**Albemarle County Planning Commission Meeting and**
**Joint Work Session with the Albemarle County School Board**
**April 11, 2017**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing and joint work session with the Albemarle County School Board on Tuesday, April 11, 2017, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Tim Keller, Chair; Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair; Pam Riley; Jennie More; Mac Lafferty; Daphne Spain and Bruce Dotson. Bill Palmer; University of Virginia representative, was present.

Other officials present were Andrew Gast-Bray, Deputy Director of Community Development and Director of Planning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; and John Blair, Deputy County Attorney.

Albemarle County School Board members attending were: Kate Acuff, Chair; Jonno Alcaro; Graham Paige; David Oberg; Steve Koleszar (arrived at 6:04 p.m.); and Pamela Moynihan (arrived at 6:08 p.m.). Jason Buyaki was not in attendance.

Other officials present were Dean Tisdale, Chief Operating Officer; Superintendent Pamela Moran, Matt Haas, Assistant Superintendent, Vincent Scheivert, and Jennifer Johnston, School Board Clerk.

**Call to Order and Establish Quorum:**

Mr. Keller, Chair, called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Ms. Acuff, School Board Chair, called the School Board to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

**From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.**

Mr. Keller invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. There being none, the meeting moved to the next agenda item.

**Joint School Board Worksession**

The Planning Commission thanked School Board members for meeting.

Commissioners and School Board members introduced themselves.

Mr. Keller commented that both the County and City planning commissions have representatives from the University of Virginia who serve in an at-large capacity and provide insights into the issues both commissions are considering.

Mr. Dean Tistadt stated that he would be presenting information prepared by Rosalyn Schmidt, the schools' assistant director of facilities planning. He said that there are three topics the School Board wishes to share with the Planning Commission: demographic shifts and changes that are occurring in County Schools; the results of the Weldon Cooper Center study; and the High School 2022 update, which Matt Haas would present.

Mr. Tistadt reported that in 2016, school staff made a presentation to the School Board at their retreat in June, and then shared it again at a joint Board of Supervisors/School Board in the fall. He said that they wanted to highlight the changes that are occurring in not only enrollment in Albemarle County Schools but demographic changes and how those are varying so dramatically from school to school – urban ring compared to suburban schools. Mr. Tistadt said that his presentation would cover enrollment growth, demographic impacts, and demographics on a school-by-school basis. He presented a chart showing the population and student enrollment changes in Albemarle, with the percentage of students in public schools decreasing and data suggesting that the population in the County is aging, with fewer families having school-age children. Mr. Tistadt noted that while they are not experiencing the same growth as the overall population, the schools are anticipating enrollment growth at a more modest rate.

Mr. Tistadt stated that the enrollment growth is not occurring everywhere, and he referenced maps showing the last five years of enrollment changes – with decreases in the northeastern and northwestern part of the County and a reduction in the Yancey area, but a lot of growth in the urban ring and toward Crozet. He said that they project relatively flat enrollment in elementary schools over the next five years, except for Agnor-Hurt, Greer, and Baker-Butler; and they project continued decline at Broadus-Wood. Mr. Tistadt stated that for the five years after that, they show some resumption of growth to the west, but declining growth to the north and a little bit of growth around the Agnor-Hurt area. He said that the middle schools and high schools are mirroring the same patterns.

Mr. Tistadt reported that they would look at four areas of demographics: English learners, economically disadvantaged as defined by eligibility for free and reduced lunch, mobility, and special education. He illustrated the impact of different demographics on the classroom, and took an actual 3rd grade classroom at Greer Elementary School last year – which had 18 students and 1 teacher. He said that one of the students receives special education instruction outside the classroom; three of the students are getting reading or math intervention services outside the classroom; four of the students get language intervention support outside the classroom; another group of students gets language support services inside the classroom; one newcomer student receives help for limited English skills; two students are pulled out for speech intervention; and five students are pulled out for enrichment. He said that six of the students were not there at the beginning of the year or not there at the end of the year, which speaks to the high level of transience at that school.

Dr. Acuff noted that the students classified as “newcomer” are those who come in after the first day of school.

Mr. Tistadt stated that what is important with the "pullout situation" (where students are taken out of the classroom to different spaces for interventions) is that in the past they have not adequately calculated or planned for the small spaces.. He presented a schematic image of Woodbrook Elementary, pointing out the location of regular classrooms and intervention services for math, reading and language – with very limited space inside the classroom because these schools were built on the model of 25-30 kids sitting neatly in rows and receiving instruction. Mr. Tistadt stated that the schools are solving their deficits by using trailers, closets, and everywhere they can find space. He said that one of the deficit solutions with the current Woodbrook addition is to solve the small space problems, with Ms. Schmidt almost finished with her work to evaluate all school buildings and available spaces, and how they would address them.

Mr. Tistadt stated that beginning with English learners, there has been growth over the last few years, with 127 students or about 12% added to enrollment. He said that this has occurred at Cale and Greer and to a slightly lesser extent Agnor-Hurt, and slightly less than that at Baker-Butler. Mr. Tistadt noted that 39% of the students at Greer are English language learners, with 213 students total and 197 of those at Cale, as part of a significant concentration of these students around the urban ring. He added that almost

all of the English language learners are in these schools, with the remaining 11 schools only having 15% of those students, and the middle schools have the same data set.

Mr. Tistadt reported that economically disadvantaged students – defined by eligibility for free and reduced lunch – went from 2,600 to 3,900 and from 21% to 29% of students. He stated that this is happening at the urban ring schools: Agnor-Hurt, Greer, and Cale – with Greer having 73% of students on free and reduced lunch, Cale having 45%, and Agnor-Hurt having 52%. Mr. Tistadt noted adjacent to Greer are the schools with the lowest percentage of economically disadvantaged students. He stated that in 2005, the lowest three schools had 8% of the economically disadvantaged students and the highest three schools had 56% – and today the lowest have 10%, but the highest have 69%, so the gap between schools is growing. He added that there is not much change in that pattern for middle schools, but there is a significant increase in the other three.

Mr. Tistadt stated that the schools define mobility as those students who come in after the first day of school, leave before the last day of school, or do both – so they are really looking at the difference between the numbers of students on the first day of school versus the last day of school. He said that Greer had 156 mobility students in the last school year; the next highest school was Agnor-Hurt with 80 students, and this dynamic is mostly concentrated to urban ring schools, with Baker-Butler and Brownsville also having some fairly high numbers.

Dr. Acuff mentioned that Greer has about 660 students, so the mobility students represent a big proportion.

Mr. Tistadt noted that the mobility in the urban ring middle and high schools is higher than elsewhere.

Mr. Tistadt presented information on special education classrooms in the 2010-2011 school year, stating that there were five pre-K special education classrooms and other VAPP classrooms, and he pointed out the additional instructional spaces in 2016-17 that are demanding facilities. He commented that a lot of this is a deliberate effort by the school system to bring special education students from outside contract services onto the schools' own campuses, where staff feels they get better services – although there are huge facility implications. Mr. Tistadt said that as the schools look at their space planning and future facilities planning, the special education component of this is a big part of what they are trying to address.

Mr. Tistadt reported that the key points are that overall enrollment and demographic groups are increasing, these increases have significant implications, the growth is not evenly distributed, and demographic changes are not equally impacting all schools – with the gap between schools growing. He stated that to begin to address this, to the extent the school system can address it, with the superintendent's focus and the School Board's budget request to the Board of Supervisors, the only initiative in the budget was to address the growing inequity with access to services. Mr. Tistadt said that students of poverty and students with limited English are not achieving as well as other students, and while they are making progress, they are not making as much progress as they need to make – and thus there is a funding initiative in this year's budget to begin to address this, particularly with urban ring schools. He noted that the gaps are evident in absenteeism, out-of-school suspensions, and students who are identified with gifted.

Mr. Tistadt stated that the schools want to start the program with the schools that have the greatest challenges with their demographics, learn from it and improve it, with the goal of eventually having it implemented throughout the entire school system. He said that the School Board's request to the Board of Supervisors is $1.3 million for a "C Team," which is comprised of staff and professional development personnel.

Ms. Spain said that she wanted to know the racial breakdown by school lunch eligibility in the general statistics presented.

Mr. Tistadt responded that he could get that data to the Commission, and he wanted to focus on the budget demographics that have an impact on budget, operating, and capital expenses. He added that they do not staff to color, but do staff to poverty and to language.

Mr. Dotson asked where the mobile students were going – the adjacent districts or to a school that is less impacted – as he would be interested in knowing whether low-income families move into other districts that are better served.

Mr. Tistadt replied that the schools do not have data that tracks where students go and their movement between Charlottesville and Albemarle, as he has heard anecdotally that they move back and forth as housing and rental prices change.

Mr. Keller stated that this is the type of data that they have discussed in the past, and if both bodies are interested in it, perhaps they could make it a priority to get this information.

Mr. Tistadt said that the schools could evaluate that possibility, but he was not sure if it was doable.

Mr. Vince Scheivert stated that there are several difficulties in collecting that information on where the students go, and there is no burden on someone leaving the division to tell the schools. He said that they have the information when students transfer between schools within the system, and sometimes when they transfer to other localities; the County will get requests for information from the adjacent school system but does not actually keep that record. Mr. Scheivert noted that they would have to ask the office assistants to follow up to get that information, so it is a more laborious process than it seems – as usually students just move away and are not heard from, so the schools are just trying to figure out whether they will return.

Mr. Keller asked if there are certain sectors with repeat time for elementary schools, in that a student starts at one school, disappears, and then shows up again.

Mr. Scheivert responded that they have some of that information because of enrollment dates, so the schools would show un-enrollment as they leave and re-enrollment when they return. He said that the schools could do that with some of their internal data, although sites work somewhat independently as students move around schools.

Dr. Acuff pointed out that what they do know is that these are people with unstable housing, and currently the County has over 300 students who are homeless. She said that there are also families living together at places like Barracks West, so there is a lot of instability, and there are a lot of IRC – most of whom go to Greer. Dr. Acuff noted that about five years ago, about 80% of IRC students were placed in City schools, but as low-income housing has become more available in the County, that statistic has flipped and about 80% of placements now are in County schools.

Ms. Riley asked them to talk about the equity and access initiatives and what issues were being addressed through that.

Mr. Matt Haas explained that the equity and access initiative is designed to address the issues mentioned in Mr. Tistadt's presentation, but schools do not view the students living in poverty or speaking a language other than English at home as being the problem. He stated that the issue is the capacity they need to build in the schools around the concentration of these students. Mr. Haas said that this effort has

three components, including a C-team to focus on social, emotional and academic development that would work in the four urban ring elementary schools as a pilot. He stated that these would be specialized staff that would work with school issues but would also have social work components, psychology, ESL, and newcomer teams – so that there is staff on hand that can work directly with those students and their families and principals don't have to reinvent the wheel every time the students come on board. Mr. Haas said that the schools are able to catch students up and get them working at the level they need to be, but it takes a lot of time and energy at the school level to be able to do that without specialized support. He stated that there would be six FTEs devoted to that.

Mr. Haas stated that the other piece is related to technology and upgrading a system for student achievement management, and the schools currently use a system for response to intervention tracking that is no longer supported by the vendor and needs to be replaced, but they would replace it with a robust program and add an FTE to bring it on board around enterprise applications so they have consistent implementation across the school division. He said that this would enable student interventions – including special education students – are well-tracked, well-documented, and more easily supported throughout the system.

Mr. Haas said that another significant piece for schools to address is a program known as micro credentialing, which is professional development with accountability for implementing what teachers and staff learn, coupled with compensation for that. He stated that the schools have estimate 500 per teacher for up to 500 teachers, to learn the skills and strategies needed to work with students who have high needs. Mr. Haas added that the schools are prioritizing those skills and strategies to the urban ring elementary schools, so teachers in the schools can learn culturally responsive teaching practices, assessment literacy, and things that would help them do a better job in working with students. He emphasized that this effort would help them build capacity with instructional staff and not just put out fires when they occur.

Mr. Haas stated that the schools are also piloting a tracking system that sits outside the student information and tracks discipline incidents so they can drill down into school performance around student behavior management and having a positive, supportive climate. He noted that they do not want all of this sitting in students' records, but this also inhibits them from tracking areas that are considered hot spots – particular classrooms or places in the school where discipline issues or certain environments could benefit from professional development or support. Mr. Haas said that the schools have data around student academic achievement, as well as the disparate impact of student suspensions and chronic absenteeism. He stated that the schools want to see better achievement among minority and economically disadvantaged students, and noted that there is a white paper that would help illuminate these efforts.

Mr. Keller stated that the first and third items seem to be logical areas for some discussion or coordination with the City school system, and asked if that was the case – particularly whether they used the same student achievement management system software.

Mr. Haas responded that the County has ongoing coordination with the City, but he was not sure if they would be using the same software program, as the County is working with its special ed department on that. He emphasized that this system tracks interventions for students' individualized education plans (IEPs) and would not get shared across entities.

Dr. Pamela Moran stated that they do share information back and forth as students transfer, and have some initial work in place to evaluate children who are coming up through preschool. She said that they sacrifice the ability to do identification of students but are able to look at the impact of programs that the City and County are implementing. Dr. Moran said that one other place for integration of capability to work with outside agencies is with the County Department of Social Services and other internal agencies.

Mr. Haas said that the schools meet with staff from the Department of Social Services to talk about the segue between what they are providing at the school level and the home support provided, so they are not duplicating services. He stated that DSS has a lot of protocols in place that the schools can learn from and apply at the school level.

Dr. Acuff stated that they already have smaller class sizes in schools with high percentages of free and reduced lunches or high numbers of ESL students, smaller class sizes and more intervention – but the progress has been slow. She added that she is excited about the program proposed.

Ms. Spain asked if the numbers reflected investments already made in the pilot program or if they were requesting that money.

Mr. Haas responded that this was part of the schools' funding request to the Board of Supervisors, and confirmed that the $1.2 million is needed for that purpose – which had started out as a $2.7 million initiative prior to the team working to bring it down. He stated that the schools are building things incrementally out over time so they can study them and determine if they are getting the desired impact before making bigger investments.

Mr. Dotson stated that the schools do not view the non-English speaking and economically disadvantaged students as being the problem, and asked Mr. Haas to clarify what was meant by that.

Mr. Haas explained that these are schools of excellence in terms of the diversity housed there, noting that his children went to Agnor-Hurt Elementary and was now a junior at Albemarle High School, taking the toughest academic program available. He stated that his daughter was at Jack Jouett, and the schools never want to send the message to the community that these places are not ones in which all children's needs are being met. Mr. Haas said that the growth and the concentrated growth as described by Mr. Tistadt brings about issues of the schools' capacity to work with students who have experienced trauma and interrupted education, or very little educational background. He emphasized that this is about their system building capacity within staff and providing the support and resources needed to do the work well.

Mr. Tistadt said that he would share the results of some work done by the Weldon Cooper Center, as the schools asked the center to evaluate enrollment projections – which have been very accurate in the aggregate but not on a school-by-school basis. He stated that the schools wanted to get updated housing yield data from them so that impact statements provided to staff or the Planning Commission on the number of students expected to come out of a new development. Mr. Tistadt noted that one thing the schools have not done is to try to project changes in demographics, so they asked Weldon Cooper about trends with ESL and economically disadvantaged populations – but their conclusion was that they could not provide that information.

Mr. Tistadt provided data on school enrollment changes in Virginia from 2000 to 2006, stating that it has changed dramatically over the last five years, with very few jurisdictions in the state still having growing enrollment. He said that Weldon Cooper's findings were that Albemarle's birth rate is only slightly higher than it was a decade ago, with incoming kindergarten classes projected to remain smaller until 2020. Mr. Tistadt stated that for the last two years, they have not had the number of students projected, and last two kindergarten classes were significantly smaller than those that proceeded it. He said that enrollment is projected to grow again after 2020, as the center feels there will be a resumption of birth rates nationally – and the number of childbearing women in Albemarle is expected to grow at a rate greater than the overall population growth.

Mr. Tistadt reported that the number of students per dwelling unit has declined, which speaks to the percentage shown earlier that shows a percent increase in student enrollment as being less than the overall growth, which he attributes to aging population. He said that the number of students coming out of housing units is decreasing, with more families living in townhouses and mobile homes versus detached, single-family homes. He provided 2016-yield information, which projected fewer numbers of students per unit for single-family detached homes; a slight change with single-family attached; and modest increases in multi-family, mobile, and town homes. Mr. Tistadt said that the schools would use the chart as shown on any impact statement provided to the Planning Commission or County staff going forward, when impact statements on development are requested.

Mr. Tistadt reported that Albemarle County is the only locality outside of the Northern Virginia urban crescent where the median home value is above $300,000 – with Arlington and Fairfax being the only jurisdictions having a ratio of income to housing values. He referenced a statistic underscoring that a lot of employees who work in Albemarle cannot afford to live there, so they commute from surrounding jurisdictions, and he reiterated that Weldon Cooper did not have a whole lot of information that contributed to predictions of student poverty. Mr. Tistadt presented information on the average Albemarle home value by decade built, noting that the Commission was probably already aware of this information. He stated that the percentage of enrollment going to Agnor-Hurt, Greer, and Woodbrook has grown much more quickly than the rest of the County, largely due to the location of the lowest-valued homes.

Mr. Tistadt noted the correlation between housing size and poverty levels, stating that 44% of the multi-family homes in Albemarle are in the Greer attendance area; 19% are in Cale; 52% of mobile homes are in the Cale district (Southwood). He stated that their study explored the methodology used for projecting enrollment and "cohort survival" – which is the percent of 5$^{th}$ graders that end up in 6$^{th}$ grade, 6$^{th}$ graders that end up in 7$^{th}$ grade, etc. – with that percentage varying significantly by school. Mr. Tistadt said that this was the first step in the projection of enrollment of a succeeding school year, although they did have to project incoming kindergarten classes for elementary schools. He added that they also talk with Community Development about what developments are coming online and what new housing inventory would be in place, and how it might impact specific schools.

Mr. Tistadt suggested that they pause briefly for questions.

Mr. Keller said that the question of owner occupancy versus renting as a determinant of wealth is of interest to him, and there seem to be some inherent biases here with trailers and multi-family housing, and there would be more modular housing because of the lower cost, and collecting the data in this way might be a bit outdated. He stated that the Commission would be the one on the firing line with transient housing, as the Board of Supervisors has asked for that to be fast-tracked by County staff. He said that his understanding from some friends in the enforcement community is that they have concerns about the impact of this on transient housing that is provided to family members for a low fee, as this could affect the group of students mentioned. Mr. Keller noted that the Commission had not seen this study previously, and the Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee (FIAC) had seen things like this but was taking the data from school resources. He asked if there were representatives from the School Board who were going to be on the newly reworked FIAC – because it seemed to be a logical body that projects the future of the County and should have that representation.

Mr. Gast-Bray responded that he did not know the origins of the membership of the Residential Work Group and their mission is slightly different from FIAC's, which has been slated to focus on some different things. He offered to find out more about the FIAC composition and bring it back to the Commission.

Ms. Firehock stated that the Commission has not seen information like this before, certainly not geographically associated with schools and student enrollment, and she greatly appreciated it. She said that she would like to see additional information on the median housing age and the concentration in the urban ring for special populations, and there is also a significant need for affordable housing, as well as a discussion needed on how it will be distributed. Ms. Firehock stated that one of the most efficient strategies for affordable housing is to acquire and rehabilitate existing housing stock, and in looking at areas where the median housing age is in that timeframe is potentially a strategic way to acquire and permanently hold affordable housing. She said that how those populations would be concentrated is another part of the conversation, and she wanted them to continue sharing the data and talking about their joint goals.

Dr. Acuff said that the schools had a redistricting study done two years ago, and one of the considerations was whether there was a way to redistrict some of the students from Greer – with Murray considered at the time – but the issue was transportation, including how to get parents to the school. She stated that the issue is a concentration of lower-cost housing and that housing being along transportation routes, so both of those need to be tackled at the same time. Dr. Acuff commented that the unintended consequence of how growth has happened has been to significantly concentrate low-income students and their families in the urban ring. She said that the newcomers moving in and out might be addressed with more housing that is available.

Mr. Keller stated that there is another piece in terms of creating a future vision for patterns of development that could have even more impact on schools.

Ms. More said that it takes a lot of staff time to come up with the number of units that have been approved but have yet to be built, and there is also a range of units within that number that may be built. She stated that she has concern with the effectiveness of that information and its ability to predict enrollment, as there are some huge projects coming online that could impact an elementary school or middle school.

Mr. Tistadt responded that the schools look at the three, five, and six-year averages for the cohorts mentioned earlier in the meeting, and they are influenced by potential growth in that area in terms of which of the averages is chosen. He stated that if it is in Crozet and there is a lot in the pipeline, they would probably take the number that gives the highest projection – but they would not specifically anticipate a certain number of children to come out of each subdivision. Mr. Tistadt also noted that if you are making investments in capital, it is better to react to it than to get out ahead of it and have it not come to fruition, so it is helpful to have staff's information as input into whether the schools go with the low, high, or middle projections for a given school.

Mr. Koleszar stated that housing developments have a lifespan or yield, so when a new development comes in with young families, they may have pre-K and elementary, but those children move up into other schools and fewer new kids fill the vacated slots in the lower grades.

Mr. Dotson asked if the trailers used tend to stay around for a long time, or if they are moved to different schools.

Dr. Acuff responded that they moved their fourth double-wide unit behind Woodbrook Elementary last summer, with a nine-trailer complex of eight classrooms they moved behind Albemarle High School. She said that some of the trailers have been there for a very long time, and the schools try not to have students there all day long – but they will use the buildings for a special class such as music or for their intervention work. Dr. Acuff stated that their use had been decreasing, with a determined effort by the schools to decrease them, but since the recession, they have unfortunately been on the upswing.

Mr. Tistadt noted that they are moved between schools when possible, and he confirmed that the presence of trailers tended to be a fairly permanent fixture.

Dr. Acuff said that they had seven trailers at Woodbrook in the early 2000s before Baker-Butler was built, but they got rid of all of those – and now they are back to four double-wides at Woodbrook. She added that the schools would like them to be less permanent.

Ms. Firehock said that the use of trailers has come up in the Commission's discussions on a few developments, where they were told there was adequate capacity – and she would like to see the capacity information delineated into capacity in trailers versus the building, as they want to know if there is quality space available.

Dr. Acuff stated that this is what Ms. Schmidt has been working on, as there is a need for break-out space and even some closets have been repurposed for that use. She emphasized that some of the space issues are significant, with the average core facility at 47 years old – and there needs to be a lot of improvement in that infrastructure.

Mr. Koleszar asked who was answering the question when it was posed, and whether it was the developer answering it or school personnel.

Ms. Firehock responded that because they are in a public hearing environment, in recent years, it has been reported by staff based on information they have obtained from the schools – and it was not broken out into main building versus trailer space.

Mr. Keller stated that this dialogue has gotten to the core of something that will be useful, although the proffer discussion will impact it, as the Commission has been told that if the trailers are there, then the locality is meeting capacity and they cannot challenge that.

Mr. Blair confirmed that this was correct, based on the state proffer legislation passed in 2016.

Mr. Tistadt said that the School Board could modify future impact statements to be as meaningful as possible, and would work together to make sure they provide the Commission with the information they are interested in hearing.

Mr. David Oberg mentioned that according to capacity, Henley is below capacity – but in visiting Henley, he did not see where they were going to put another 50 students. He said that they could reorganize the classrooms and the space, and while technically it may not be at capacity, the teachers, parents and students would see the school as being jam-packed. Mr. Oberg added that there are likely other schools that fall into the category of not being at capacity but are very crowded. He mentioned that there were many constituents who were emphatic in 2008 about building new schools when construction costs were lower, but they didn't do that. He stated that it concerns him how many buildings were being built in the Crozet area, with people continually providing him assurances that that construction would not impact the capacity at schools. Mr. Oberg added that he was not a statistician, but his common sense feeling was that there would be more students with all the additional residences going up. He said that there are many children at Old Trail, despite assurances at the time it was built that there would only be older people living there.

Dr. Acuff stated that it will be interesting to see Ms. Schmidt's study because capacity is affected by the number of students or those who need pull-out spaces, but it's also a function of the need to modernize the school facilities because they are aging facilities that don't support what they are doing.

Mr. Blair mentioned that the Board of Supervisors set out the charter for the FIAC committee back in September, which included liaisons that included two BOS members, two Commissioners, the County Attorney, and the Director of Planning. He said that that committee should address the capacity issues, because the proffer law says they cannot expand capacity from a proffer. Mr. Blair suggested that the School Board request from the Board of Supervisors that a school staff member, School Board member, or both were added to the committee.

Ms. Firehock stated that she and Ms. Riley have been trying to get the County to reinstate its affordable housing committee and do more proactive work on that, and one issue that has come to their attention is the matching teachers with affordable housing before it disappears.

Dr. Acuff responded that the schools have 2,500 staff, half of whom are teachers, and the School Board received 220 letters from teachers this year – and the ones that have struck her are those explaining that they must live in other counties because they can't afford to live in Albemarle.

Ms. Riley said she thought something could be piloted relatively easy, perhaps a down payment program, and this was not enabling teachers to afford housing, having them join the geographic community fostered the small-town community they've been seeking.

Mr. Keller said that in terms of the young beginning teachers, there are a number of affordable housing credits that can be used for things like garage apartments. He stated that he would be interested to know how many of the auxiliary buildings being approved with affordable credits in new developments could be education workforce housing.

**High School 2022 Update**

Mr. Haas reported that due to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Every Student Succeeds Act, there have been a lot of changes at the federal level in mandates for testing for students, and the state Department of Education seized the opportunity to rethink the high school experience, with students more ready to take on life, work, and college than they are currently being educated to. He stated that there is pressure on high school capacity in the County, and instead of immediately proposing the addition of seats at the high schools, the School Board embarked on a study. Mr. Haas stated that the first part of the study went from August 2016 through February 2017, with a new program of studies for Fall 2018 that incorporates the "Virginia Profile of a Graduate" and shifts emphasis from academics to workplace readiness skills, career development, and community engagement. He said that this may require a different kind of facility, and may reduce the number of classroom boxes and seats needed at the high school level and increase the need for different kinds of spaces that foster mentorship and work with community organizations, as well as having students be out in the community more.

Dr. Moran stated that there has been an effort to look at schools as community centered and not just about students, with consideration of collocation for things that community needs inside or along with schools, particularly if they were to end up with a new high school.

Dr. Acuff mentioned that they have proffered land on Berkmar and Rio Mills, which could be a potential high school site; Albemarle High School has 2,000 students; and Monticello and Western Albemarle have 1,200 students. She stated that there is some feeling that having four equally sized schools would be beneficial, but there is also support for a high school in the northern part of the County. Dr. Acuff said that another option would be to expand and substantially renovate Albemarle High School. She stated that regardless of the approach, there would be transportation impacts, especially with having 25% or more of

juniors and seniors out in the community doing projects on both capacity and transportation needs.

Mr. Keller said that in the urban areas, there could be a new transit authority that addressed this is part of their work. He asked about the schools' timeframe to study a new high school.

Mr. Haas stated that the schools just had an RFP meeting to work with a consultant and help them organize information around these same topics – transportation, 21st Century design of high schools, and the impact of that on programs versus having four schools.

Dr. Acuff said that in terms of a timeframe, whether they renovate and expand or build a new high school, it will take a tremendous amount of cash and another referendum. She stated that it would have to be on the ballot in 2018, so that voters come out, and the School Board recommendation would need to come this year in order to get the Supervisors engaged. She stated that after the consultant provides recommendations, the Commission and School Board could meet again.

Mr. Keller suggested that their respective staffs pick a date.

Dr. Acuff responded that October would likely be a good timeframe as they should have a lot of the information by then.

Ms. Firehock asked to what degree the School Board has been involved with the Board of Supervisors' community development assessment.

Dr. Acuff responded that she has not had any interaction with staff in that regard.

Mr. Tistadt stated that he had just met with Susan Stimart of County staff earlier that afternoon, and he told her that she needed to reach out to Mr. Haas.

Mr. Keller noted that this was a good reason for the individual bodies to meet together, adding that planning staff has not heard anything about the County Executive search and their involvement in that.

Dr. Moran stated that there is a consultant who would be helping with the interview process.

Dr. Acuff commented that it would be a good idea for the schools to have input, since they represented 60% of the County's budget.

**Route 29 Small Area Planning**

Mr. Andrew Gast-Bray presented a PowerPoint overview of Rio/29 and developing a new land use process that converts a more corridor-based pattern of development into a higher performing way of development as identified in the Comp Plan. He said that they will be looking at the tools needed for this process, and his conversation would focus on how to engage on multiple levels to get the tools to perform better.

Mr. Gast-Bray said that phase one began in 2016 and concluded in March 2017, and looked at how to take the small area plan for Rio/29, which includes Rio and Fashion Square Mall and goes to the river – and a tool that can make it happen. He stated that the phase one findings were that they were looking at a different way of developing, in a pattern of "nodes" rather than a strip pattern. Mr. Gast-Bray said that this was a transformational approach, and he used the example of the Downtown Mall in Charlottesville as creating a micro-economy. He said that these nodes function as self-identified places, which would likely foster a different development pattern of 10 to 20-minute walkable communities. Mr. Gast-Bray

stated that this concept was embraced by the community, reinforcing the Comp Plan and being the organizing principle for the implementation tool, and up to three nodes were identified as part of phase one.

Mr. Gast-Bray stated that phase two would look at a detailed design of a node in particular – at Rio and 29 – with the transportation vision being key as a methodology for creating better places. He said that the form-based code would enable them to come up with regulatory mechanisms to make sure this kind of development pattern happens. Mr. Gast-Bray noted that phase three elements would begin in October, and he would also talk about the process public engagement.

Mr. Gast-Bray said that developing in pulse nodes is a much more effective use of community resources and gives a lot of opportunities, and also correlates with better use of transportation and the economy. He stated that this was heartily embraced in the public engagement part of phase one – but the community emphasized that the County should focus on one node so as not to push development into too many other areas and have the pattern get back to a strip mode. Mr. Gast-Bray said that in that process, they identified Rio and 29 as the area of focus, so that became the priority and the focus for the next phase. Mr. Gast-Bray stated that they talked about the general performance characteristics of the nodes, the mix of building types and heights, and the density and intensity of development. He said that they came up with several possibilities including a small-scale community such as a village versus a small CBD, and while both can work, the choice the community wants to make would be determined in phase two. Mr. Gast-Bray emphasized that no matter what they chose, it would have to work from all aspects: transportation, economy, etc.

Mr. Gast-Bray stated that the conclusions of phase one were to organize around nodes, have up to three nodes, phase the nodes – with the first being Rio and 29, and have differentiating use of categories. He said that the public process recognized the opportunities for a public or civic space, and they do not have the availability in phase one, but in future phases they could possibly integrate opportunities for schools. Mr. Gast-Bray noted several areas of common interest, stating that they would be looking at a hybrid or integrated form-based code. He said that instead of traditional code, which uses density, they would be putting a greater emphasis on the form and relationship of it to streets and neighborhoods – and less emphasis on using density. Mr. Gast-Bray noted that the reason they call it "hybrid/integrated" was because they will also bring transportation and economy into it.

Mr. Gast-Bray said that conventional zoning code talks about segregating land uses, which is conducive to strip development but was not very economical and was not particularly liked by the community. He presented an image depicting development that followed form-based code, which the community embraces. Mr. Gast-Bray said that traditional zoning was simplified and specified through text, with pictures added to illustrate what was meant. He added that the Neighborhood Model can be specific in terms of what it looks like and how it relates to things like transportation, which is often missing in terms of how the transportation network functions. Mr. Gast-Bray said that in other communities, the timeframes for when the bus is busiest for the school, it nests almost perfectly within the pattern of where the peak loads are for regular transit. He said that these are just opportunities as part of the process, and there are different aspects of this in terms of tools, the code, and location – whether it is around a transit station or more in a village residential area, which would provide a different context for development patterns. Mr. Gast-Bray noted that Arlington zones are based on street frontage, and there may be minor and major streets within one zone, so it is related to the form of the building and how it is situated on a lot, as well as whether it is mixed-use vertical.

Mr. Keller asked for an explanation of mixed-use vertical.

Mr. Gast-Bray explained that mixed-use vertical has a mix of different uses on floors, such as residential above offices and a restaurant on the first floor.

Mr. Gast-Bray stated that the Hydraulic/29 planning is also underway now, and they are looking at a node pattern for that development area. He said that transit does not work very well in this area currently, but having nodes along the way could offer opportunities for people to have complete lives where they live and age in place – but it needs to be a coordinated effort. He added that the nice thing about having Hydraulic underway at the same time as Rio is that it gives them a chance to understand how node to node form works and to do these things in parallel, and to come up with more adaptive solutions for each place.

Mr. Gast-Bray stated that staff would come forward in May with a proposal for a public engagement (charrette) process, and in this case a lot of the vision work has been done already so they would focus on specific design elements and how to make them work – as well as adapting transportation so that there is a sensible approach to investment in it over time.

Mr. Keller asked about the undeveloped and brownfield sites, and how population growth would be handled in that corridor.

Mr. Gast-Bray responded that staff approached this as a hypothetical of if they build in the pattern they have seen, what the County can handle or do – and just working on infill, it is mostly empty parking lots. He said that if they did the same exercise for 5-10 nodes that are identified in the future, and with places like Pantops, they could handle all the proposed and foreseeable development up to 2,100 without technically having to remove a building.

Mr. Lafferty asked if VDOT design engineers in Richmond are aware of the form-based code, because there will be a great impact.

Mr. Gast-Bray responded that they did, stating that the average timeframe for a major transportation project is 20 years, and they are having to predict well into the future. He stated that there is a lot of data from around the country, and they have to go with what they know.

Mr. Keller said that Columbia Pike in Northern Virginia has demonstrated that it can happen relatively quickly, when there is the will of the jurisdiction to support it.

Mr. Gast-Bray added that Bethesda, Maryland has used this approach successfully.

Dr. Acuff commented that Gaithersburg has also done well with this form of development. She asked why the Rio/29 intersection was selected as the first node, as it is antithetical to a neighborhood and all of the property is already in private hands.

Mr. Gast-Bray responded that it has been identified already, and even though the land is in private hands, it would not make sense to locate the first node in a greenfield site far north of town. He stated that with staff just asking to work together, there were developers on board with this concept and not going immediately to a big-box building.

Mr. Koleszar stated that one Board of Supervisors member is very excited about this approach and the possibility of relocating the court there as a starter, and he asked how much public infrastructure is needed as the seed in place in order for people to want to build around it.

Mr. Gast-Bray responded that when there is a complete place, there is usually a civic function as part of that. He stated that the County is sponsoring a session as part of the Tom-Tom Festival that talks about crossing the 29 divide as being an opportunity, and said that other places have done things as innovative as building things over a highway – such as a mall in Columbus, Ohio on a bridge over the highway, a community park built over a park in Dallas, and an arts garden and park in Cincinnati built over Route 1. Mr. Gast-Bray said that these things take what seems to be a deficiency into an opportunity, and while it is not cheap, the alternative is throwing away places because it is too expensive to live there. He stated that it has been demonstrated that public investment in terms of infrastructure and amenities helps to make places – although it is not clear to him yet to what extent that should happen.

Mr. Keller stated that the answer is that different nodes could have different characters, with one around a municipality or jurisdiction's infrastructure, such as courts; and another node could be completely private sector. He said that a new "City of Albemarle" that rings the City of Charlottesville would be made up of a number of these different places that have different characters.

Dr. Acuff asked Mr. Gast-Bray and the Commission if they felt this could be accomplished by incentives for developers, or if there would need to be a significant investment by the County as the startup for it.

Mr. Gast-Bray responded that he felt it would be both as it is a partnership, and if they want mixed use there need to be many elements working together – with no one entity expected to take it all on. He said that the things that people like best are often borne of hard work and challenge, but those efforts make the places that last.

Mr. Keller said that there are urban areas where there are major schools that have a very different character than the suburban schools now, and there is all this redundancy in open space that isn't really being used for much of the year, as us is concentrated in the spring. He stated that most of them probably thought of a more suburban model when the acreage on Berkmar Extended was earmarked for a new high school, so there would have to be very different zoning approaches for that area to develop as a node in and of itself. Mr. Keller said that conceivably, a major school could be that sort of node as well, and in the past there has been a real segregation of uses when it comes to locating schools and not wanting there to be much around it.

Mr. Koleszar stated that if they decide to build a new high school or specialty center, somewhere in the node might be the appropriate place.

Dr. Acuff said that Supervisor Rick Randolph had suggested that when she was reporting to the Board a few months ago, and they might have to change their concept of high school in terms of having sports fields.

Mr. Gast-Bray responded that those could become community amenities and opportunities, rather than the redundant standalone fields that Mr. Keller referenced. He stated that safety data shows that places are much safer when there are lots of eyes around, rather than located in isolated areas, and this also provides walkability for students to their homes, jobs, and after-school activities.

Dr. Acuff commented that this has been a very useful meeting.

Mr. Keller asked if there was any interest among Commissioners and School Board members in having a few from each body working on these topics informally, such as affordable housing for teachers. He stated that in October, they would be focusing primarily on the new high school, and there seemed to be more concern on the Commission's part in terms of data gathering.

Mr. Gast-Bray stated that staff has wanted the schools to finish the information provided, because that will go into the capacity analysis and projections over time. He said that with the new neighborhood planning effort, they hope to be integrating the new data that no one is currently utilizing thoroughly. Mr. Gast-Bray noted that it is a pretty laborious effort which is part of the reason for the neighborhood planner position just posted.

Mr. Keller said they would just let it go until the October meeting and then see if there is any acceleration that occurs after a second meeting.

Ms. More stated that she liked the suggestion of having the School Board represented on the Residential Development Impact Group, and one outcome of this meeting could be the Commission's support of that proposal.

Mr. Keller said that if the School Board made a decision on it and copied the Commission, they in turn could do a resolution of support.

Dr. Acuff noted that they would have a meeting on April 13, so they could decide then unless there is a sense now.

School Board members expressed their support.

Mr. Paige asked what was the task of that committee.

Dr. Acuff responded that it was newly formed.

Mr. Gast-Bray explained that last year's state proffer legislation, which went into effect in July, affected schools, transportation, and other proffers associated with residential development. He stated that dealing with those changes and handling residential development was largely the focus of this work group.

Mr. Keller noted that the original FIAC was developed to work on coming up with a process, methodology, and figure for the County to use as a guideline for developers. He stated that there was initially an amount of $20,000, which was reduced to $7,000, and that came about through the work of FIAC.

Mr. Oberg said that he would feel more comfortable from a process standpoint if they put it on the agenda and addressed it appropriately, instead of winging it now.

Dr. Acuff asked Mr. Blair to send her information on the group, including its mission, and commented that it would likely be a time-restricted process of figuring out a policy.

Mr. Blair agreed to send her the group's charter and membership.

Ms. Riley commented that the County has a number of proffered units, and they have no plan for how they are going to get into families' hands – so it may be helpful to look at their proximity to schools, and whether there may be a way to provide an employer-assisted program for teachers and staff to rent or purchase them.

Mr. Keller asked her to provide a brief description of how the proffered housing works and how it can disappear, as the impression is that it will remain available into perpetuity.

Ms. Riley explained that previously the County had affordable housing staff that worked with down payment assistance and qualifying families, but there is currently no staff doing that work. She stated that when they had a proffer policy they could enforce, a developer would proffer affordable housing units – some have been proffered, some developments have not been built yet, and there is some preliminary data that shows where those units will be. Ms. Riley said that without a County-sponsored process, a developer simply needs to advertise the unit for 60 days, and if a qualified family purchase it, it becomes a successful affordable home. She stated that otherwise, it goes to market rate and anyone can purchase it, so there is a very short window of time.

Dr. Moran suggested that Mr. Tistadt work with Human Resources staff to see if they can get in the communication pipeline, because there are shortages of affordable housing for other workforce sectors, such as police and firefighters.

Mr. Tistadt agreed that he would, but expressed concern about the absence of resources and dedicated staff, as Ms. Riley mentioned.

Ms. Riley stated that there is one housing person, but they are not dedicated solely to that work, and there is a small pot of funds – about $500,000 – because some developers chose to pay cash in lieu of actually developing units.

Dr. Moran commented that it was worth exploring.

Dr. Acuff asked Ms. Riley if they were working on this as a whole Commission or if there was a work group.

Ms. Riley responded that she and Ms. Firehock have taken initiative to at least gather the data on these units, along with other relevant information, and would bring recommendations back to the Commission and the Board. She stated that she hoped there would at least be something reported by October.

Ms. Firehock said that at the very minimum, they are going to go to the Board and ask them to reestablish the affordable housing committee they used to have, and she acknowledged that there were staffing implications for that. She stated that they would have to be even more creative now that the affordable housing proffer has gone away under the legislation last year, and at a minimum, they should get the units available now identified and promoted to teachers and other school employees. Ms. Firehock commented that this was an easily solved problem with education and awareness. She added that a lot of this went away because of the recession, and they need to be competitive in Albemarle County.

Mr. Keller invited public comment.

Mr. Julian Waters stated that he is a resident of the Samuel Miller District and said that regarding school population and accommodating overcrowding, there will be some residual increased enrollment – but the current wave will likely only last about five years and would not be sustained. Mr. Waters said that in terms of another bond referendum for the building of a high school, he would like to see results from the current bond referendum first so they don't lose face with their constituents. He invited the School Board members and Commissioners to several Tom-Tom Founders Festival events.

Dr. Acuff thanked the Commission for the invitation to the meeting, and said she looked forward to working with the Commission this fall.

The School Board adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

The Commission recessed their meeting at 8:17 p.m. and reconvened at 8:19 p.m.

**Board of Supervisors April 5, 2017 meeting**

Mr. Gast-Bray reported on the April 5 Board of Supervisors meeting, stating that a resolution of intent related to the Photo-Voltaic Generation facilities on Route 53 would be coming to the Commission in the May/June timeframe, with the Board planning to fast-track it and consider it at their July meeting.

**Old Business**

Mr. Keller asked if there was any old business.

Mr. Gast-Bray said that staff would like to collect business cards after the fact so they do not create problems for Commissioners if they have their personal information on them.

Mr. Blair noted that Ms. More's comments from the previous discussion on this have prompted the County to consider a policy in which employees would return them upon departing their positions.

Ms. More stated that it seemed like a logical thing to happen at an exit interview.

**New Business**

Mr. Keller asked if there was any new business. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

**Adjournment**

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m. to the Tuesday, April 18, 2017 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Room #241, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

Andrew Gast-Bray, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)

| |
|---|
| Approved by Planning Commission |
| Date: 7-11-2017 |
| Initials: sct |