An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on September 19, 2017, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 241, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from September 13, 2017.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Ms. Liz A. Palmer (arrived at 11:30 a.m.), Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Mr. Rick Randolph, and Mr. Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Interim County Executive, Doug Walker, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order.

Charlottesville City Council Present: Mr. Bob Fenwick, Ms. Kathy Galvin, Mr. Mike Signer and Ms. Kristin Szakos.

City Staff Present: City Manager, Maurice Jones. Assistant City Manager, Mike Murphy, and City Attorney, Craig Brown.

The Board of Supervisors meeting was called to order at 10:09 a.m., by the Chair, Ms. McKeel.

The City Council meeting was called to order at 10:09 a.m., by the Mayor, Mr. Signer.

Ms. McKeel then introduced staff present and the presiding Security Officer.

Agenda Item No. 2. Regional Transit Partnership.

Item No. 2a. Background/Overview of proposed Regional Transit Partnership.
Item No. 2b. Consideration of Memorandum of Understanding.
Item No. 2c. Discussion of RTP Member Appointments.

_____

The following proposed document was provided to the two bodies for discussion:

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON THE
JEFFERSON AREA REGIONAL TRANSIT PARTNERSHIP (RTP)**

This agreement is made and entered into as of September __, 2017, by and between the Charlottesville- Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization hereinafter referred to as the MPO, the City of Charlottesville hereinafter referred to as the CITY, the County of Albemarle hereinafter referred to as the COUNTY, JAUNT, Inc hereinafter referred to as JAUNT, with JAUNT and Charlottesville Area Transit together hereinafter referred to as the PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS, and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission serving as planning and administrative staff to the MPO, hereinafter referred to as the TJPDC.

WHEREAS, in 2016, the Planning and Coordination Council (PACC) asked TJPDC to review and recommend opportunities for improved communication, coordination and collaboration on transit matters; and,

WHEREAS, the TJPDC completed work on a Regional Transit Coordination Study, where the main recommendation from this study was to establish a Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) hereinafter referred to as the PARTNERSHIP, consisting of an Advisory Board and whose charge is to provide a venue for continued communication, coordination and collaboration between transit providers, localities and other stakeholders; and,

WHEREAS, City Council and the Albemarle Board of Supervisors held a joint meeting on February 14th, 2017, where both bodies voted to support development of the PARTNERSHIP and asked TJPDC to develop an MOU; and,

NOW THEREFORE, be it recognized and agreed that the MPO, CITY, COUNTY and JAUNT hereby establish the Jefferson Area Regional Transit Partnership (RTP), in accordance with the following articles.

Article 1
Staffing, Funding and Boundaries

The MPO is responsible, as the lead, for staffing and programming for the PARTNERSHIP, with Section 5303 program funding from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT). Funding will be a regular item in the MPO's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The PARTNERSHIP's program area is limited to the Charlottesville-Albemarle metropolitan transportation planning area (MPA) that includes the CITY and the urbanized portions of the COUNTY.

Article 2

Function and Authority

The PARTNERSHIP will be an advisory board that provides recommendations to CITY, COUNTY, PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS and other stakeholders, such as the University of Virginia (UVA). The PARTNERSHIP shall not have any inherent decision-making powers and does not supersede management over the PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS.

Article 3
Membership and Voting Structure

The composition of the PARTNERSHIP may change with time, as the Advisory Board meets and identifies an improved membership structure. At a later date, the Partnership may extend to the University of Virginia, surrounding counties and towns, as needed. Expansion of Advisory Board members will require written amendments to this MOU. The PARTNERSHIP roster includes voting and non-voting membership. Each voting member is permitted one vote on all matters addressed by the PARTNERSHIP. All individuals on the Advisory Board have equal voting powers, with no weighted privileges given to any members.

Voting membership includes seven representatives, including:

- Charlottesville City Council – *two representatives*
- Albemarle Board of Supervisors – *two representatives*
- JAUNT Corporation Board – *two representatives*--one urban & one rural representative with at no time having both serve from the same governmental jurisdiction
- Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) – *one representative*

There shall also be a non-voting representative as designated by the PARTNERSHIP.

The designating body of each member locality or agency, having appointed the appropriate number of representatives to the PARTNERSHIP, as indicated in this ARTICLE, whether voting or nonvoting, may appoint an alternate member(s). Voting privileges for alternates shall be the same as for the regular member in the absence of the regular member.

There are no set term-limits for members of the PARTNERSHIP Advisory Board. Each member locality or agency shall reassess membership to the PARTNERSHIP, according to their own processes.

Article 4
Meeting Schedule and Bylaws

The PARTNERSHIP will set a meeting schedule that is coordinated with the MPO Policy Board meeting schedule. PARTNERSHIP meetings will be bimonthly, during off-months from the MPO Policy Board. The PARTNERSHIP shall convene at least four times in a given fiscal year.

This MOU will serve as the main guiding documents for the PARTNERSHIP. The PARTNERSHIP may adopt bylaws, to aid in management of meetings. Unless otherwise determined by the PARTNERSHIP, TJPDC will facilitate and manage meetings. Voting and parliamentary procedure will be conducted according to simplified Robert's Rules of Order.

Article 5
Deliverables and Roles

As recurring responsibilities, the PARTNERSHIP will be responsible for the following:

- *Building the CITY/COUNTY Relationship.* The PARTNERSHIP will help the region build relationships and momentum for future successes.
- *Create a formal means of sharing information*. Created by an MOU, the PARTNERSHIP will create and maintain a formal mechanism for exchanging information between transit providers, localities and other stakeholders.
- *Address pressing issues immediately.* The PARTNERSHIP will provide immediate attention to pressing concerns and issues, as laid out in the Regional Coordination Study, conducted by TJPDC.
- *Facilitate transit planning*. The PARTNERSHIP will provide recommendations, assessments and guidance on transit-related matters to the CITY, COUNTY and PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS.
- *Integrating transit into other decision-making.* The PARTNERSHIP will ensure that transit will receive increased consideration in regional and local planning efforts.
- *Test an RTA structure*. The PARTNERSHIP will provide a trial version of a Regional Transit Authority (RTA) that allows all parties to become more familiar with the concept of a consolidated transit system.
- *Preparing for an RTA.* Within the PARTNERSHIP, the region will have a venue for negotiating and studying an RTA that could benefit all partners in the region.

Specific deliverable include but are not limited to:

- *Drafting Formal Agreements:* The PARTNERSHIP will review existing arrangements and transit relationships, reviewing and drafting if necessary, formal contracts and agreements. The initial and primary task would be to address the most pressing problem, the complicated web of arrangements.
- *Integrating Transit into Decision-Making*: The PARTNERSHIP will work to integrate greater transit considerations into planning efforts around the region. The

PARTNERSHIP will have involvement with the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), vetting transit-related recommendations. It would also provide recommendations to local planning efforts and projects.

- *Coordinated Transit Development Plans:* Currently, the three transit providers have entirely separate planning documents. PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS must update their Transit Development Plan (TPD) every five years. Whether done through the TDP or as a document that later consolidates planning recommendations, the PARTNERSHIP is responsible for overseeing the region's transit planning process.
- *Update RTA Study:* The PARTNERSHIP, in coordination with the MPO, will update the RTA Study and develop a new report that will help the region determine if an RTA is feasible.
- *RTP Bylaws and Mission:* The PARTNERSHIP may develop bylaws and mission statement.

ARTICLE 7
AMENDMENTS

Amendments to this AGREEMENT, as mutually agreed to, may be made by written agreement between all parties of this AGREEMENT.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, all concerned parties have executed this AGREEMENT on the day and year first written above.

_____

Mr. Sheffield announced that when the discussion and vote on the Memorandum of Understanding is undertaken, he will step out of the meeting.

Mr. Chip Boyles, Executive Director, Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), presented. He introduced Mr. Will Cockrell, Planning Director for the TJPDC, as the author of the regional transit study completed earlier this year, which he said has been reviewed and accepted unanimously by both City Council and the Board of Supervisors. He said the presentation will review the history of what led to the partnership, his recommendations for the partnership, and a recommendation for the memorandum of understanding. He recognized Mr. Bill Wuensch, Ms. Fran Hooper, and Ms. Patrice Strachan of the JAUNT Board as being present, and said Ms. Strachan is the JAUNT Board representative for the Department of Rail and Public Transit (DRPT). He turned the presentation over to Mr. Cockrell.

Mr. Will Cockrell stated that the TJPDC devoted a lot of time to study the issue, dating back to the 1970s. He said that during the 1980s there were various memos about the need for coordination between CAT, UTS, JAUNT, and the County. He stated that a regional transit study was conducted in 2008, which led to legislation that permitted the creation of an authority, though this effort had stalled as they had not received funding authorization from Richmond. He said that in 2015, PAC asked the MPO to conduct a system analysis of the transit systems in terms of how they communicate with each other and work with localities to provide service. He thanked the transit systems for their cooperation in providing all the material they asked for. He said the study had involved interviews with every City Council and Board of Supervisors member and transit staff, as well as reviewing memos. Mr. Cockrell said they had come up with several recommendations, with one being the need to build trust among the providers which could be achieved by having some successes and then building a partnership on top of this foundation. He noted that if they were to establish an authority, this would not be easy to get out of, so it was suggested that a partnership be formed that would serve as an advisory body, comprised of City Council, the Board of Supervisors, DRPT, and the JAUNT Board. He said they will review agreements and communication among the providers and look at ways to improve through sound analysis.

Mr. Cockrell reminded them of the original presentation of the partnership idea at the February 14 meeting, after which they had received unanimous support. He said there had been an enthusiasm building and they are anxious to get started, and they will fund staffing with MPO funds. He said they look forward to working with everyone and building trust to provide better transit service to residents in an efficient and affordable way.

Mr. Boyles echoed Mr. Cockrell's comments about being excited to get started. He emphasized that the partnership will be advisory, with a board of decision makers that will review documents, information, and communication points that they have not reviewed before as a joint body. He noted that the TJPDC will staff the partnership with funding from the MPO. He said that in addition to the City, County, and JAUNT, the board will consist of non-voting member stakeholders. He said they will look at opportunities for the Rideshare program to begin, to support both JAUNT and CAT in providing transit service to the region. He said the role of the regional transit partnership (RTP) will be to build relationships, which was a recurring theme, along with building trust. He said they want to build sustainable agreements as well as handle pressing and immediate issues.

Mr. Boyles said they learned from interviews that there is a need for some immediate route changes for both CAT and JAUNT that have not been fully vetted, which can be vetted by the partnership to assist the City or County with timely decision making. He stated that JAUNT and CAT are in the process of formulating a regional plan, which had been prepared separately by both bodies in the past but are now collaborative. He said another benefit of the partnership will be the ability to include transit planning in larger regional planning efforts, such as the comprehensive plan and small area plans and updates. He reminded them that DRPT is now part of Smart Scale funding and transit updates should be included.

Mr. Boyles stated that a final benefit of the partnership would be to test an authority model, and he listed three longer term possibilities arising out of the partnership. He said the first would be that the partnership was found to be a success, solved all transit issues, and continues in perpetuity. He stated that a second possibility is that the partnership was found not to be very useful and they dissolve it and return to the way things were before. The third possibility, according to Mr. Boyles, is that they determine there is a need to establish an authority and work with the General Assembly to put it in place. He noted that a fallacy arising out of the 2008 study was the aim to prove or disprove the need for an authority, and it did not consider alternatives. He said the partnership will look at alternatives as well as the potential for establishing a regional transit authority. He reviewed additional RTP roles as follows: recommend budgets, recommend route or service type changes, review and recommend Smart Scale applications, review partnership agreements among service providers, explore additional partnership opportunities, increase communication, and study, test, and develop an authority structure.

Mr. Boyles reviewed the TJPDC's recommendation of how the partnership board will be formed, stating that it will consist of two elected officials from both City Council and the Board of Supervisors, and two JAUNT board members, with one representing urban areas and the other representing rural areas, and neither coming from the same governmental entity. He said they want to avoid having the City or County overrepresented on the board. He explained the importance of having a representative from the rural area as one of the two JAUNT members, because a future authority will have a very big influence on service in neighboring counties. He indicated that the seventh representative will come from the DRPT. Mr. Boyles stated that it will be up to the partnership to determine the non-voting stakeholders who will serve on the board, which can include a staff member from MPO, transit, City and County Planning, JAUNT staff, UTS, Greene County Transit, hospital systems, and school systems. He said they already have funding from DRPT and VDOT for administrative staffing.

Mr. Boyles proposed that the partnership meet bi-monthly, alternating with MPO meetings. He said the partnership will create its own bylaws, meeting dates, and structure. He indicated that both JAUNT and TJPDC have approved draft MOUs, with the MPO to consider its MOU later this month. He said the goal is for the partnership to hold its first meeting October 30 when they will establish a meeting schedule, review budgets of the transit service providers, review a proposed Charlottesville–Harrisonburg connecting service as recommended by an intercity transit study, and review a monthly consolidated ridership report from CAT, JAUNT, and Rideshare. He invited questions.

Mr. Randolph said he was struck by the term "deliverables and roles" in Article 5.

Ms. McKeel reminded Mr. Randolph that discussion of the memorandum of understanding will be held after Supervisor Sheffield excuses himself from the meeting.

Ms. Galvin thanked Mr. Boyles for the wonderful overview and vision. She asked if it was implied that this body would be able to review small area plans along corridors of regional significance. She said she does not want transit planning to be viewed in isolation of land use planning. Mr. Boyles responded that it is intended for the partnership and the elected bodies to review as many plans as they feel are relevant and necessary.

Mr. Sheffield said he had spoken with Mr. Cockrell about utilizing the TJPDC as a venue to have transit land use conversations, in an effort to help everyone understand the nuances and establish the TJPDC as a central place for this kind of information.

Mr. Boyles said they had planned to meet last month specifically to discuss this topic and had invited a guest speaker, though the meeting was cancelled. He said they were going to discuss the importance of establishing priorities as to why transit planning is important.

Ms. Galvin asked for confirmation that it would be the elected bodies that will tell the regional transit partnership what they would like it to review. She asked who will provide plans for the elected bodies to review. Mr. Boyles said they can make the MPO aware of issues involving transportation and that the MPO has a list of things they must review by statute, but they can bring other relevant issues to its attention.

Mr. Fenwick described the partnership idea as great. He said his question involves the partnership, the MOU, and Mr. Cockrell's comments about building trust and racking up wins. He emphasized that ridership will drive everything and indicated he will have more to say about this once they reach this area of discussion during today's meeting.

Ms. McKeel noted that the scheduled speaker at the cancelled meeting was from Portland and happened to be in Richmond. She said they will try to have him speak if he visits the area again.

Mr. Randolph said his questions are not about the MOU, but are about issues embedded in it that are significant to the discussion of the regional transit partnership and regional transit authority. He referenced the last bullet point in Article 5: "The partnership would provide a trial version of a regional transit authority." He said this concept needs to be fleshed out and asked what was meant by a trial version, how will it be configured, and how will it operate. He asked if the formation of the regional transit partnership is a transitional phase to build confidence to move to a regional transit authority. He said they should have a criteria listed for moving towards the RTA and asked if there would be measurable, quantifiable goals, such as ridership levels, that will determine this.

Ms. Galvin suggested they have benchmarks for progress.

Mr. Randolph agreed. He said they will need feedback from job centers they serve. He referenced the September issue of “Governing” magazine, which had an article about transit in several large cities, explaining that the theme of the article was the traditional hub and spoke system with one central transit center probably does not make sense anymore. He said the article also discussed how cities are reconfiguring routes since ridership is down, whereas the Charlottesville area has the opportunity to increase ridership by creating intelligent routes to the workplace and reducing area emissions. He said it would be important to be mindful of what other cities around the country are doing.

Ms. Mallek commented that a lot of things to be worked on have been raised, and she would prefer not to work on all of these until the partnership has been started. She said she does not want benchmarks at this point but wants instead to see if the partnership, which is an intermediate structure, can find a better way to bring issues forward. She emphasized that she does not expect to have a solution for the establishment of a regional transit authority at this point, but just wants to get started.

Ms. McKeel agreed with Ms. Mallek, adding that many of the ideas mentioned by Mr. Randolph would be the work of the partnership.

Mr. Sheffield expressed excitement at being able to engage in these topics.

Mr. Fenwick said that at the first meeting of the regional partnership, participants will likely wonder why they are there, and he feels the Council and Board should provide them with general direction for a running start, but not go into detail.

Ms. Szakos suggested they add a bullet point indicating that one of the deliverables is for the RTP to establish benchmarks for progress in order to get this idea established, without specifying what the benchmarks would be.

Ms. Mallek proposed that Councilors and Supervisors direct representatives to carry forward changes and additions at the partnership meeting and these do not have to be solved today.

Ms. McKeel agreed.

Ms. Galvin emphasized that the RTP was to receive direction from representatives of the elected bodies and be guided by the MPO. She asked if this is implied or if they should be more direct in stating this.

Ms. Mallek said that from the point of view of the Board of Supervisors, those on a committee are acting for the Board and not on their own.

(Note: At 10:47 a.m., Mr. Sheffield read the following Transactional Disclosure Statement: “I am employed as Executive Director of JAUNT, a regional public transportation provider owned by the City of Charlottesville, and the counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Louisa, Nelson and Buckingham located at 104 Keystone Place, Charlottesville, Virginia, 22902, and have a personal interest in JAUNT because I receive an annual salary from JAUNT that exceeds $5,000 annually.

He stated that JAUNT is a subject matter of this agenda item and JAUNT could realize a reasonably foreseeable direct or indirect benefit or detriment as a result of any decision related to JAUNT on this date. He, therefore, would disqualify himself from participating in this transaction and requested that this fact be recorded in the appropriate public records for a period of five years. Mr. Sheffield then left the room.)

Mr. Signer said it seems the only decision for now is whether these issues can be addressed in the draft MOU. He noted that their two delegates can represent the will of the Council, and the question is whether they need to drive this beyond what has been drafted.

Mr. Randolph said it is not a lack of trust and confidence on his part that elected officials would not keep this in mind, but is a matter of public awareness and being mindful that residents of some areas who do not utilize transit may wonder what they are getting out of the partnership. He emphasized the importance of reassuring the public that they will not be marching towards a very expensive transit system if it is not necessary.

Ms. McKeel asked if they wish to work their way through the MOU and make edits. She expressed hope they would be able to agree on the MOU before them.

Mr. Boyles emphasized that the goal of the MOU is to establish the partnership and to provide direction. He said the partnership will identify its scope of work and bylaws and get into the details of what has been talked about today, representing the will of the elected bodies. He emphasized that there would be more to determining success than ridership levels.

Ms. Galvin then **moved** that City Council adopt the proposed Memorandum of Understanding to establish a Regional Transit Partnership. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Fenwick. On a voice call vote, all voted aye. There were no nays.

Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board of Supervisors adopt the proposed Memorandum of Understanding to establish a Regional Transit Partnership. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek.

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

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Dill and Ms. Mallek.
NAYS: None.
ABSENT: Ms. Palmer and Mr. Sheffield.

(Note: Mr. Sheffield returned to the meeting at 10:55 a.m.)

Mr. Boyles reminded them that each body must appoint two representatives to the partnership board and asked that they do so by early October.

Mr. Sheffield said that when Mr. Cockrell and Mr. Boyles began this process he was skeptical from his own transit professional standpoint, but he has since told them he is very impressed with the process and outcomes, and they have gained his trust. He said they have worked hard to bridge the gaps.

(Note: The adopted Memorandum of Understanding is set out below:)

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
ON THE JEFFERSON AREA
REGIONAL TRANSIT PARTNERSHIP (RTP)**

This agreement is made and entered into as of September __, 2017, by and between the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization hereinafter referred to as the MPO, the City of Charlottesville hereinafter referred to as the CITY, the County of Albemarle hereinafter referred to as the COUNTY, JAUNT, Inc hereinafter referred to as JAUNT, with JAUNT and Charlottesville Area Transit together hereinafter referred to as the PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS, and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission serving as planning and administrative staff to the MPO, hereinafter referred to as the TJPDC.

WHEREAS, in 2016, the Planning and Coordination Council (PACC) asked TJPDC to review and recommend opportunities for improved communication, coordination and collaboration on transit matters.; and,

WHEREAS, the TJPDC completed work on a Regional Transit Coordination Study, where the main recommendation from this study was to establish a Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) hereinafter referred to as the PARTNERSHIP, consisting of an Advisory Board and whose charge is to provide a venue for continued communication, coordination and collaboration between transit providers, localities and other stakeholders.; and,

WHEREAS, City Council and the Albemarle Board of Supervisors held a joint meeting on February 14th, 2017, where both bodies voted to support development of the PARTNERSHIP and asked TJPDC to develop an MOU; and,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RECOGNIZED AND AGREED, that the MPO, CITY, COUNTY and JAUNT hereby establish the Jefferson Area Regional Transit Partnership (RTP), in accordance with the following articles.

**Article 1
Staffing, Funding and Boundaries**

The MPO is responsible, as the lead, for staffing and programming for the PARTNERSHIP, with Section 5303 program funding from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT). Funding will be a regular item in the MPO's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The PARTNERSHIP's program area is limited to the Charlottesville-Albemarle metropolitan transportation planning area (MPA) that includes the CITY and the urbanized portions of the COUNTY.

**Article 2
Function and Authority**

The PARTNERSHIP will be an advisory board that provides recommendations to CITY, COUNTY, PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS and other stakeholders, such as the University of Virginia (UVA). The PARTNERSHIP shall not have any inherent decision-making powers and does not supersede management over the PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS.

**Article 3
Membership and Voting Structure**

The composition of the PARTNERSHIP may change with time, as the Advisory Board meets and identifies an improved membership structure. At a later date, the Partnership may extend to the University of Virginia, surrounding counties and towns, as needed. Expansion of Advisory Board members will require written amendments to this MOU. The PARTNERSHIP roster includes voting and non-voting membership. Each voting member is permitted one vote on all matters addressed by the PARTNERSHIP. All individuals on the Advisory Board have equal voting powers, with no weighted privileges given to any members.

Voting membership includes *seven* representatives, including:

- Charlottesville City Council – *two representatives*
- Albemarle Board of Supervisors – *two representatives*
- JAUNT Corporation Board – *two representatives*--one urban & one rural representative with at no time having both serve from the same governmental jurisdiction.
- Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) – *one representative*

There shall also be a nonvoting representative as designated by the PARTNERSHIP.

The designating body of each member locality or agency, having appointed the appropriate number of representatives to the PARTNERSHIP, as indicated in this ARTICLE, whether voting or nonvoting, may appoint an alternate member(s). Voting privileges for alternates shall be the same as for the regular member in the absence of the regular member.

There are no set term-limits for members of the PARTNERSHIP Advisory Board. Each member locality or agency shall reassess membership to the PARTNERSHIP, according to their own processes.

Article 4
Meeting Schedule and Bylaws

The PARTNERSHIP will set a meeting schedule that is coordinated with the MPO Policy Board meeting schedule. PARTNERSHIP meetings will be bimonthly, during off-months from the MPO Policy Board. The PARTNERSHIP shall convene at least four times in a given fiscal year.

This MOU will serve as the main guiding documents for the PARTNERSHIP. The PARTNERSHIP may adopt bylaws, to aid in management of meetings. Unless otherwise determined by the PARTNERSHIP, TJPDC will facilitate and manage meetings. Voting and parliamentary procedure will be conducted according to simplified Robert's Rules of Order.

Article 5
Deliverables and Roles

As recurring responsibilities, the PARTNERSHIP will be responsible for the following:

- *Building the CITY/COUNTY Relationship*. The PARTNERSHIP will help the region build relationships and momentum for future successes.
- *Create a formal means of sharing information.* Created by an MOU, the PARTNERSHIP will create and maintain a formal mechanism for exchanging information between transit providers, localities and other stakeholders.
- *Address pressing issues immediately.* The PARTNERSHIP will provide immediate attention to pressing concerns and issues, as laid out in the Regional Coordination Study, conducted by TJPDC.
- *Facilitate transit planning.* The PARTNERSHIP will provide recommendations, assessments and guidance on transit-related matters to the CITY, COUNTY and PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS.
- *Integrating transit into other decision-making.* The PARTNERSHIP will ensure that transit will receive increased consideration in regional and local planning efforts.
- *Test an RTA structure.* The PARTNERSHIP will provide a trial version of a Regional Transit Authority (RTA) that allows all parties to become more familiar with the concept of a consolidated transit system.
- *Preparing for an RTA.* Within the PARTNERSHIP, the region will have a venue for negotiating and studying an RTA that could benefit all partners in the region.

Specific deliverable include but are not limited to:

- *Drafting Formal Agreements:* The PARTNERSHIP will review existing arrangements and transit relationships, reviewing and drafting if necessary, formal contracts and agreements. The initial and primary task would be to address the most pressing problem, the complicated web of arrangements.
- *Integrating Transit into Decision-Making:* The PARTNERSHIP will work to integrate greater transit considerations into planning efforts around the region. The PARTNERSHIP will have involvement with the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), vetting transit-related recommendations. It would also provide recommendations to local planning efforts and projects.
- *Coordinated Transit Development Plans:* Currently, the three transit providers have entirely separate planning documents. PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS must update their Transit Development Plan (TPD) every five years. Whether done through the TDP or as a document that later consolidates planning recommendations, the PARTNERSHIP is responsible for overseeing the region's transit planning process.

- *Update RTA Study:* The PARTNERSHIP, in coordination with the MPO, will update the RTA Study and develop a new report that will help the region determine if an RTA is feasible.
- *RTP Bylaws and Mission:* The PARTNERSHIP may develop bylaws and mission statement.

ARTICLE 7
AMENDMENTS

Amendments to this AGREEMENT, as mutually agreed to, may be made by written agreement between all parties of this AGREEMENT.

____

Agenda Item No. 3. Arts and Culture Initiative.

Mr. Signer stated that they will hear a presentation on how the City and County can work together to strengthen this part of the economy and culture and dispel some myths about funding and support for the arts. He reviewed the list of presenters and commented that a strong group of stakeholders have worked on the presentation for several months.

Ms. McKeel noted that this is not an action item, but is information for them to take away and digest for future discussion.

Ms. Erica Barnes introduced herself as a group secretary for several area arts groups. She quoted John F. Kennedy: “I look forward to an America which would reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft. I look forward to an America which would steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which would steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens and I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world, not only for its strength but for its civilization as well.”

Ms. Emma Terry of the University of Virginia Arts presented on behalf of the various arts organizations and artists they have been working with. She expressed thanks on behalf of all the arts organizations for the opportunity to present to the Council and Board. She said they hope to harness and grow the power of the arts and that when creative activity occurs, in both large and small ways, it creates a ripple effect of benefits, even to those who do not directly participate. She said benefits of this ripple effect are to a community’s economic vitality, and it brings members of a community together and improves understanding. Ms. Terry noted that theaters, galleries, and concerts mean more economic activity, which includes more tourists, more businesses, and people moving to an exciting and appealing place. She stated that a vibrant arts community with music, storytelling, and community cultural centers, like the Jefferson School, means that more people are coming together to share experiences, ideas, and to connect with one another. Ms. Terry said they have a shared responsibility to support the arts, including film, dance, theater, visual arts, creative writing, animation, digital and graphic design, architecture, and innovation in multiple ways. She said that research has shown the arts are a good public sector investment, creating jobs, producing tax revenue, serving as a business magnate to expand the workforce and enhancing property values. She said the arts are an educational asset and cultivate young imaginations, with studies indicating that students of the arts perform better academically. She said the arts foster physical, mental, and emotional health, aiding in recovery, community reintegration, coping skills, and beautifying and improving medical facilities. She said the arts are a civic catalyst to creation of a welcoming sense of place and a desirable quality of life and provide a safe space for dialogue in community building. She said the arts preserve the heart and soul of a community and preserve and pass along a cultural legacy of a community’s unique character to future generations as well as a shared cultural identity and financial equity.

An unidentified female continued the presentation, stating that the arts are very important not only day to day but for their healing powers. She said that many in the audience were involved in the cultural plan years ago that was never funded and never got off the ground. She said it will need tweaking and updating, but there are some vital parts they would like to integrate into the current proposal. She reviewed two overarching needs that would sustain the vital arts infrastructure: leadership and funding. She defined leadership as “working with a well-organized arts constituency that came together knowing they need to raise the arts sector up as one, unified voice.” She said they need to coordinate across sectors to enhance tourism and cultural efforts and recognized the presence of CACVB representatives at the meeting, stating that they are a natural fit and that working with them on what they are already doing so well will help the entire community. She said they would like to bring arts groups into every sector of the community and implement the Charlottesville-Albemarle Cultural Plan. She said they lack one central office that secures funding, as various arts groups are taking up pieces of this challenge but are unable to finish the efforts. She said this would require some funding, but they hope to have a self-sufficient organization in three years that will apply for federal and state grants and build donor support. She said they would require staff and an office, which would be part of the infrastructure cost, as well as program costs. She said the strategic program investment could build on things they already do and expand them to other areas of the County. She suggested they communicate with CACVB and coordinate activities with hotels during the off season when they could most benefit from arts activities to bring people to the area. She emphasized that they are not looking for a handout but an investment. She said evidence suggests that tax revenues increase when there are cultural activities, and she believes they could have a 5 to 1 return on investment. Her request is for $250K from both the City and County for a period of three years, at which time they plan to be self-sufficient.

Ms. Susan Payne, Chair of the Virginia State Tourism Corporation, presented. She said they are a $25 billion industry, the third largest employer in the state, and that during her six-year tenure they have brought prosperity to many corners of Virginia. She explained that her presentation will demonstrate that the arts are a tourism product investment. She projected a return on investment of 5 to 1, which she described as being conservative, as the state tourism board has returns of 7 to 1. She said that despite startup costs, they expect a $750,000 return on investment during the first year, increasing to $1.5 million the second year. She said in the third year, they would seek a $200,000 grant from the state, in addition to the $500,000 provided by the City and County, and strategic investments of $450,000. Ms. Payne stated that the return on investment would be $2.25 million. She said the Virginia Tourism Corporation has spent its time and energy developing tourism products, with Charlottesville and Albemarle having many weddings, vineyards, cycling, and national parks. She asked them to think of tourism as a major revenue source and strategic investment. She asked that they fund the cultural plan for the arts, provide the CACVB with a product to promote, and seek grants for the arts and culture. She said all three of these sources would reinforce each other and accrue straight to the tax benefit.

Ms. Ann Scott, President and CEO of Charlottesville Area Community Foundation, presented and described the foundation's mission as serving as an engine for positive change. She recognized how local arts and cultural groups, as well as artists, have come together to develop an exciting vision that can be transformative for the community. She said she will review the role the foundation can play. She said they have expertise in bringing in private philanthropic dollars to help grow the engine to create a return on investment and reviewed the two positions that would support the infrastructure: an Arts Director and Communications/Program Manager. She explained that the foundation will be responsible for developing a set of accountability indicators to measure progress, as well as for data collection and presentation to the Council and Board. She said they are a 501c3 and could also serve as an administrator, either temporarily or permanently, according to City and County preference. She suggested the establishment of two accounts, with the first being an arts and culture fund to hold strategic investment money and the second being an operating account from which they could pay bills. Ms. Scott said they propose to have a resource allocation committee consisting of two representatives from both Council and the Board, as well as two from arts groups, with the Charlottesville Area Community Foundation disbursing funds in accordance with the decisions made by the committee. She said her committee would liaison with the arts group, which acts as a community-wide ambassador for the arts and could talk with citizens across the area about the impact the arts are having and its return on investment. She summarized their goals after City and County funding expires, which were to have a functional arts infrastructure with a growing donor base, growing return on investment, preservation of community heart and soul, and effectively communicating return on investment to area residents. She thanked the Council and Board for their consideration and offered to answer questions.

Mr. Fenwick expressed his confidence in the arts groups and asked if they have consolidated.

Ms. Leslie Bowman replied that they have consolidated.

Mr. Fenwick calculated that the arts funding request represents 0.17% of the City budget.

Ms. Galvin asked what Charlottesville's current ABRT budget is. She said her position had been that consolidation was needed for a long time, and that if this is the vehicle that will be taking care of the arts, she would like to see them wean away from the ABRT process. She asked for clarification as to whether there would be double funding.

Ms. Bowman stated that her understanding is ABRT funding is about $250,000/year.

Ms. Bowman said that strategic investment for the arts involves taking off their individual organizational hats and making strategic investments using a resource allocation committee that would generate a return on investment. She said this does not replace the vital importance of individual grants and arts and culture organizations, noting that the CACVB has expertise in marketing.

Ms. Szakos said she would love to have the two bodies, as well as the committee, made up of two members from each body, consider whether they want to outsource the work of the ABRT so it can be a cash grant for that body to make grants to arts organizations.

Ms. Bowman agreed that there would be advantages to this.

Mr. Signer commented that the request is for additional funding for three years beyond existing grant money. He noted that a lot of work and consultation with staff and government officials went into this, and the benefit of implementing the cultural plan jointly with the County was that it would benefit both jurisdictions and strengthen the economy.

Ms. McKeel invited Mr. Walker to add any comments he may have.

Mr. Walker noted that the County is entering into its five-year planning process and two-year fiscal planning process this fall, ahead of the annual budget process. He said it would be helpful for the staff budget planning process if they were to include the arts funding as a consideration for the two and five-year plans.

(Note: Ms. Palmer arrived at 11:30 a.m.)

Mr. Sheffield asked what the next steps would be. Ms. Bowman responded that they could begin thinking about recruitment and flesh out potential investments. She said the community foundation is already working on co-funding from private philanthropists.

Noting that there are competing priorities for City and County money, Mr. Sheffield said it would be helpful to make public officials and the public understand why this should be a priority above other items.

Ms. Bowman emphasized that this is not an allocation, but an investment with a return on investment of 5 to 1, which is an instant tax generator.

Ms. McKeel noted that Councilors and Supervisors were provided a document entitled, "State Policy Briefs: Why Should Government Support the Arts."

Ms. Galvin referred to Mr. Sheffield's comments about having messaging that conveys to constituents that this is positive. She said that tourism is viewed as a double-edged sword in the community, creating an economy that does not lead to upward mobility for longtime residents yet attracting those with higher incomes to move to the area and inflate real estate values, which leads to patterns of gentrification. She said they need assistance with messaging so they can have something that is embraced by residents who are long standing, lower wealth, and particularly with the African-American community.

Ms. Szakos added that spreading the impact to those communities is also important.

Mr. Signer, emphasizing that there would not be a vote today, asked Counselors and Supervisors if there is general consensus to move forward with consideration of the proposal. He acknowledged their nods of approval.

Ms. Mallek said it is important to move forward to obtain as much information as they can and that other communities have been doing this very successfully, and she hopes to learn more.

Recess. The Board recessed their meeting at 11:37 a.m. and reconvened at 11:55 a.m.

Agenda Item No. 4. Updates on Select MOU Activity.
Item No. 4a. Affordable Housing.
Item No. 4b. Education.
Item No. 4c. Environment - Proposed modification to the Environmental MOU.

Mr. Boyles said the TJPDC had asked staff to study the supply and demand of housing at a regional level with a desired outcome, resulting from the questioning of local officials, of being able to determine what they meant by "affordable housing." He emphasized that the definition of affordable housing varies with every local government and said that although affordable housing is required by state code in comprehensive plans, not every local government in the region has an affordable housing element in its comprehensive plan. Mr. Boyles said they will try to produce an easily navigable template for local governments to make sure they are following state code. He said they will assemble a group of stakeholders from local governments, non-profit housing providers, businesses, and others in order to obtain direction as to where they should be looking to address affordable housing. He said they are not planning to create an entity that would build housing, pay rent, or provide direct services, but one to assist local governments and non-profits in addressing affordable housing needs, which is one of their biggest priorities. He said they would not require additional funding, as this was provided by the regional per capita contributed by members, with funds set aside for FY18 and FY19.

Ms. Galvin said she recently learned the City of Charlottesville Redevelopment Housing Authority has a wait list of 1,200 that consists of those at and below 30% of the area median income level. She said there are an additional 200 on a wait list for those 50% and below the median income, and wonders if those on the wait list are Charlottesville residents or those coming from surrounding counties that do not have enough affordable housing. She said if there were shared responsibility for affordable housing, then people would not have to leave their home communities. Mr. Boyles replied that this had not been considered on a regional level before and is one of the end goals of their exercise.

Mr. Mike Murphy, Assistant City Manager, stated that Charlottesville has increased its affordable housing fund this year to $2.5 million from $1.6 million and estimated that it would increase to $3.4 million next July. He said they have appropriated $250,000 this year and $500,000 for the following five years to the Charlottesville Regional Housing Authority. He estimated they would have a total investment in affordable housing of $19 million in the capital program as a starting point, before any new investment. He said they are working closely with the community foundation on a grant to redevelop public housing and to gain community trust. Mr. Murphy stated that the previous night, City Council had approved funding for two projects at Carlton View, with one being to rehabilitate and improve energy efficiency of 35 units at a cost of $600,000 and the other to build 54 units at a cost of $1.4 million. He said that $500,000 in funding for Albemarle Housing Improvement Program, $250,000 for Habitat for Humanity, a locally funded voucher program, a landlord assistance fund to encourage property owners to become landlords to those with low income, and a land bank program are all items that will soon be brought before Council for consideration. He said they are considering a zoning change to form-based code in the strategic investment area south of the downtown mall. Mr. Murphy stated that affordable housing was a hot topic at a Charrette held the previous week and noted that the determination of the qualification threshold in terms of income would be an important matter for discussion.

Mr. Ron White, Chief of Housing for Albemarle County, stated that the County continues to work with the private sector to promote affordable housing, and the comprehensive plan specified a goal of 15% affordable housing units. He said the elimination of proffers has led them to look at other options and incentives to work with developers. He reviewed three current projects, including two tax credit deals totaling 184 units within one mile of the City line and another with 26 affordable units out of 200+ units within a mile of the City line, which is taking advantage of a density bonus. He said the Southwood project would be one they will be working on for many years, and he hopes that at some point the City and County can work together on this. He said City parks is working on trail connections for this area.

Mr. Randolph expressed hope they will have a discussion about a land bank, which he feels may have greater overall value for the City than the County. He said they would have some differences in how to approach affordable housing and that having a unified affordable housing policy would be difficult, whereas having differentiated affordable housing policy based on common goals and objectives is eminently workable.

Ms. Palmer noted that there are two affordable housing projects along the Old Lynchburg Road/Sunset Avenue Extended area, and she expressed a desire to have the bicycle/pedestrian transportation corridors fixed with a sidewalk connection from housing that passes underneath I-64 to Azalea Park and the City's trails. She said it would make sense to have a joint project.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Boyles if these issues would be looked at in the connectivity study his office is conducting. Mr. Boyles replied that it would be directly influenced from two projects the Piedmont Development Council is working on, including a Charlottesville Area Community Foundation grant with the Piedmont Environmental Council that advocate for joint greenways, trails and bicycle/pedestrian opportunities, with one component being the regional bike/pedestrian plan they are currently working on.

Mr. Dill noted there are 400 people on a wait list for dementia care at Mountainside in Crozet and that although this is not considered to be part of affordable housing, it is a serious issue.

Mr. Boyles replied that as a member of the Charlottesville Alliance, a coalition of non-profits and agencies, he is aware they are looking at a City/County model to expand care for dementia patients. He stated that this is most definitely an element of affordable housing and that health and aging, income, and homeless populations all have to be considered when looking at affordability.

Ms. Szakos said the series of MOUs and meetings are really important and that transit and affordable housing overlap as they need transit and sidewalks.

Ms. Galvin commented that while they are talking about the importance of having elected officials and decision makers in the room, it is at the operational level where it actually happens, which was already built into the MOUs. She said they need to know there is coordination, but is hearing that there is not.

Ms. Mallek said she thought the MOU was in study mode.

Ms. Galvin said she thought they had adopted the MOU.

Mr. Murphy said they could ensure that conversations are taking place among the staffs so connections can be made easily when they are ready to move forward.

Mr. Boyles added that the regional housing component includes a stakeholder group centered around the technical staff and non-profit providers, and provides them with a formal meeting mechanism for these discussions.

_____

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, presented. She said Mr. Murphy will assist her in presenting an update on the education memorandum of understanding. She reminded them that one element focuses on pre-kindergarten and the second on career vocational workforce orientation. She said she will provide an update on expansion of the Charlottesville Growing Opportunities Program (Go Pro) into Albemarle County, which had been an initiative identified at the last joint meeting. She stated that during this spring's budget discussion, the Board had directed staff to advance implementation of this program as quickly as possible. She said they decided to have a bus driver training pilot. She said that Chris Engel and Holly Lee had provided them with information on how the program was put together, including use of PVCC and other resources to get the program going. Ms. Catlin stated that Charlottesville's program is located at the downtown workforce center and has staff dedicated to providing the complete services needed to make the program happen. She said the County has partnered with PVCC Workforce Services staff, consisting of Valerie Palamountain, Kathy Reed, and Ridge Schuyler. She said the Office of Economic Development and school transportation staff are excited to build an in-house pipeline to provide career opportunities and fill an urgent need. She said that PVCC is conducting recruitment, screening, and classroom training as well as soft skills training to make sure participants will be successful once they are in the workplace. She said the goal of the pilot is to have an initial class of 10 students graduate and fill open bus driver positions, with a long-term goal of conducting two classes each year and expanding to include other job areas.

Ms. Palmer asked if the classes are all being held here or if there have been discussion to have some in southern Albemarle. Ms. Catlin replied that results of this discussion would come before the Board next month.

Mr. Murphy presented on early education, stating that both localities participate in the Early Education Task Force through the leadership of The United Way and the Community Foundation, with a focus that at-risk four-year-olds have a quality pre-K experience. He said the County has filled all slots for pre-K and the City has filled all slots for three-year olds with some slots left for four-year olds. He said the group is now looking to expand its focus to ages 0-5 and not just three and four-year olds. Mr. Murphy stated that he expects to have more information at the next joint meeting.

_____

The following proposed document was provided to the two bodies for discussion:

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Between the City of Charlottesville and
Albemarle County
Regarding the Environment

WHEREAS regionalism is a recognized governing principle across the United States in which neighboring jurisdictions can recognize mutual benefit, efficiencies, and harmony by working together on areas of mutual concern, rather than apart or even against each other; and

WHEREAS both the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County have recognized that protecting natural resources, including clean water, biodiversity and tree cover foster livable, sustainable and resilient communities; and

WHEREAS both the City and County recognize the value of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving air quality, and anticipating and adapting to local impacts of a changing climate; and

WHEREAS the populations served by the City and County similarly impact and benefit from natural resources, and <u>the outdoor recreational and sustainable stewardship</u> programs offered by and coordinated with both localities will result in a stronger and more resilient community; and

WHEREAS existing examples of cooperation between the City and the County include:

- Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA)
  - McIntire Recycling Center Operations
  - Hazardous Materials Collection/Disposal
  - Bulky Waste
- Joint Solid Waste Management Plan – TJPDC
- LEAP Governance Board
- Local Climate Action Planning Process
- Better Business Challenge
- Rivanna Conservation Alliance (Stream Watch)
- <u>Rivanna River Basin Commission</u>
- Rivanna Stormwater Education Partnership
- Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District
- Rivanna Environmental Management System Association
- Livability Project
- Rivanna River Corridor Plan
- Hazardous Spill Cleanup coordination – Fire/Rescue
- Imagine A Day Without Water
- Green Infrastructure planning
- <u>Outdoor Park, Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure and Trail Planning and Construction</u>

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Charlottesville and the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County hereby agree to this Memorandum of Understanding directing our respective City Manager and County Executive and their staffs to develop and enact plans to:

- Designate a staff member assigned to promoting success
- Identify potential available resources available to both localities
- Identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization
- Identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction of acting with or without information sharing where appropriate; and
- Identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate, including governance structure where possible.

This Memorandum of Understanding shall begin on the date of signatures by both the Mayor of the City of Charlottesville and the Chair of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, as authorized by their respective bodies.

_____

Mr. Greg Harper, Albemarle County Chief of Environmental Services, and Ms. Kristel Riddervold, Charlottesville Environmental Administrator, presented. Mr. Harper said the first item to be addressed is the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, a state mandate for the County to assist the region in cleaning up

Chesapeake Bay by doing local projects that promote the overall health of the bay. He said that during the course of identifying a cost-effective project, they came across an old, blown-out storm water facility in River Run Park that they will restore, for which they will obtain credit for phosphorus and nitrogen reductions. He indicated that some of the damage from the blow out crossed the City line into Pen Park, so it was determined by the County Engineer that the project would be better and more cost-effective if they were to extend it into the City. He stated that they have been working with Mr. Dan Sweet, the Charlottesville storm water utility administrator, on design and logistics. Mr. Harper noted that the project will be supported by two grants. He said the County has phosphorous as a critical pollutant while the City has nitrogen as a critical pollutant, and they have arranged with the Department of Environmental Quality for the County to get a full phosphorous credit, with the City getting a full nitrogen credit.

Ms. Kristel Riddervold presented on climate protection and noted that both the City and County have reaffirmed a commitment to climate protection and emissions reduction. She said that staff has already committed to a review of the local climate action planning process in order to hold themselves accountable for what has been done and determine what items need revisiting. She stated that Charlottesville is updating the greenhouse gas inventory using 2016 data to provide guidance with future planning, and both the City and County are developing separate climate action plans. She said she would also address the topic of resiliency and achieving their goals more effectively.

Ms. Riddervold noted that at the beginning of the year, they sought the free assistance of a technical advisor to help with the achievement of the Solar Foundation's Sol Smart designation, which recognizes communities taking steps to address costs and barriers to allow business and residents to go solar. She said that in only seven months, both the City and County have become the first jurisdictions to earn the bronze designation, with a goal of achieving a silver designation in the future. She stated that a current effort is a financing mechanism related to energy and water renewables and efficiency. Ms. Riddervold said the General Assembly had recently authorized Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE), a mechanism which the City has been tracking for several years and which the County has agreed to explore. She suggested that they work together since many property management and construction companies work in both communities. She said they worked with the Virginia Energy Efficiency Council this summer, co-hosted a well-attended workshop, and learned that Arlington County has already engaged a program administrator, with a cooperative procurement clause that allows other jurisdictions to use a similar mechanism. Ms. Riddervold stated that there had been increasing interest in waste diversion and composting and noted they have drop-off locations at the farmers market and at McIntire that are well used and well received. She said they had worked with the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority on a pilot transfer station model, which has worked well but is not a long-term solution, and they are engaged with local stakeholders in exploring opportunities.

Ms. Palmer expressed hope that they could all work on the issue of responsible materials management in the future, adding that expansion of composting is incredibly important. She said they would love to work with the City on the drug take-back program. She said the County's solid waste committee had just convinced Phil McKalips from Rivanna to join, but the City has not provided a representative to the committee and she would like them to. She said it helps a lot to have the City at the table so they would know what they are already doing.

Mr. Dill stated that he had just joined the board for LEAP and that in the past both the City and County had used it to reduce energy consumption, which was important in addressing climate change. He encouraged the County to do more with LEAP. Ms. Riddervold added that LEAP is a product of a City/County, multi-party collaboration.

Mr. Fenwick asked if the issue of having a representative to the solid waste committee mentioned by Ms. Palmer would be an action item for City Council. Ms. Riddervold said she would confer with the Department of Public Works, as the public service manager was originally going to attend but this position is vacant. She said the question is who can most effectively serve on the committee, which would be those who are involved in waste management contracts.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Walker to update them on the County's level of financial support for LEAP. Ms. Mallek replied that funding is from a federal grant that lasted four years. She encouraged them to have a discussion about taking a more active role in LEAP in the two and five-year fiscal plans. Mr. Walker said the best way to go about this would be for LEAP to submit a request.

Addressing the TMDL issues, Ms. Mallek said it is not just the Chesapeake Bay that they are worried about, but also clean streams and water locally. She said they did a better job in communicating with constituents when they talked about benefits to the local water. Ms. Riddervold said that Charlottesville has a contracted program services agreement with LEAP for a scope of work as an extension of its climate protection program.

Proposed Modification to Environmental MOU

Ms. McKeel reviewed the proposed changes, with the first being after the fourth "whereas," where they had added some language. She said that Ms. Mallek noticed they had omitted the Rivanna River Basin Commission. Ms. McKeel stated that Ms. Galvin had suggested that bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, trail planning, and construction should be added as the last bullet point. She asked if anyone would like to comment.

Ms. Palmer said the changes are great and suggested they add composting as a fourth item to the RSWA.

Ms. McKeel said they need to vote on these changes since they voted on the MOU.

Mr. Randolph requested an editing change on Page 2 at the second bullet where the word "available" was used twice in one sentence, so that it appears only once.

Ms. Galvin asked why there was a line item about hazardous spill cleanup coordination with fire and rescue under one of the examples of cooperation.

Ms. Riddervold asked if the intent was to obtain updates from fire and rescue since they do most of the coordination in this area, although it is not a role that environmental offices typically take a lead on. Ms. Szakos responded that they have their own fire services agreement that covers this.

Ms. McKeel said it ended up in the MOU because it was part of their environmental work, noting that staff does not have to provide updates at every meeting so she sees no harm in leaving it.

Ms. Szakos said it is partly for the public to understand what they do together.

Mr. Fenwick noted there are four committees associated with the Rivanna River, stating that it might make sense to have a discussion about consolidation at a future meeting.

Ms. Mallek said one was a quasi-governmental agency and the others were non-profits that certainly work together, and they are not in a position to consolidate them.

Ms. Szakos pointed out that they discuss a lot of the same things in their meetings.

Mr. Fenwick added that they do not always keep each other up to date which is a problem.

Mr. Randolph said it used to be worse when there were three organizations and now there is really only one organization, the Rivanna River Basin Commission (RRBC), an educational entity that is under the control of the TJPDC. He said that he used to serve on the commission and mentioned that they had achieved a merger of River Watch and Rivanna Conservation to form the organization.

Mr. Fenwick said that if it is not a functioning organization and they are touting City/County cooperation, they should look at this.

Ms. Mallek **moved** that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Memorandum of Understanding, as amended. The **motion** was **seconded** by Mr. Dill.

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

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill and Ms. Mallek.
NAYS: None.

Ms. Szakos moved that the City Council adopt the Memorandum of Understanding, as amended. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Galvin. On a voice call vote, all voted aye. There were no nays.

(Note: The adopted Memorandum of Understanding is set out below:)

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Between the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County
Regarding the Environment

WHEREAS, regionalism is a recognized governing principle across the United States in which neighboring jurisdictions can recognize mutual benefit, efficiencies, and harmony by working together on areas of mutual concern, rather than apart or even against each other; and

WHEREAS, both the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County have recognized that protecting natural resources, including clean water, biodiversity and tree cover foster livable, sustainable and resilient communities; and

WHEREAS, both the City and County recognize the value of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving air quality, and anticipating and adapting to local impacts of a changing climate; and

WHEREAS, the populations served by the City and County similarly impact and benefit from natural resources, and the outdoor recreational and sustainable stewardship programs offered by and coordinated with both localities will result in a stronger and more resilient community; and

WHEREAS, existing examples of cooperation between the City and the County include:

- Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA)
  - McIntire Recycling Center Operations
  - Hazardous Materials Collection/Disposal
  - Bulky Waste
  - Composting
- Joint Solid Waste Management Plan – TJPDC
- LEAP Governance Board

- Local Climate Action Planning Process
- Better Business Challenge
- Rivanna Conservation Alliance (Stream Watch)
- Rivanna River Basin Commission
- Rivanna Stormwater Education Partnership
- Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District
- Rivanna Environmental Management System Association
- Livability Project
- Rivanna River Corridor Plan
- Hazardous Spill Cleanup coordination – Fire/Rescue
- Imagine A Day Without Water
- Green Infrastructure planning
- Outdoor Park, Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure and Trail Planning and Construction

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Charlottesville and the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County hereby agree to this Memorandum of Understanding directing our respective City Manager and County Executive and their staffs to develop and enact plans to:

- Designate a staff member assigned to promoting success
- Identify potential resources available to both localities
- Identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization
- Identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction of acting with or without information sharing where appropriate; and
- Identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate, including governance structure where possible.

This Memorandum of Understanding shall begin on the date of signatures by both the Mayor of the City of Charlottesville and the Chair of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, as authorized by their respective bodies.

____

Agenda Item No. 5. Standard Operating Procedures for Effective Communication.

The following proposed document was provided to the two bodies for discussion:

Standard Operating Procedures for Effective Communication

Ms. McKeel stated that they had begun work on this during the early part of the year after realizing there were disconnects between City Councilors and Supervisors, with one example being an eight-month gap during which both bodies were awaiting action from one another. She indicated that this was not the fault of anyone but they are very busy and not able to always follow each other's agenda. She expressed hope that everyone has had a chance to read the document.

Ms. Szakos **moved** that the City Council adopt the Standard Operating Procedures for effective communications between the County and City on specific matters. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Fenwick. On a voice call vote, all voted aye; there were no nays.

Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Standard Operating Procedures for effective communications between the County and City on specific matters. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek.

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

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill and Ms. Mallek.
NAYS: None.

Ms. Mallek commented that this is incredibly important.

Ms. McKeel pointed out that the most important bullet is that they would make sure they have someone tracking deadlines when they communicate with each other.

(Note: The adopted Standard Operating Procedures are set out below:)

Standard Operating Procedures for Effective Communications
Between the County and the City on Specific Matters

1. A contact person, or more than one contact person, should serve as the project owner for that locality and be responsible for ensuring communications are replied to in a timely manner, needed information is collected, and the locality's staff involvement is coordinated (rather than having multiple departments independently engaged).

2. Communications between the localities should request a reasonable reply date so that the time

for a reply is not open-ended and timely follow-up can be expected.

3. Periodic meetings should be held so that issues can be discussed face-to-face. The periodic meetings should include persons designated by each locality to take notes. The notes should reflect each locality's understanding of any conclusions reached on the matters discussed at the meeting, and thereafter be shared with all attendees to review, correct, and identify the need for follow-up.

4. For those matters where any decision must be made jointly by the Board of Supervisors and the City Council, the Chair/Mayor of each governing body should be copied on communications between the locality's staffs. Only those communications pertaining to discussions that are above the technical level, and are approaching the policy level, should be copied to the Chair/Mayor of each body. This procedure will not apply to communications between the offices of the City Attorney and the County Attorney without the prior consent of the other locality's governing body. The Chair/Mayor will share information regarding the communications with all of the members of their respective governing bodies.

5. For those matters where any decision must be made by the Board of Supervisors, the City Council, or both, discussions on specific matters should be initiated only with staff having technical expertise on the subject matter so that they can identify key issues and outline the parameters and limitations related to the matter being discussed.

6. Any matters resolved, promised, or preliminarily agreed to in communications between the County Executive and the City Manager should be provided in writing to the respective Chair/Mayor of their governing bodies and the contact persons/project owners if the matter is of a type for which contact persons/project owners have been designated. The Chair/Mayor will share information regarding the communications with all of the members of their respective governing bodies.

Note that some of these procedures include creating documents that may be subject to mandatory disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

Agenda Item No. 6. Economic Development Memorandum of Understanding.

The following proposed document was provided to the two bodies for discussion:

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
FOR COLLABORATION
BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND
THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
REGARDING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

WHEREAS, the City and County both recognize that a strong, vibrant and stable local economy provides significant benefits to the shared Charlottesville and Albemarle region; and

WHEREAS, the City and County seek to work in partnership to support the region's existing businesses including providing opportunities for their successful growth and expansion by leveraging the complementary assets and opportunities provided by both jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, the City and County value the energetic entrepreneurial spirit that has launched a wide spectrum of start-up companies that bring investment and diversity to our economy; and

WHEREAS, the City and County want to provide a welcoming and supportive environment to new businesses that match our community preferences and bring desired capital investment and quality job opportunities for our residents; and

WHEREAS, the City and County recognize the importance of entry level positions with the potential for upward mobility that can provide a first step into employment for local residents; and

WHEREAS, the City and County embrace working with the University of Virginia as a partner in advancing economic development initiatives that provide mutual benefit; and

WHEREAS, the City and County desire a quality of life and desirability of place that will attract and retain the skilled workers that support our shared target industries; and

WHEREAS, existing examples of cooperation between the City and County include:

- Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development (CVPED)
- Regional Target Industries Report
- GO Virginia Regional Council
- Piedmont Workforce Network
- Piedmont Virginia Community College
- Charlottesville-Albemarle Technical Education Center (CATEC)
- Charlottesville Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB)

- Joint presentations for Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP)
- Charlottesville-Albemarle Regional Airport (CHO)
- Charlottesville Business Innovation Council's Tech Tour
- Infrastructure partners like the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) and the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA)
- Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

WHEREAS, while the City and County recognize that each locality's first and main priority is to retain or grow existing businesses within their own jurisdictions, we pledge to support a regional approach through the following commitments:

- Focus on maintaining jobs and capital investments by collaborating fully to retain companies that are at risk of leaving the Charlottesville/Albemarle community
- Share referrals for new business prospects looking for space whose needs cannot be met by the jurisdiction that is initially contacted
- Not to actively solicit or initiate discussion to encourage the relocation of any business from one jurisdiction to the other
- Notify each other of serious conversations regarding businesses looking to relocate from one jurisdiction to the other
- Jointly focus on building upon the strength of our shared target industry clusters
- Collectively support our educational systems and workforce development initiatives that support our desired industries
- Maintain the confidential nature of economic development projects and prospects and the importance of regional cooperation
- Cooperate and communicate on building an effective business ecosystem that supports and accommodates businesses through their lifecycle, recognizing that different stages of business growth may be more well suited for one jurisdiction or another

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Charlottesville and the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County hereby agree to this Memorandum of Understanding directing their respective City Manager and County Executive and staffs to develop and enact plans to:

- Designate a staff member assigned to promoting success
- Identify potential available resources available to both localities
- Identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization
- Identify and consider potential impacts on each others' jurisdiction and share information as appropriate
- Identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate where possible

_____

Ms. Catlin stated that she and Mr. Chris Engel had held conversations with regional partners at Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development, and this was the first stage of MOU development for this important topic. She invited the bodies to discuss, consider, and provide guidance on the draft language.

Ms. Mallek indicated that the draft copy she was provided was a prior draft and did not include the most recent updates. Ms. Catlin apologized and said she thought they had the most recent draft.

Ms. Szakos offered to read aloud the change to the fifth bullet, which she said did not change the content but changed the order, putting the most important part first: "Whereas the City and County recognize the importance of upward mobility for local residents and the potential for entry level positions and apprenticeships to provide a first step into employment."

Ms. McKeel apologized for having the wrong draft hard copy and noted that the email was correct.

Mr. Signer read the most recently updated language: "Whereas the City and County recognize the importance of upward mobility for local residents through entry level positions, apprenticeships, and training and Whereas, the City and County commit to address longstanding economic inequities and provide access to opportunity to all residents and Whereas, the City and County embrace working with The University of Virginia as a partner in advancing the economic development initiatives."

Mr. Randolph observed that the final "whereas" at the bottom of Page 1 was very good in terms of the bullets for establishing a communications process that was mutually respectful. He said they lacked language regarding communication of new businesses relocations to the other body prior to it becoming public knowledge. He said this would be a courtesy but could also mean that services from respective government entities could be utilized. He suggested that they add this at some point, but did not want to hold up the memorandum. Mr. Randolph said he suspects they already do this, but to have it codified would demonstrate to the public the mutual respect both bodies have for one another.

Ms. Szakos suggested that rather than being specific they add language that specifies there would be communication to the other body prior to a public announcement.

Mr. Randolph indicated that this would be fine with him.

Ms. Szakos said the requirement to have advanced notice may be a lot to ask, and they should make sure the other body receives this information and not have to rely solely on the newspaper.

Ms. Mallek commented that many times announcements are controlled by the state, and they are not allowed to talk about something until an announcement is made.

Mr. Dill pointed out that a new business coming to town may not want a prior announcement to be made.

Ms. Mallek indicated that there may be times when they wish to make joint announcements to recognize the positive regional impact of a project, as opposed to having someone be a winner and someone not be a winner.

Mr. Signer said he was struck by how specific and strong the statements were, which reflected a lot of staff consultation, and he noted that statements around economic development were not included in early drafts as it was recognized that this could be an area of competition. He read some of the draft statements concerning notification in this area and said this could serve as a model for regional cooperation among jurisdictions. He added that if they pass the MOU, they should notify the PACC so that the University of Virginia and businesses become aware of this new regional economic approach.

Ms. Galvin suggested they add “sustains the arts” to the second “whereas” from the bottom. She noted that the MOU did not have anything about the arts, and they had just discussed the importance of the arts to the economy. After a few comments from others, she settled on the phrase “celebrates the arts.”

Ms. McKeel asked if there was any objection to this addition. There was none.

Ms. Mallek noted that in her conversations with representatives of other communities at conferences about how they collaborate, she had been told of the importance of having an agreement.

Ms. Catlin said they would amend the two top bullets and add to the second from the bottom “quality of life and desirability of place that would celebrate the arts and would attract and retain.” She said they would add an item about notification of incoming new businesses prior to public announcement, as was appropriate, to the final list of “whereas” clauses.

Mr. Walker indicated that there had been enough changes made to warrant taking the draft back to the respective jurisdictions.

Ms. Palmer commented that she could not imagine voting against the MOU, but that the changes are not entirely clear to her. She asked if someone would review the changes that were contained in an email, but not provided in the packet.

Mr. Maurice Jones read the changes.

Ms. Szakos **moved** that the City Council adopt the Memorandum of Understanding for Collaboration Between City of Charlottesville and County of Albemarle Regarding Economic Development, as amended. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Signer. On a voice call vote, all voted aye; there were no nays. .

Ms. Mallek **moved** that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Memorandum of Understanding for Collaboration Between City of Charlottesville and County of Albemarle Regarding Economic Development, as amended. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Dill.

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

AYES: Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill and Ms. Mallek.
NAYS: None.

(Note: The adopted Memorandum of Understanding is set out below:)

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR COLLABORATION
BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND
THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
REGARDING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

WHEREAS, the City and County both recognize that a strong, vibrant and stable local economy provides significant benefits to the shared Charlottesville and Albemarle region; and

WHEREAS, the City and County seek to work in partnership to support the region’s existing businesses, providing opportunities for their successful growth and expansion and leveraging the complementary assets and opportunities provided by both jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, the City and County value the energetic entrepreneurial spirit that has launched a wide spectrum of start-up companies that bring investment and diversity to our economy; and

WHEREAS, the City and County want to provide a welcoming and supportive environment to new businesses that match our community preferences and bring desired capital investment and quality job opportunities for our residents; and

WHEREAS, the City and County commit to address long-standing economic inequities and provide access to opportunity to all residents; and

WHEREAS, the City and County recognize the importance of upward mobility for local residents through entry-level positions, apprenticeships, and training; and

WHEREAS, the City and County embrace working with the University of Virginia as a partner in advancing economic development initiatives that provide mutual benefit; and

WHEREAS, the City and County desire a quality of life and desirability of place that will celebrate the arts and retain and attract the skilled workers who support our shared target industries; and

WHEREAS, existing examples of cooperation between the City and County include:

- Thomas Jefferson Partnership for Economic Development (TJPED)
- Regional Target Industries Report
- GO Virginia Regional Council
- Piedmont Workforce Network
- Piedmont Virginia Community College/CATEC
- Charlottesville Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB)
- Joint presentations for Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP)
- CHO
- Charlottesville Business Innovation Council's Tech Tour
- Infrastructure partners like RWSA
- Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

While The City and County recognizes each locality's first and main priority is to retain or grow existing businesses within their own jurisdictions, we pledge to:

- Focus on maintaining jobs and capital investments by collaborating fully to retain companies that are at risk of leaving the Charlottesville/Albemarle community
- Share referrals for new business prospects looking for space whose needs cannot be met by the jurisdiction that is initially contacted
- Not to actively solicit or initiate discussion to encourage the relocation of any business from one jurisdiction to the other
- Notify each other of serious conversations regarding businesses looking to relocate from one jurisdiction to the other
- Jointly focus on building upon the strength of our shared target industry clusters
- Collectively support our educational systems and workforce development initiatives that support our desired industries
- Maintain the confidential nature of economic development projects and prospects and the importance of regional cooperation
- Focus on building an effective business ecosystem that supports and accommodates businesses through their lifecycle, recognizing that different stages of business growth may be more well suited for one jurisdiction or another
- Notify each other of new business ventures coming into our respective jurisdictions as appropriate

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Charlottesville and the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County hereby agree to this Memorandum of Understanding directing their respective City Manager and County Executive and staffs to develop and enact plans to:

- Designate a staff member assigned to promoting success
- Identify potential available resources available to both localities
- Identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization
- Identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction and share information as appropriate
- Identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and community where possible

---

Ms. McKeel invited discussion among Supervisors and Councilors for ideas about topics for future joint meetings, with the next one likely to occur after the first of the year.

Ms. Mallek suggested that they ask their respective staffs to continue working together and bring back suggestions for future improvements to management of the Sugar Hollow area around the reservoir. She said that she and Ms. Palmer had attended a meeting between the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) and City and County staffs last Friday and received an update on what was happening. She stated that Rivanna is making some changes on its own and proceeding with some necessary capital and construction work.

Ms. Palmer said if the County would do a project to improve parking, it would make sense to do it with them, which becomes an issue of timing. She said it would take more than just staff work.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Walker for his thoughts. Mr. Walker responded that staff would want to continue working with the RWSA on property ownership issues and capital improvement considerations, which would be appropriate topics for discussion among the two elected bodies. He said that staff could prepare for this if the Board wants to have a discussion.

Ms. Mallek asked if they need to discuss all the river agencies and corridor planning or receive an update. Ms. McKeel agreed with Ms. Mallek.

Mr. Dill said that he and Ms. Mallek had attended the Go Virginia program presentation at PVCC last week and the importance of timing was emphasized, as grants would begin to be awarded in December. He emphasized that they may want to work on this, adding that he learned that Go Virginia representatives viewed Charlottesville and Albemarle as one unit and they would have to include other counties to receive a significant grant.

Ms. Mallek commented that they are holding the Charlottesville-Albemarle community to a different standard from everyone else in the state. She said she complained to Carrie Roth, who is on the state board, that all the money would be gone by December, which means that others are already organized while the rest did not even have the rules yet. She said that Ms. Roth had reassured her this was not true and that the money would stay in the region until good projects were found. Ms. Mallek said they may want to partner with other localities and emphasized that the localities do not have to be adjacent.

Mr. Dill pointed out that the program is privately funded by business and does not follow the same rules as other grants. He said they would have to take some initiative if they want to become involved.

Ms. Mallek replied that businesses are in charge of the process, but state tax money funds the program.

Ms. Galvin reminded them of the City and County working together on the Sustainable Communities grant, doing a joint comprehensive plan update and setting a goal that the respective planning commissions would meet routinely, striving to have some consistency in zoning where possible. She pointed out that both she and Ms. McKeel serve on the Hillsdale/Hydraulic small area planning group, and if they were ever to sustain something like a bus rapid transit along the US 29 corridor, they would have to get the land use and clusters of development right all along the corridor. She said they should encourage the respective heads of planning to work more closely together on major areas of common need so they could facilitate a good and robust land use and transportation planning regimen.

Mr. Signer said there would be a conference at the University of Virginia on September 30, with the Virginia Secretary of Technology presenting on a driverless future and the Governor also speaking. He said this could be an interesting topic for them to discuss and to consider any protocols as to how they would approach this. He said that attendees would have the opportunity to ride in driverless cars around grounds with a partner from Perrone Robotics, and registration is free.

Ms. McKeel suggested a discussion among the two boards about environmental changes, sustainability, and resilience, as it is important to have the two communities working together.

Ms. Palmer said she would like to find a way to share costs in planning for connections on the City/County line, such as the area under I-64, which benefits both jurisdictions. She noted that this connection goes from asphalt to sidewalk to path.

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn to October 4, 2017, 1:17 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 1:17 p.m., Ms. McKeel adjourned the Board of Supervisors meeting to October 4, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium.

Mr. Signer adjourned the Charlottesville City Council meeting.

____
Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 01/03/2018
Initials CKB