area.

A: (Ms. McClintic): I don't think I did, but, if so, I must have misspoken.

Q: Is there water & sewer there right now?

A: No, it would have to be extended.

Q: Who pays for the extensions and any potential upgrades?

A: (Sup. Palmer): There are connection charges that help to pay and multiple business could connect to the line. I have not seen an estimate of the cost.

C: The Comprehensive Plan was just amended and it took several years. This all seems very hurried.

C: The Planning Office has met privately with Commissioners in groups of two. There is a conspiracy taking place to shield the information from the public. This secrecy is distasteful. The government is participating in shielding this information from the public.

C: These activities all seem to be very secretive, but all you have to do is Google breweries and East Coast to find who is looking for a location

C: The Board of Supervisors should stop and take an account of what we have – we should value the DA boundaries and take the position that we use what is inside of the boundaries first.

Responses:

C: (from Sup. Palmer): We do not yet know the tax benefit.

C: (from Mr. Randolph): The Planning Commission & Sup. Palmer have bent over backwards to provide as much information as possible. We are threading a very careful needle. At our last meeting, someone asked, "Why should we trust you (the Planning Commission)?" The answer is that the Planning Commission does not get any direct

benefit from the decision. I provided some of the information that I did at the Commission meeting because I felt an obligation to the community to do so. However, I will not share the name of the company. The company is looking at other communities.

Q: Have the bullet points that were identified by the Commission as being important been added to the Comp Plan?

Q: How would this project (or any potential project here) change/alter the character of the land?

Q: There is a big issue with traffic – we see serious traffic accidents – How many trucks per hour? Are we talking about big impacts or not? We know that VDOT will not do traffic analysis right now.

Q: Do we want an Amazon Distribution Center? How do we quantify traffic impacts?

Q: The Growth Area was specifically created to protect the Rural Area. How does an expansion into the Rural Area help protect the Rural Area?

Q: There a lot of development potential on the properties. Can we ensure that there will be no residential use in the rezoning? Maybe its owner would be willing to commit to that.

C: (Ms. Firehock): The Planning Commission needs to know the development potential of the RA and R1 zoned parcels. What is practical and what is impractical?

Q: (Ms. Firehock): Can the County put conditions on itself if it proactively rezones the property?

A: (Ms. Echols): There are two ways that a rezoning can be initiated: by the property owner and by the elected body, in this case, the Board of Supervisors. The extent to which any conditions could be applied by the Board in a rezoning is something I don't know just yet; however, the County Attorney will need to weigh in if there is a way to do it.

C: (Ms. Firehock): The County is looking to rezone to light industrial.

Q: What could be allowed by right and SP for a light industrial zoning?

A: (Ms. Firehock): I plan to base my decision on what could or couldn't go at this location if it is zoned for light industrial uses.

A: (Ms. Echols): We don't know what the zoning district would be right now. It could be light industrial; it could be a different district. It could be a distinct district that the Board creates that identifies particular uses and development standards.

C: We have no idea right now of where a road would come out onto Route 29.

C: The Planning staff & Planning Commission have been presented a very gnarly problem. Where did the proposal originate?

A: (Sup. Palmer): County (Executive) staff came to the Board of Supervisors and provided information on a potential business prospect that was interested in this location. They asked if the Board wanted to respond. The Board would need to make a decision by September to respond to company's interest.

Q: Why 223 acres, why not just the developable land? Why couldn't the boundaries be drawn to avoid critical slopes, etc.?

A: (Ms. Echols, who showed map from staff report of the proposed land use plan): The second attachment to the staff report shows the land area to be added, the expectations for uses, and the text that would be added to the Comprehensive Plan. It includes the bullet points from the Commission. It shows the areas in critical slopes with a Parks and Green Systems designation and the developable land in purple, representing Industrial land.

Q: Why did this grow from 20 acres to 223 acres?

A: (Ms. McClintic): No one is saying what can happen in RA now which is clearcutting along with other uses.

A: (Sup. Palmer): The company initially was shown X, they wanted Y.

Q: Would the County get proffers if it rezones the property?

A: Only if the owner were to request the rezoning and voluntarily offer certain things.

Q: Why would someone want to proffer anything?

Q: Is there a local incentive package right now?

A: (Ms. McClintic): The County has proposed an incentive package to the Company. Any proposal would have to be vetted by Board of Supervisors – we are setting the stage.

Q: I am worried about actuarial effects. Will the water supply be there when it is needed? Is the Owner going to live long enough to see this through in the future?

C: I am happy to see that there is support for economic development in the County. It is good for us to bring jobs to the area. But, the County should not pay to extend water and sewer for a company. All the rest of us have paid our own way. The property owner should be responsible for the burden of extending utilities. You have to pay your way. This is a fairness issue.

C: This is a “brave new world” we are entering and I am glad that the Board did not push this through to happen on June 10. These are things we have never done before. We have our own staff working for applicant and not for carrying out the Comp Plan. Who is our staff working for? We have never done utility extensions for others. The Board needs to be very clear that it is going to make these kinds of changes.

C: We need to think through what we are willing to do to attract industry.

C: Why not make all the properties industrial to reduce the amount of residential impacts? We could have a lesser impact with a new zoning district.

Q: Can the County rezone property without owner’s consent?

A: (Ms. Echols): Yes, but only under certain conditions. The County Attorney’s office needs to weigh in on the particulars.

C: (Ms. Firehock): I want an official division rights determination for the RA zoned properties.

C: Earlier in this process, it looked like the Board of Supervisors was trying to bypass the public process. I want to apologize for the negative tone of our letters. We were afraid that we wouldn’t have input into this process.

C: We are concerned about our property values. We are concerned that there will be air emissions. This doesn't appear to be a company which will employ existing neighborhoods. It will increase traffic.

Q: How will this area be walkable? [Elaine Echols and Liz Palmer used the maps to show where the walkability locations were proposed]

C: The economic development staff has talked down to us and to the Planning Commission throughout this process. Both the public and the Planning Commission have been trying to get information from Ms. McClintic that she is not providing.

C: An I.T. campus could be good, but a factory and manufacturing are not good.

C: People do not know if this is going to be a net win. Set a process – provide the net figures for costs and benefits and make it public.

C: You have an opportunity to prevent negative impacts now. There should be a relationship to UVA. There should not be pollution. It should fit in with our area. We can control this now. Get all the facts you can get and take your time to make the right decision.

Sup. Palmer asked Ms. McClintic to explain how the Target Industry study reflects the County's desire to align what would fit in the County. Ms. McClintic explained that the 4 targets are:

- IT and Defense
- Food and Beverage Manufacturing – Agribusiness
- Biotech
- Financial Services

These pay better than many of the jobs we have. The object of the game is to grow.

Q: Can we gauge the pollution potential? How do we know if this industry would be a good fit?

A: Our representative from the Regional Partnership for Economic Development visited their west coast facility and believes that this business would be a good fit for our community.

C: Mr. Randolph/Ms. Firehock: The Planning Commission had said they want to be more involved in the dialogue about desired industries.

C: It is easy to calculate what the water needs are. The current business is producing 500,000 barrels/year that translates into 15 million gallons of water. It takes 10 gallons of water to produce 1 gallon of beer.

C: (Ms. Firehock): We do not have a satisfactory answer from the staff report about sewer.

C: (Sup. Palmer): This industry, if it comes, may change the nature of the wastewater being processed at the sewage treatment plant.

Q: (for Mr. Randolph): If this particular amendment had been discussed from the beginning would it have passed muster as part of the Comp Plan?

A: (Mr. Randolph): I don't think so. We spent about 8-10 minutes discussing this particular area. We said things should be left as they were. The Seigs were not interested in having industrial uses on their property. Staff told us that the Sweetspot owner was not interested either. It remains to be seen whether the Planning Commission will recommend any, some, or all of the area to be added to DA.

C: If some amount of money will be offered, why not offer it to someone to use Development Area property more easily?

C: We have always been determined to stay in Development Areas. To look at properties already in the Development Areas is not unprecedented. These are not impossible demands or requests.

C: Why not concentrate on redevelopment?

C: The County needs to identify and develop a more formalized process for next time this happens.

C: I am pro-development w/conditions to ensure that whatever comes will create a positive addition to community.

Q: What does staff recommend?

A: Staff has recommended approval with the qualifications that the Planning Commission asked be in the amendment they will review. The Commission may or may not agree. The Board ultimately makes the decision.

Q: What if the Planning Commission disagrees with staff?

A: The staff does not highlight the difference. The Planning Commission's recommendation is forwarded. Staff's recommendation is in the report. The Board looks at all of these things before deciding.

Q: What is the "vibrant active area" (mentioned in the staff report) and what are the interconnections? What development will come first?

A: (Ms. Echols): The Regional Mixed Use Area is already designated in the Comprehensive Plan – it has been there for many years. If the expansion takes place, it will be important to make sure that the employment area and the mixed use area have a relationship that is mutually beneficial. The mixed use area could provide places for employees to shop and live. Bicycle and pedestrian connections between the two areas would be needed.

Q: Why hasn't the Regional Mixed Use Area developed?

A: There could be any number of reasons. It may not be ripe yet. There is no sewer there yet.

C: Will the sewer being extended and the industry then be the catalyst? Will there be a domino effect causing the northbound property to develop?

A: It is not known which will come first.