ALBEMARLE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
401 MCINTIRE ROAD – ROOM 241
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2018 – 3:00 P.M.
Joint Work Session with Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and School Board

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a joint work session with the Board of Supervisors and School Board on Tuesday, February 13, 2018, at 3:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Commissioners attending were Karen Firehock, Jennie More, Bruce Dotson, Daphne Spain, Julian Bivins, Pam Riley, Vice Chair and Bill Palmer, UVA Representative. Absent was Tim Keller, Chair.

Other staff present were Director of Community Development, Mark Graham, Director of Planning, Andrew Gast-Bray, and Clerk to the Planning Commission, Sharon Taylor.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Ms. Pam Riley, Vice-Chair of the Planning Commission, called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Mr. Ned Gallaway, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel and Ms. Liz A. Palmer. ABSENT: Mr. Rick Randolph.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeff Richardson, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Mallek.

School Board Members Present: Mr. Jonno Alcaro, Ms. Katrina Callsen, Mr. Stephen Koleszar, and Mr. Graham Paige. ABSENT: Ms. Kate Acuff, Mr. Jason Buyaki and Mr. David Oberg.

School Staff Present: Dr. Matt Hass, Deputy Superintendent, and Mrs. Jennifer Johnston, Clerk.

At 3:04 p.m., Mr. Alcaro, Vice-Chair, called the School Board to order.

_____

Agenda Item No. 2. **Joint Work Session w/ School Board and Planning Commission:** Outlook on Demographics and Housing.

Ms. Emily Kilroy, Community Engagement Coordinator, stated that this is the first joint meeting of the three bodies that anyone on County staff could recall, and she thanked members for attending. She stated that their budget processes, strategic plans, and policy directions guide the pillars of the community and local government – built on natural environment, education, and service delivery. Ms. Kilroy said that this convening is in line with the Board's strategic plan goal to increase communication and collaboration between the three bodies, and the topic of this discussion is growth impacts, including what it means for service delivery and the community, as well as adapting to meet the changing needs of the community. Ms. Kilroy stated that the format of this meeting will be intentionally different than a traditional Board meeting or work, as staff felt that having a large group of 20 might not be the most effective approach, so they will recess into small groups and reflect on the information provided by staff. She noted that when all small group presentations are complete, they will reconvene in Room 241 and do a report-out so they have an opportunity to reflect on what has been discussed.

Ms. Kilroy reported that anecdotally, they know that the community is growing – with more traffic during rush hour, longer wait times for tables in restaurants, etc. – but what that means for local government is something the County faces every day. She said the staff across the organization is always reflecting on the data they can collect on different service areas to establish how they can be smarter and better in responding to changing needs. Ms. Kilroy stated that population growth brought an increased demand for services, but the types of services are also shifting – so staff is shifting in response to that. She said this meeting has had a huge lift from staff, and she thanked staff members who will be presenting, as well as support staff and facilitators for the small group meetings. She stated that the small group presentations will share data with the bodies on the impact of growth on government services, and staff hopes this information will be useful to them as decision-makers and advisors to the community.

Mr. Rod Burton, Senior Systems Analyst for Community Development, addressed the group and reported that he will provide a brief understanding of demographics in Albemarle, and Ms. Elaine Echols, Chief of Planning - Long Range, and Mr. David Fox, Neighborhood Planner, will also assist in establishing a view of where the County has been, how it is doing currently, and projections for the future. Mr. Burton stated that they will talk about demographic trends and projections, which impacts development areas, and they will also address development area capacity along with location and timing of development activity. He said that Albemarle's population has steadily been increasing and becoming more racially diverse, as well as aging.

Mr. Burton presented data on Albemarle County's demographics over the past 50 years in comparison to the City of Charlottesville and Virginia as a whole, with the County experiencing an average of approximately 2% growth annually. Mr. Burton noted that the state's growth rate has slowly decreased, although overall growth has continued to increase. He stated that in the early 1990s, Albemarle grew at over 2% annually – which had decreased to 1.6% and since 2010 has been about 1.2%, which is still above the state average. Mr. Burton said that this translates into about 1,400 people per year in the County, which is similar to the pattern in localities like Rockingham County. He pointed out that localities such as Spotsylvania and Stafford County had robust growth in the 90s – almost double that of Albemarle's – but has experienced a heavy downward trend in the past 16-17 years, bringing them on par with Albemarle.

Mr. Burton reported that the urban crescent from Northern Virginia to Richmond to Tidewater is still experiencing growth, aligning with Albemarle, but in the rural parts of the County growth is stagnating and even decreasing in some cases. He stated that the birth rate versus death rate is not keeping up, and while the state is experiencing in migration it is also experiencing out migration in the southern counties. Mr. Burton said that out migration is the result of several factors, including federal sequestration, and the influx of retirees is causing the population age to increase. He stated that going back 26 years, Albemarle County's population was approximately 86% white – but in current years there is growing diversity, with a massive jump in the Hispanic population from 1% to 5.7%; the Asian population has jumped from 2.5% to 5%; and the African-American population has remained steady at about 10%. Mr. Burton noted that over that same period of time, the white population has dropped to 77%, and as the vast majority of the Hispanic population self-identified as white when given the choices of white, black, or Asian, that makes the white population up to 83% in current times. He emphasized that although the County is becoming more diverse, when compared to state trends it is not nearly as diverse as state trends show – with the African-American population about half of what it is in the state as a whole.

Mr. Burton stated that the population of 15-19 year olds remains steady, due in part to UVA, but the demographic group of 40-44 year olds has been decreasing. He noted that the older demographics are ticking upward, including those of retirement age. Mr. Burton said that compared to 1990, the age group of 15-34 year olds comprises one-third of the County's population – but the 19-34 segment of that has decreased. He mentioned that Albemarle trends behind state and national trends in terms of the 25-54 demographic, which are key components of the workforce, with slightly higher trends in terms of the older segment of the population. Mr. Burton stated that when compared to 1990, the number of high school graduates has decreased measurably, but the number with some college has stayed consistent. He emphasized that the graduate and professional degree level beyond bachelor's degrees has risen to approximately 26% – and when taken those measures into account, it represents 50% of the population. Mr. Burton noted that this is abnormally high when compared to the state trend of 37%.

Mr. Burton reported that the median household income was $36,000 in 1990, and Albemarle had stayed ahead of the inflation rate – but not by much, which is curious considering the education levels and job opportunities locally, and this still compares favorably to state and national trends. Mr. Burton said that in terms of housing, when compared to 1990, attached units such as townhouses and duplexes had jumped from a few hundred to approximately 5,000 units in 2017. He commented that while there are numerous factors, one significant driver is the cost of housing in the area driving people to want attached units.

Mr. Burton stated that the most recent available Weldon Cooper Center estimates put the County's population at 107,000, with an estimated 148,000 by 2045. He said that while there is an expectation for an increase in the City's population, it is expected that it will level off to 55,000 or 60,000 people in the next 50 years. Mr. Burton noted that the expectation is for the County's growth rate to flatten out at about 1%, with the City's expected to experience a slight uptick and then leveling off. He stated that the state is expected to continue the downward trend through 2045. Mr. Burton stated that he expects the trend of greater racial diversity to continue, but as with current trends the County is becoming an older population – which will eventually make the population increase stagnate, as it has done in other areas of the state. He said that diversity levels are increasing but are still lower than state and national totals, and there is also a lower number of entry-level workers in the current population because of the aging demographic.

Ms. Spain commented that nationally, the percent of Americans with a college degree is around 30%, compared to 50% in the County.

_____

Agenda Item No. 3. Growth and Land Use.

Ms. Elaine Echols addressed the group and reported that in Planning, the County looks at land use and whether there is enough land to accommodate the future expected population. She noted that Mr. Burton's projections address the County as a whole and not any specific areas, and in doing growth projections they must consider that there are both rural areas and development areas. Ms. Echols stated that it is very challenging to predict growth in the rural area because that is not where residential units are expected to be built – and they want thriving farms, traditional crossroads, and protected scenic areas. She said that many new residents do not know there is a lower level of service delivery expected in the rural areas, and she mentioned that about 40% of existing population lives in about 95% of the County's total land. Ms. Echols stated that development areas are expected to have an investment in services and delivery of services, road construction, road improvements – both for residents and businesses. She said the development areas encompass about 65% of the population in 5% of the land area. Ms. Echols stated that the variety of housing types offered is by design, and about 24 years ago the County took steps to try to diversify its housing stock as the community was becoming more urban and less suburban in appearance.

Ms. Echols reported that Mr. Burton and other staff worked to establish how many people live in the different development areas, and the designated development areas around the City have investment in infrastructure and services, and this is where the new population is expected to live. Ms. Echols said that staff keeps track of how many dwelling units are in each individual development area, then estimate the population using the American Community Survey information from the U.S. Census. She stated that Hollymead and Piney Mountain are the northernmost pars, but together with Neighborhood 1 and Neighborhood 2 – north of the City of Charlottesville – there is 44% of the development area population, which is more than one-fourth of the entire County population. She noted that Pantops has a much smaller population, with a little less than 5,000 residents, and the Village of Rivanna is the smallest and is comprised mostly of Glenmore. Ms. Echols said the southern neighborhoods have just under 10,000 residents and western neighborhoods being somewhat full because they include University of Virginia housing. She stated that Crozet has under 8,000 people in its development area.

Ms. Echols stated that one of the objectives with planning is to ensure there is enough land area to accommodate future growth, so staff evaluates periodically what the development areas can

accommodate for future growth. She noted that this is reported via the Planning Commission's annual report with the Board of Supervisors, and copies of the capacity analysis are available for School Board members who likely have not seen this information. Ms. Echols reported that the analysis shows that each development area can accommodate more growth, with most of them having designations or zoning or both that would allow for significantly more growth. She noted that they used an assumption that all new growth would occur in the development areas, with no redevelopment, and staff concluded that there is sufficient land area to accommodate growth through 2035. Ms. Echols stated that staff expects there will be redevelopment taking placing that will accommodate even more population. She said that Hollymead and Piney Mountain are projected to continue be the most populous areas and are expected to double in population size, with Pantops expected to have leveled-off growth if no redevelopment occurs. She added that the Village of Rivanna has limited capacity; the southern neighborhoods could double; the western neighborhoods would less than double – not reflecting UVA growth in capacity analysis; and Crozet could possibly double from 8,000 to 16,000.

Ms. Echols emphasized that what is most difficult to predict is what the market might do, as it determines when and where development will take place. She stated that staff is working hard to establish in a systematic fashion what developments are occurring where, and they do this to help predict growth for service providers. Ms. Echols said they use this to help the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority and Albemarle County Service Authority so they can accommodate the water and wastewater demands the community will have in the future. She stated that they also work with County schools to use this information to determine where more students would be expected – which informs the number of teachers to be appropriated in different schools, and possibly redistricting to accommodate the student population. Ms. Echols said they also look at traffic area zones with the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission and MPO to provide guidance to all service providers in terms of what the future might look like, and information is also furnished to the library system for their planning purposes.

Ms. Echols pointed out that they do not use trend lines to do this because they do not know if past trends will continue into the future, and that is because of land supply. She stated that there is a limit on where growth can occur and there are development areas that could become much more dense more quickly, and it is not possible to tell what will happen and when because of shifting market trends. Ms. Echols noted that they could look at development tracking and what activities are being approved, where they are being approved, and how quickly the building permits and certificates of occupancy are being issued as a measure of predictive growth.

Mr. David Fox addressed the group and stated that staff is trying to get a handle on where development had been occurring in the past and where it will be occurring in the future. He said he will be reviewing residential growth patterns from 2010-2017, particularly by looking at certificates of occupancy, which reflect residential units as opposed to total population. Mr. Fox commented that there is a complicated relationship between residential units and population, depending on the type of unit and where in the County it is being built. He referenced a map showing the core development areas, with Crozet in the west and the Village of Rivanna in the east, and Charlottesville in the center, and the urban corridor along 29 North.

Mr. Fox presented an animation showing units coming online, noting the single-family residential units and duplexes, and he stated that there are also larger multi-family units coming online. He noted Stonefield, Belvedere, and Arden Place units coming online, with many scattered units throughout the County. Mr. Fox stated that Pantops picked up beginning in 2014, with lots of activity still happening in Crozet and the Rio corridor. He said that Glenmore is filling in, with Fontana and Cascadia picking up in 2016 and 2017, moving into the current year. Mr. Fox stated that when adding all of this up and looking at total residential units that have come online in the development areas over the last eight years, a basic analysis shows where residential hotspots have been since 2010. He stated that Crozet has been an active area, particularly around Old Trail and the western part of the Crozet Development Area, and the multi-family units at Pantops has also brought a lot of capacity online. Mr. Fox noted that Belvedere and Arden Place have also brought significant capacity online along the Rio corridor, with Stonefield also bringing capacity.

Mr. Fox stated that in looking toward the future and what these patterns mean, building applications in the development pipeline inform the same type of analysis for the future decade. He said that Crozet would remain dominant, with a lot of unit capacity still available there, but there is not much proposed for Pantops or the Rio corridor, and instead there is a shift to major developments such as Brookhill, north of the Rivanna; Hollymead Town Center, on the west side of 29; and Northpointe, to the northeast of 29. Mr. Fox stated that in looking at the data, Places 29 and the Rio District brought in about 1,000 units of residential capacity; and Crozet brought in about 900 units of residential capacity, with Pantops being the next highest and other development areas trailing off. He said that based on the applications in the pipeline, Hollymead and Places 29 will become dominant, with about 4,000 units predicted, and Crozet would still have a lot of capacity, with 2,500 units expected. Mr. Fox noted that almost all the other units are less than 1,000 in the development pipeline at this point. He reported that the next consideration is how long it will take to reach those numbers, and they need to be cautious because there are a lot of highly unpredictable factors influencing rates. He pointed out that they can draw some general trends based on the data analysis being done, and the units brought in since 2010 totaled about 4,200 units' worth of capacity – and currently there are approximately 9,700 units in the pipeline.

Mr. Fox said they can perform this analysis for numerous geographical areas, and he referenced the same data broken up by elementary school districts. He stated that Hollymead, Brownsville, and Baker-Butler schools are expected to experience the majority of residential growth. Mr. Fox stated that to inform how long it will take to reach these residential capacities, they could look at existing developments and their buildout trend. He referenced a graph of the Whittington residential element in one of the southern neighborhoods, noting that the ZMA was originally approved in 2007 – but units were not brought online until 2014, due primarily to the economic downturn that would put the development pipeline on hold. Mr. Fox stated that for the Belvedere development, a maximum of 96 units were approved, with 50 built by the end of 2017, and that pace would reasonably anticipate that the rest of the capacity would be brought online over the next two years. He said that for Belvedere, when bringing on multi-family units that capacity jumped to 400 units within just a year – so it is hard to predict the change in capacity. Mr. Fox emphasized that they want to be empirical and use real data, understanding the patterns that really drive development in the County.

Mr. Fox stated that as they did the data analysis, they observed that the community was steadily growing but there was a gap in the population for the 25-54 age range. He said they were becoming more diverse but is below national trends, and they know where growth has occurred in the past and where the most populous areas are in the northern ring of the City – but that pattern is shifting to the more northern development areas. Mr. Fox noted that they could tell where development is happening now and are using it to make some inferences about the future, but need to be cautious. He added that based on rezonings and applications over the last 10-12 years, there are indications of where growth will be happening in the future, so that kind of information can help inform service providers in the County as to where they might need to enhance services and think about the future.

Ms. Kilroy stated that the key takeaways from the Community Development presentation are that population growth has been steady, diversity is increasing, and the community is aging. She asked the small group facilitators to identify themselves, and participants broke into small groups for the next portion of the meeting. Ms. Kilroy emphasized that it is important to stay on time, and facilitators will be capturing notes from their discussions. She said there will be a presentation on a topic then two minutes for questions of presenters, followed by a small group discussion and prompting questions for that. Ms. Kilroy stated that halfway through the breakout sessions, the groups will identify someone to represent them in the report-out at the very end when they reconvene. She noted that she will also provide instructions for the public in attendance after the recess is called, so that members can come in and get settled.

_____

Recess into Small Groups to discuss the following:

- Education
- Health and Welfare
- Public Safety
- Community Development

Ms. Mallek pointed out that members of the public are welcome to come and listen in to the small groups.

Attendees broke into small group discussions at 3:43 p.m., and reconvened as a large group at 5:39 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 4. Summation of Group Work.

At 5:39 p.m., Ms. Mallek called the meeting back to order.

Ms. Kilroy stated that there was a lot of information covered and she appreciates the work of participants, with staff seeking their feedback on meeting format and future topics. She said that staff will provide all small group sessions and copies of presentations to participants, and the remainder of this meeting will be small group report-outs and comments from County Executive, Jeff Richardson.

Mr. Gallaway reported from his small group, one of the standout points was that poverty in the rural areas seems to come in under the radar, along with access points to services, which overlaps into public safety and other areas. He stated that they also identified elder abuse and financial exploitation as accompanying those dynamics, and DSS staff is spread thinly to cover the entire County. Mr. Gallaway noted that in looking at the schools, they focused on four urban schools and services, but other services such as CPS and APS are really spread out around the County. He stated that with public safety, the group identified the need for more CERT program participants and emphasis on that program because community members – especially in rural areas – are often the first responders. Mr. Gallaway stated that Ms. Mallek had brought up the point of reasonableness in response time goals, given the size of the County. He said the group discussed affordable housing and the impact of affordable housing placement in relation to what that does to a school population, and policymakers can help influence the location of housing stock so that it does not exacerbate economic disadvantage and other population issues that can strain a school population. Mr. Gallaway stated that the schools can serve as an access point for other community services. He said there are constituent concerns regarding resident quality of life, and the cost of living in Albemarle is one of the highest in the state – with 30% of households living below the poverty line. He stated that the information regarding what is affordable versus home sales prices really stood out to the group.

Ms. Palmer stated that she feels this is a good way to get the information to the forefront, and she assumes this will take the place of staff coming individually to the different governing bodies to provide this information. She said the takeaways from their group are that the community is supposedly getting wealthier, but the DSS maps show a lot of increase in poverty and in the number of economically disadvantaged children. Ms. Palmer stated that she does not know if this reflects income disparity or just an influx in wealthy residents.

Mr. Koleszar commented that his assumption was that a few wealthy individuals sold some stock or businesses, which generated most of the increase in income – and these types of fluctuations happened across the state because a handful of individuals did something, which reflects a weakness in the state formula and reliance on the income concept.

Ms. Palmer asked if this should be added to the legislative agenda. Mr. Koleszar responded that it would be on the agenda the following year.

Ms. McKeel mentioned that it had been on there before.

Mr. Koleszar said the issue of fluctuations in the composite had not been addressed in the agenda previously.

Ms. Palmer stated that Planning Director, Andrew Gast-Bray, had pointed out that they would start to look at affordability with a combination of housing and transportation costs, which will be important

as they are concentrating more growth in the development areas. She said the group also identified elder abuse as an issue needing attention, and she noted that EMS calls represented 70% of the total calls for fire and rescue, with the 30% calls for fires reflecting many false alarms. Ms. Palmer stated that the group found it interesting that mental health was a major driver for police calls.

Mr. Alcaro stated that he had only been in the area for about 8 years and does not know what the history was in terms of what the County was like 20 years or 40 years earlier, but obviously there has been a lot of changes. He emphasized that the needs are very real, and he found it interesting that the comment had been made about a "loss of community" that adds to the calls for help – as there were not neighbors people would go to for help, so they end up calling 911. He said that he learned a lot from Lisa Green regarding zoning enforcement, including that quality of life complaints are typically maintenance related. Mr. Alcaro stated that the school sees a lot of these issues from the school side of things because they get translated through to children, and Ron White had mentioned that about one-third of families have incomes of less than $40,000, which means they qualify for free and reduced lunch. He pointed out that this alignes almost exactly with the numbers experienced in the school system. Mr. Alcaro stated that the previous two speakers had mentioned the financial victimization of adults, and one thing that came out was that the numbers being talked about was victimization by their own adult children. He said there is often self-neglect in the rural areas because older residents do not want to go to the doctor; there was a high incidence of neglect by adult children; and drugs played a significant role in child abuse throughout the County. He said that 56% of economically disadvantaged students are in the urban ring, and enrollment is lower and decreasing in rural schools. Mr. Alcaro said there is a divergent middle school that will pose challenges for the education system in the future, with growing demographic characteristics between schools that need to be noted.

Ms. Riley stated that her group appreciates all the data they were provided and enjoyed the meeting format, with additional time for discussion likely being beneficial. Ms. Riley said her group spent a lot of time talking about affordability and the challenge of making 80% of area median income, but still not being able to afford a home in the County. She stated that they also focused on the disparity among schools in terms of family incomes, recognizing that just busing will not solve that problem. Ms. Riley said they felt it was important to focus on public transit and coordinating it with new affordable housing units and targeting of development to create equity. She stated that the group discussed the impact of an aging population, particularly with emergency medical services, and they felt it was not fair to cannibalize the rural areas with less services, and they need to be looking at increasing services toward fire, rescue and police in the development areas. Ms. Riley noted that there are positions for three mental health counselors in the high schools this year, which the group felt was really important in providing intervention for youth in the context of trends seen across the board.

Ms. Spain pointed out that 10% of Albemarle County's population, as defined by the Census Bureau, which is typically about half of the median income and is just about the national median – so the 30% mentioned is being considered in terms of housing affordability.

Ms. McKeel said there was a lot of good data presented, and she asked how this data could be used to make things better. She stated that they talk about affordable housing all the time, but the three boards have never had an opportunity to work on it together. Ms. McKeel said the population in each magisterial district is approximately 16,000-17,000 people, and the percentage of population varies fairly significantly. She stated that the Jack Jouett District has a lower percentage of students attending County schools, relative to the number of people living in the magisterial district – with Whitehall having 17.9% of residents attending and Jouett having 7%. Ms. McKeel stated that she would like to know why the percentage of children in her district attending school is so skewed when compared to other magisterial districts when the populations are the same. She commented that there are some schools in the County that have excess land, and she asked if there is a way to take some of this land to build affordable housing for teachers and police officers, which is a model being implemented in other communities. Ms. McKeel noted that Western Albemarle and Baker-Butler both have excess land, and she wonders if they could make permanently dedicated affordable housing for teachers and police officers as transitional housing until they could make a down payment on a purchase. She said she would like to have that discussion since it is property they already own. Ms. McKeel also urged them not to lose site of the transit

partnership with the City, and the reason so many people are packed into certain complexes is because transit does not go to some places and they have to get to their jobs.

Ms. Mallek stated that her group discussed expansion of transit so that people have more housing choices, and Mr. Koleszar had raised the idea of working with the schools and their buses, as well as academy transport, that might provide some possibilities in another year.

Ms. McKeel said that in the perfect world, the County could have bus transit going to schools in the daytime to pick up students for internships, and she stated that she envisions one unified transportation system that will serve schools, residences, and businesses.

Mr. Dotson stated the County is maturing, with more attached housing, racial and ethnic diversity, and economically disadvantaged people, as well as English-language learners, more calls for service, and higher public costs across all sectors with those costs increasing faster than population growth. He said these things should have been anticipated, and they are now trying to address them while dealing with very immediate problems. Mr. Dotson stated that the challenge is to think out to 2040 and 2045, with the long-range transportation plan currently being worked on. He said he is very encouraged that the community is well-served, with a lot of database thinking and GIS map presentations that show overlapping services and coordination potential. Mr. Dotson commented that staff is doing a good job of thinking ahead to both explain existing conditions and anticipate those that will be experienced in the future.

Mr. Gallaway asked if there is a way to have interactive mapping for users so that the income poverty map and school data can be overlaid, and as a policy maker this would be an excellent tool to have available. He mentioned that the "heat map" of single-family attached homes shows places where single homes are going up in the rural area at pace with the development area, and a small investment in a tool like that will go a long way in helping policymakers cross-section a number of issues. Mr. Gallaway added that this also helps inform where money should be focused, so they avoid costs and save dollars elsewhere. He mentioned that the past board invested in an options counselor at JABA, where people could call instead of calling emergency services personnel.

Ms. Mallek commented that Mr. Sheffield had raised the idea of using the mapping for transit options, and she thought there was something in process but does not have details.

Mr. Richardson had participants recognize and applaud staff for their work on this meeting. He stated that the overall themes of growth, aging, diversity, demand for services, etc. are not the full picture, as Albemarle County is becoming more urban but is currently rural. He emphasized that their growth is manageable, and the types of services demanded today are different than those 10 years ago, and the issues are different, the problems more complex. He stated that they face language barriers, social isolation, and mental health challenges, as well as changes in affordable housing and service delivery models. Mr. Richardson also noted the growing demographic differences among schools in the County and mentioned the state composite issues and unintended consequences due to penalization for community attributes that set Albemarle apart from other localities. He stated that they talked about the need for improvement in fire/rescue response times, expansion of Bright Stars, increased support for families through DSS, and other items.

Mr. Richardson stated that the problems faced in the past have primarily been technical problems requiring changes in just a few places, but typically were within the organization's boundaries. He stated that the issues are now more adaptive in nature and crossed those boundaries, and it is encouraging to him to see so many elected officials who care about the community. Mr. Richardson emphasized that you cannot manage what you do not measure, and staffs within government try to measure data so they can manage customer service delivery – and it is becoming apparent that the issues are cross-organizational and require collaboration from key organizations. He noted that the County's budget to be presented on February 16 represents partnerships with 58 agencies within the community, and they will continue to collaborate and communicate to help solve the community's problems.

At 6:14 p.m., Mr. Alcaro adjourned the School Board meeting.

At 6:14 p.m., Ms. Riley adjourned the Planning Commission to February 20, 2018, at 6:00 p.m.

_____

Adjournment:

With no further business, the Planning Commission adjourned at 6:14 p.m. to the next regular meeting on Tuesday, February 20, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. in the Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

Andrew Gast-Bray, Secretary

(Submitted by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 10-16-2018
Initials: sct