CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
Monday, December 2, 2019

5:30 p.m. Closed session as provided by Sections 2.2-3711 and 2.2-3712 of the Virginia Code
Second Floor Conference Room (Personnel; legal consultation; Boards and Commissions)

6:30 p.m. Regular Meeting - CALL TO ORDER
Council Chamber

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
ROLL CALL
ANNOUNCEMENTS
PROCLAMATIONS

Lighting of the Lawn Proclamation

1. CONSENT AGENDA*

   a. MINUTES:
      October 7, 2019 Regular meeting; October 21, 2019 Special meeting
   b. APPROPRIATION:
      Re-appropriate funds from the Department of Human Services to the Department of Economic Development for the Home to Hope Program - $321,103.35 (1st of 2 readings)
   c. APPROPRIATION:
      Victim Witness Assistance Program Grant - $265,024 (1st of 2 readings)
   d. APPROPRIATION:
      Virginia Outdoors Foundation Grant – Land Acquisition - $50,000 (2nd reading)
   e. APPROPRIATION:
      Virginia Department of Education Special Nutrition Program Child and Adult Care Food Program - $35,000 (2nd reading)
   f. APPROPRIATION:
      Virginia Department of Social Services Employment Advancement for Temporary Aid to Needy Families Participants Grant - $130,259.83 (2nd reading)
   g. APPROPRIATION:
      Fire apparatus payment reimbursement $642,609 (2nd reading)
   h. RESOLUTION:
      Transfer of funds from Small Area Plan – Penn Park study (African-American cemetery) - $9,319 (1 reading)
   i. RESOLUTION:
      Request for Support of Refugee Resettlement (1 reading)
   j. RESOLUTION:
      Acceptance of new public streets within the Burnet Commons 3 Development (1 reading)
   k. RESOLUTION:
      Acceptance of 11th Street as a residential permit parking block (1 reading)
   l. RESOLUTION:
      Ethnic Studies Course by African-American Heritage Center - $15,000 (1 reading)
   m. RESOLUTION:
      Capital Funding Transfer – Electronic Poll Books - $24,618 (1 reading)
   n. ORDINANCE:
      Adding Section 2-159 to Chapter 2 (Administration), Article III (City Manager) of the Charlottesville City Code (1990) (1st of 2 readings)
   o. ORDINANCE:
      Bicycle & E-Scooter Sharing System (aka “Dockless Mobility”) Ordinance and Permit Program (2nd reading)
   p. ORDINANCE:
      209 Maury Avenue rezoning request (2nd reading)

CITY MANAGER RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY MATTERS (FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS)

COMMUNITY MATTERS

Public comment is provided for up to 16 speakers at the beginning of the meeting (limit 3 minutes per speaker.) Pre-registration available for up to 8 spaces; pre-registered speakers announced by Noon the day of the meeting. The number of speakers is unlimited at the end of the meeting.

2. PUBLIC HEARING/ORDINANCE*:
   Vacation and release of public utilities easements - Lochlyn Hill Subdivision (1st of 2 readings; consideration of waiving 2nd reading)

3. RESOLUTION*:
   City Manager’s Recommendation to Address Organizational Equity - $113,596 (1 reading)

4. RESOLUTION*:
   General District Court and 7th Street Deck Project - $1.28 Million (1 reading)

5. RESOLUTION*:
   218 West Market Street Special Use Permit (1 reading)

6. RESOLUTION*:
   167 Chancellor Street Special Use Permit (1 reading)

7. RESOLUTION*:
   Adopting an updated Standards and Design Manual (1 reading)

8. RESOLUTION*:
   Board of Architectural Review appeal - 605 Preston Place (1 reading)

OTHER BUSINESS

MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

*ACTION NEEDED
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COUNCIL CHAMBER - October 7, 2019

ROLL CALL

The Charlottesville City Council met on this date in City Hall Council Chamber with the following members present: Mayor Nikuyah Walker, Vice Mayor Heather Hill, Dr. Wes Bellamy, Mr. Mike Signer, and Ms. Kathy Galvin.

Mayor Walker called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS / PROCLAMATIONS

Dr. Bellamy announced an Alex-Zan event, and the University of Virginia’s Community Bridges Four-Mile Run on Saturday, October 12th, with all proceeds going toward local initiatives that support affordable housing.

Ms. Hill announced dates and location for the DMV Connect, and she read a proclamation for Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

CONSENT AGENDA*

Ms. Walker opened the floor for public comments on the consent agenda. With no one coming forward to speak, the consent agenda public comment period was closed and Maxicelia Robinson, Assistant to the Clerk of Council, read the following consent agenda items into the record.

a. MINUTES: August 19 Regular meeting, September 3 Special and Regular meetings

August 19 Regular meeting minutes

September 3 Special meeting minutes

September 3 Regular meeting minutes

b. APPROPRIATION: Funding for Virginia Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Employment and Training (VTET) pilot program - $50,000 (2nd reading)

VTET Pilot $50,000

APPROPRIATION

Funding for Virginia Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Employment and Training (VTET) Pilot Program - $50,000
WHEREAS, the Charlottesville Department of Social Services has received $50,000 from the Virginia Department of Social Services to participate in the TANF Non-Custodial Parent Employment Pilot.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the sum of $50,000 is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

Revenue-$50,000
Fund 212 Cost Center: 9900000000 G/L Account: 430080 $50,000

Expenditures-$50,000
Fund 212 Cost Center: 3333002000 G/L Account: 540060 $50,000

c. APPROPRIATION: Charlottesville/Albemarle Adult Drug Treatment Court Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Grant Award - $300,548 (2nd reading)

$300,548 FY2020 SAMHSA Treatment Drug Court

APPROPRIATION
Charlottesville/Albemarle Adult Drug Treatment Court Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Grant Award - $300,548

WHEREAS, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, a division of the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, in the amount of $293,745 for the Charlottesville/Albemarle Drug Court Treatment Court in order to fund salaries, benefits, and operating expenses; and

WHEREAS, the City of Charlottesville serves as the fiscal agent for this grant program; and

WHEREAS, the grant award covers the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the sum of $300,548, received as a grant from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

Revenues
$300,548 Fund: 211 Internal Order: 1900335 G/L Account: 431110

Expenditures
$300,548 Fund: 211 Internal Order: 1900335 G/L Account: 530550

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of $300,548 from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.
d. **APPROPRIATION: Refund of Tax Payment to East Market Street LLC - $16,173.30 (2nd reading)**

$16,173.30 East Market Street, LLC tax refund

**RESOLUTION**

**AUTHORIZING REFUND TO EAST MARKET STREET, LLC OF REAL ESTATE TAXES PAID FOR 2016-2019 - $16,173.30**

**WHEREAS**, the City Assessor has determined that East Market Street, LLC was incorrectly identified as the owner of 0 10th St NE; and

**WHEREAS**, the real estate taxes for the Property for calendar years 2016-2019 were paid on time and as billed; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Assessor has certified that a refund of taxes paid and interest is due in the amount of $16,173.30; and

**WHEREAS**, City Code Section 30-6(b) requires City Council approval for any tax refund exceeding $2,500.00; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the City Council hereby authorizes the City Treasurer to issue a refund of $16,173.30, payable to East Market Street, LLC.

e. **APPROPRIATION: Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR) 2019-2020 Certified Local Government grant funding for 10th and Page Neighborhood Historic Resources Survey - $31,590 (2nd reading)**

VDHR_CLG Grant 10th and Page-$31,590

**APPROPRIATION**

Virginia Department of Historic Resources
2019-2020 Certified Local Government Grant Funding for 10th and Page Neighborhood Historic Survey - $52,650

**WHEREAS**, the City of Charlottesville, through the Department of Neighborhood Development Services, has received from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, funding to support a historic survey for the 10th and Page Neighborhood,

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the sum of $21,060 for the fiscal year 2019-2020 received from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources is hereby appropriated in the following manner:
Revenue
$21,060  Fund: 209  IO: 1900338  G/L: 430120 (State/Fed Pass Thru)
$31,590  Fund: 209  IO: 1900338  G/L: 498010 (Transfer from other fund)

Expenditure
$52,650  Fund: 209  IO: 1900338  G/L: 530670 (Other contractual services)

Transfer
$20,568  Fund: 426  WBS: P-00484  G/L: 561209 (Transfer to grants)
$11,022  Fund: 105  CC: 3901005000  G/L: 561209 (Transfer to grants)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of r
2019-2020 from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

f.  APPROPRIATION: Albemarle County funding for Albemarle County Resident
Workforce Development Training - $13,395 (2nd reading)

$13,395 Albemarle Co funding - Albemarle Co Resident Workforce Training

APPROPRIATION

Albemarle County funding for Albemarle County Resident Workforce Development
Training - $13,395.00

WHEREAS, the City of Charlottesville has received funds from Albemarle County in the
amount of $13,395.00; and

WHEREAS, the funds will be used to support workforce development training programs
provided by the Office of Economic Development;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville,
Virginia, that the sum of $13,395.00 is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

Revenue – $13,395.00
Fund: 425  WBS: P-00385  G/L: 432030

Expenditures - $13,395.00
Fund: 425  WBS: P-00385  G/L: 599999

g.  APPROPRIATION: Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS/H.I.V.
(H.O.P.W.A.) - $240,642 (2nd reading)

Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS/H.I.V. (H.O.P.W.A.) - $240,642
APPROPRIATION

Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS/HIV (HOPWA) Grant - $240,642

WHEREAS, The City of Charlottesville, through the Department of Human Services, has received the H.O.P.W.A. Grant from the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development in the amount of $240,642;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the sum of $240,642 is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

Revenues

Expenditures
$240,642  Fund: 209  IO: 1900339 (H.O.P.W.A.)  G/L: 530550 Contracted Services

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon receipt of $240,642 in funds from the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development.

h.  APPROPRIATION: Virginia Housing Solutions Program Grant Award - $484,785
(2nd reading)

$484,785 FY2020 Va Housing Solutions Program Grant Award

APPROPRIATION

Virginia Housing Solutions Program Grant - $484,785

WHEREAS, The City of Charlottesville, through the Department of Human Services, has received the V. H. S. P. Grant from the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development in the amount of $484,785;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the sum of $484,785 is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

Revenues
$386,545  Fund: 209  IO: 1900340  G/L: 430110 State Grant

Expenditures
$484,785  Fund: 209  IO: 1900340  G/L: 530550 Contracted Services

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon receipt of $484,785 in funds from the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development.
i. **RESOLUTION: Hedgerow Land Acquisition - $37,500**

   **Hedgerow Land Acquisition - $37,500**

   **RESOLUTION**

   **Allocation of Parkland Acquisition Funds for Hedgerow Land Acquisition - $37,500**

   **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the City Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the sum of $37,500 be allocated from previously appropriated funds in the Parkland Acquisition account to the Hedgerow Holding LLC for the purpose of providing supplemental funds for the purchase of ~144 acres of undeveloped forested land adjacent to the Ragged Mountain Reservoir property.

   $37,500  Fund: 426  Project: P-00534  G/L Account: 530670

j. **ORDINANCE: PEG Bandwidth VA, LLC - Telecommunications Franchise (Carried)**

   Franchise Agreement with PEG Bandwidth VA

k. **ORDINANCE: Rental Relief for Elderly and Disabled (2nd reading)**

   Rent Relief Ordinance and Memo


l. **ORDINANCE: Changes to Real Estate Tax Relief Program for Elderly and/or Disabled (2nd reading)**

   Real Estate Tax Relief Ordinance and Memo


   On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Ms. Galvin, Council by the following vote APPROVED the consent agenda 5-0: (Ayes: Bellamy, Hill, Galvin, Signer, Walker; Noes: None).
CITY MANAGER RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY MATTERS (FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS)

City Manager Tarron Richardson announced details of the trolley route pilot study, provided steps upon completion of the study, and shared outlets used to announce trolley changes. The mayor reiterated that the pilot would go beyond ninety days if more data was needed.

Ms. Walker asked for an explanation of why the pilot changed to ninety days versus the six months voted on by Council. Dr. Richardson advised that the six months was originally proposed by the traffic engineer and not Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) personnel. He advised that the CAT Director would visit Midway Manor to speak with residents about transportation.

COMMUNITY MATTERS

Ms. Honie Ann Peacock ceded her time to Brooke Ray, Manager of Food and Agriculture program with International Rescue Committee, who spoke about affordable housing and food justice in Charlottesville.

Ms. Jasmine Chen ceded her time to Ms. Janette Kawachi of Habitat for Humanity, Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless, and the Charlottesville-Albemarle Housing Coalition. Ms. Kawachi spoke about affordable housing and advocated for Council to fund the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) with any year-end surplus.

Ms. Mikayla Woodley ceded her time to Ms. Kizzy Walker, who spoke about affordable housing, jobs of the working class citizens contributing to the success of the city, and about working with Habitat Pathway to Housing program to obtain homeownership and better quality of life for her and her family.

Ms. Zoe Pham ceded her time to Ms. Phyllis Meredith, the first Habitat Home Owner in Charlottesville, who spoke about what home ownership has meant to her family. She spoke about the lack of affordable housing options and asked Council to support the CAHF.

Ms. Mary Carey thanked the City Manager for the trolley pilot program and gave her observation of community members’ use of the pilot program. She asked Council to look into children of incarcerated parent(s) being placed in foster care when family members are available to care for the child.

Ms. Kate Fraleigh asked that Council support the Police Civilian Review Board (CRB). She asked Council to support the CRB with the proposed bylaws as written, and she asked for an update on the CRB.

- City Attorney John Blair responded that he anticipated a draft of bylaws and an ordinance for Council’s consideration at the next Council meeting.
Ms. Shanice Gray spoke about challenges with finding affordable housing in Charlottesville, despite a college education.

Ms. Tanesha Hudson commended Council on the trolley pilot program and said that residents at Midway Manor are pleased with the changes to the trolley. She requested that a diaper changing station be installed in the City Hall restroom near Council Chamber, and asked for funding of the CRB. She asked Council to make a public comment about their support of Police Chief Brackney’s expressed stance on assault rifles.

- Ms. Walker responded that the signatures gathered to remove Chief Brackney were from outside of the area, although some locals signed, and that she did not take the petition seriously. She stated that Council was in support of the Chief’s stance and that Council was aware of Chief’s position prior to her testimony.
- Ms. Galvin added that she and Dr. Bellamy are on the committee for legislative requests to the General Assembly and that Council’s stance on banning assault rifles would be included in the packet and will be a public statement. She stated that the packet would be due late October or early November, and that Council would have the opportunity to discuss, change and vote on contents of the legislative packet.

Ms. Sena Magill spoke about some concerns of the 10th and Page Neighborhood Association: delivery trucks on 8th Street blocking traffic and visuals; the request for an audible crossing signal at the Preston and Rose Hill intersection; and that Mr. Gaines is requesting that the John West placard be moved closer to Hardy Drive where most of Mr. West’s advocacy occurred.

Mr. David Redding, representing Eco Village Charlottesville and Food Not Bombs, spoke in support of food equity initiatives and asked that non-profits be stationed away from the porta-potties at the Charlottesville Farmers Market.

Ms. Myra Anderson acknowledged Mental Health Awareness Week and advocated for mental health services for people of color in the City of Charlottesville. She asked for culturally competent mental health services in Charlottesville, for a Sankofa Center, and long-term trauma services.

Ms. Nancy Carpenter shared a story of what the CAHF meant to someone who was formerly homeless.

The meeting recessed at 7:34 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 7:53 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE: Release of Portion of Sewer Easement - McIntire Plaza (Carried)**

*Agenda memo, Proposed Ordinance; Deed and Plat*
Ms. Walker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Michael Payne asked Council to be mindful of the impact this project would have on nearby infrastructure and/or projects. He referenced the special use permit (SUP) for West Main Street and its effects on First Baptist Church. He asked Council to consider the input of the First Baptist congregation on the West Main Street SUP.

With no one else coming forward to speak, Ms. Walker closed the public hearing.

Council unanimously agreed to move the item to the October 21, 2019, consent agenda.

RESOLUTION*: Comprehensive Signage Plan for Hillsdale Place

Agenda memo; Resolution; Planning Commission staff report September 10, 2019; Hillsdale Place Comprehensive Signage Plan

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Dr. Bellamy, Council by the following vote APPROVED the consent agenda 5-0: (Ayes: Bellamy, Hill, Galvin, Signer, Walker; Noes: None).

Ms. Galvin asked Council to work toward implementing the Hydraulic Zoning Plan which provides the directive for turning the area into a place where people can live and work.

RESOLUTION APPROVING COMPREHENSIVE SIGNAGE PLAN FOR HILLSDALE PLACE
(Application No. OT19-00186)

WHEREAS, on September 10, 2019, the City’s Entrance Corridor Review Board and the City’s Planning Commission reviewed the Comprehensive Signage Plan proposed for Hillsdale Place, and recommended approval of the plan if certain modifications were to be made; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has indicated that the modifications recommended by the Planning Commission are acceptable, and has incorporated those modifications into a revised Comprehensive Signage Plan for Hillsdale Place (rev. September 12, 2019) for review and approval by City Council; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with City Code Sec. 34-1045(c), City Council has determined that:

(I) There is good cause for deviating from a strict application of the requirements of Section 34-1020, et seq. (City Code Chapter 34, Article IX, Division 4 – Signs), and
(2) The comprehensive signage plan, as proposed, with the modifications recommended by the Planning Commission, will serve the public purposes and objectives set forth within City Code Section 34-1021 at least as well, or better, than the signage that would otherwise be permitted for the subject development;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council for the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that this Council hereby approves the Comprehensive Signage Plan for Hillsdale Place (rev. September 12, 2019).

RESOLUTION*: 602-616 West Main Special Use Permit request for a mixed-use building

Agenda memo; Resolution for Proposed Special Use Permit

Mr. Brian Haluska, Principal Planner, noted some edits for the resolution. He answered questions from Councilors regarding parking.

Ms. Galvin asked to hear from the applicant.

Mr. L.J. Lopez with Milestone Partners explained that the project sought the approval of all of the necessary groups to ensure compliance and to reach a point for council consideration. He said that all of the requirements presented to the applicant affect things such as parking. The previous project used off-site parking based on approval stipulations and adjacent historic structures. He explained that off-site parking was not desirable and that 53 parking spaces indicated in the plans was to illustrate that on-site parking could be provided. He said that three known concerns of the Board of Architectural Review were: 1) the front building facade, 2) the placement of the garage entrance, and 3) the desire for open space, which would all have an effect on parking and that 53 parking spaces would be difficult to achieve. The condition submitted in the memo was to provide a minimum of 40 spaces and if the zoning ordinance based on the site plans required more, they would meet that requirement.

Further discussion from Council ensued and Dr. Bellamy expressed that the initiative to be a multi-modal city affects low income families.

Per Council request, based on suggestions during discussion, Mr. Blair stated the revised Language for the resolution.

On motion by Mr. Signer, seconded by Ms. Hill, Council by the following vote APPROVED the resolution 4-1: (Ayes: Bellamy, Galvin, Hill, Signer. Noes: Walker).

RESOLUTION
APPROVING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT
WHEREAS, landowner Heirloom West Main Street Second Phase, LLC is the current owner of a lot identified on 2019 City Tax Map 29 as Parcel 3 (City Parcel Identification No. (290003000) (the “Subject Property”), and pursuant to City Code §34-641, the landowner proposes to redevelop the Subject Property by constructing a mixed use building on the Subject Property (“Project”), containing residential dwelling units at a density of up to 120 dwelling units per acre (“DUA”); and

WHEREAS, the Project is described within the Applicant’s application materials dated May 14, 2019 submitted in connection with SP19-00003, including, without limitation, a narrative statement dated May 14, 2019, and a preliminary site plan dated May 13, 2019, as required by City Code §34-158 (collectively, the “Application Materials”); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the Application Materials, and the City’s Staff Report, and subsequent to a joint public hearing, duly advertised and conducted by the Planning Commission and City Council on August 13, 2019, the Planning Commission voted to recommend that the City Council should approve the requested special use permit, to allow residential density up to 120 dwelling units per acre (DUA), subject to certain suitable conditions and safeguards recommended by the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the comments received during the joint public hearing, the Planning Commission’s recommendation, and the Staff Reports discussing this application, as well as the factors set forth within Sec. 34-157 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, this Council finds and determines that granting the proposed Special Use subject to suitable conditions would serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare or good zoning practice; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that, pursuant to City Code §§ 34-641, a special use permit is hereby approved and granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. The specific development being approved by this special use permit (“Project”), as described within the site plan exhibit required by City Code §34-158(a)(1), shall have the following minimum attributes/characteristics:

   a. Not more than one building shall be constructed on the Subject Property (the “Building”). The Building shall be a Mixed Use Building.

   b. The Building shall not exceed a height of four (4) stories.

   c. The Building shall contain no more than 55 dwelling units.

   d. The Building shall contain space to be occupied and used for retail uses, which shall be located on the ground floor of the Building facing West Main Street. The square footage of this retail space shall be at least the minimum required by the City’s zoning ordinance.
e. Underground parking shall be provided within a parking garage structure constructed underneath the Building, which shall provide at least 53 parking spaces serving the use and occupancy of the Building. All parking required for the Project pursuant to the City’s zoning ordinance shall be located on-site. All parking required pursuant to the ordinance for the Project shall be maximized on-site to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission. No direct access shall be provided into the underground parking from the Building’s street wall along West Main Street.

2. The mass of the Building shall be broken down to reflect the multi-parcel massing historically on the site, as well as the West Main Street context, using building modulation. The Building and massing refer to the historic buildings on either side.

3. There shall be pedestrian engagement with the street with an active, transparent, and permeable façade at street level.

4. The Landowner (including, without limitation, any person who is an agent, assignee, transferee or successor in interest to the Landowner) shall prepare a Protective Plan for the Rufus Holsinger Building located on property adjacent to the Subject Property at 620-624 West Main Street (“Holsinger Building” or “Adjacent Property”). The Protective Plan shall provide for baseline documentation, ongoing monitoring, and specific safeguards to prevent damage to the Holsinger Building, and the Landowner shall implement the Protective Plan during all excavation, demolition and construction activities within the Subject Property (“Development Site”). At minimum, the Protective Plan shall include the following:

   a. *Baseline Survey*—Landowner shall document the existing condition of the Holsinger Building (“Baseline Survey”). The Baseline Survey shall take the form of written descriptions, and visual documentation which shall include color photographs and/or video recordings. The Baseline Survey shall document the existing conditions observable on the interior and exterior of the Holsinger Building, with close-up images of cracks, staining, indications of existing settlement, and other fragile conditions that are observable.

   The Landowner shall engage an independent third party structural engineering firm (one who has not participated in the design of the Landowner’s Project or preparation of demolition or construction plans for the Landowner, and who has expertise in the impact of seismic activity on historic structures) and shall bear the cost of the Baseline Survey and preparation of a written report thereof. The Landowner and the Owner of the Holsinger Building (“Adjacent Landowner”) may both have representatives present during the process of surveying and documenting the existing conditions. A copy of a completed written Baseline Survey Report shall be provided to the Adjacent Landowner, and the Adjacent Landowner shall be given fourteen (14) days to review the Baseline Survey Report and return any comments to the Landowner.

   b. *Protective Plan*—The Landowner shall engage the engineer who performed the Baseline
Survey to prepare a Protective Plan to be followed by all persons performing work within the Development Site, that may include seismic monitoring or other specific monitoring measures of the Adjacent Property if recommended by the engineer preparing the Protective Plan, and minimally shall include installation of at least five crack monitors. Engineer shall inspect and take readings of crack monitors at least weekly during ground disturbance demolition and construction activities. Reports of monitor readings shall be submitted to the city building official and Adjacent Landowner within two days of inspection. A copy of the Protective Plan shall be provided to the Adjacent Landowner. The Adjacent Landowner shall be given fourteen (14) days to review the Report and return any comments to the Landowner.

c. Advance notice of commencement of activity--The Adjacent Landowner shall be given 14 days’ advance written notice of commencement of demolition at the Development Site, and of commencement of construction at the Development Site. This notice shall include the name, mobile phone number, and email address of the construction supervisor(s) who will be present on the Development Site and who may be contacted by the Adjacent Landowner regarding impacts of demolition or construction on the Adjacent Property.

The Landowner shall also offer the Adjacent Landowner an opportunity to have meetings: (i) prior to commencement of demolition at the Development Site, and (ii) at least fourteen (14) days prior to commencement of construction at the Development Site, on days/ times reasonably agreed to by both parties. During any such preconstruction meeting, the Adjacent Landowner will be provided information as to the nature and duration of the demolition or construction activity and the Landowner will review the Protective Plan as it will apply to the activities to be commenced.

d. Permits--No demolition or building permit, and no land disturbing permit, shall be approved or issued to the Landowner, until the Landowner provides to the department of neighborhood development services: (i) copies of the Baseline Survey Report and Protective Plan, and NDS verifies that these documents satisfy the requirements of these SUP Conditions, (ii) documentation that the Baseline Survey Report and Protective Plan were given to the Adjacent Landowner in accordance with these SUP Conditions.

RESOLUTION*: 503 Rugby Road Special Use Permit

Agenda memo; Resolution; link to Staff Report from September 10, 2019 Planning Commission meeting

Mr. Joey Winter, Planner in Neighborhood Development Services, came forward to present the item, and noted a clerical correction on the resolution.

Ms. Hill commented that three councilors had already seen the presentation and that Dr. Bellamy had previously stated that he did not have any questions, so she asked if council could forego the presentation. Councilors agreed.
On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Ms. Galvin, Council by the following vote APPROVED the resolution 5-0: (Ayes: Bellamy, Galvin, Hill, Signer, Walker. Noes: None).

RESOLUTION
AUTHORIZING A SORORITY HOUSE AT
503 RUGBY ROAD FOR UP TO 37 OCCUPANTS

WHEREAS, pursuant to City Code §34-420 and §34-162, landowner Epsilon Sigma House Corporation/Kappa Kappa Gamma Sorority has submitted an application seeking a special use permit to authorize a “boarding, fraternity and sorority house”, as defined within City Code §34-1200, to be used as a place of room and board for up to thirty-seven (37) members of a fraternity or sorority, and a modification of certain yard requirements (the proposed “Special Use”); and

WHEREAS, the proposed Special Use will be located at 503 Rugby Road (the “Subject Property”), which is further identified on 2019 City Tax Map 5 as Parcel 52 (City Parcel ID No. 050052000) and is located within the City’s R-3 zoning district, and the area proposed to be subject to the proposed Special Use Permit will be 0.3440 acre, or approximately 14,985 square feet; and

WHEREAS, previously, on February 21, 1978, City Council granted a special use permit to authorize a sorority house with thirty-six (36) rooms on the Subject Property, and the Subject Property has been used as such since that time; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Special Use is generally described within written materials submitted in connection with SP19-00004, including: (i) the application materials dated July 13, 2019, and related narrative; and (ii) a proposed preliminary site plan submitted July 16, 2019 as required by City Code §34-158 (collectively, the “Application Materials”); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the Application Materials, and the City’s Staff Report pertaining thereto, and then, following a joint public hearing duly advertised and conducted by the Planning Commission and City Council on September 10, 2019, the Planning Commission voted to recommend that City Council should approve this proposed Special Use, subject to certain conditions; and

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the comments received during the joint public hearing, the Planning Commission’s recommendation, and the Staff Report, as well as the factors set forth within Sec. 34-157 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, this Council finds and determines that granting the proposed Special Use subject to suitable conditions would serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare or good zoning practice; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that, pursuant to City Code Sec. 34-480, the proposed Special Use is granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. The “boarding, fraternity and sorority house” use approved by this special use permit shall
have a maximum of thirty-seven (37) occupants.

2. For the building containing the use referenced in ¶(1), above:
   (a) The following side yards shall be required:
       i. North Side Yard abutting TMP 5-53: A side yard of five (5) feet, minimum will be required instead of one (1) foot of side yard per every two (2) feet of building height with a minimum of ten (10) feet.
       ii. South Side Yard Corner, street side abutting Lambeth Lane: A side yard of fifteen (15) feet, minimum will be required instead of twenty (20) feet, minimum.
   (b) The following front yard shall be required:
       i. East Front Yard abutting Rugby Road: A front yard of twenty-five (25) feet, minimum will be required instead of the average depth of the existing front yards within five hundred (500) feet.

3. On-site parking will be provided, in the general location and configuration shown within the preliminary site plan dated July 16, 2019. The final site plan shall demonstrate compliance with the following: (a) on-site parking shall be used exclusively by residents of the sorority house and their guests (no sale or leasing of on-site parking for off-site functions is permitted) and (b) signage and pavement markings, including both lane lines and text, may be required by the City’s Traffic Engineer, in order to designate travel ways and specify the direction of traffic in on-site parking area(s).

4. All trash receptacles must be hidden from view when not set out for curbside pickup.

5. The “boarding, fraternity or sorority house” use approved by this special use permit, and (except as specifically modified within condition (2), above), all buildings and structures located on the Subject Property, shall comply with the provisions of City Code Sec. 34-353 and all other applicable provisions of Chapter 34 (Zoning) of the Code of the City of Charlottesville.

   **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Special Use Permit approved by this Resolution amends and supersedes the special use permit approved by resolution dated February 21, 1978 for the Subject Property.

RESOLUTION*: Allocation of FY 2020 Charlottesville Affordable Housing Funds (two resolutions)

Agenda memo; CAHF Funding Requests; Resolution for VSH; Resolution for AHIP

Mr. John Sales, Housing Program Coordinator, presented.
Dr. Bellamy shared information about the Crossings II, and stated that the goal is to end chronic homelessness in Charlottesville. He spoke about the community collaboration to work on the initiative, conversations with Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA) about vouchers and site control, and that they were considering Levy Avenue as the site for the Crossings II. He went on to explain that the CRHA Redevelopment Committee provided the organizers of the Crossings II with five key questions related to the project and that the team would provide the Redevelopment Committee with a response by the end of the week.

Discussion ensued about where funds would be allocated if the project was not approved.

Mr. Blair clarified that both resolutions for CAHF were appropriations and did not list secondary options if the project were not approved. He advised that Council could approve the appropriations as is and if money could not be given to the projects listed, then Neighborhood Development Services could make the determination that the appropriation cannot legally be made and then the funds would be reconsidered with the Housing Advisory Committee (HAC) allocation subcommittee. At that time HAC could make additional recommendation to Council and Council would repeal the previous resolution and enact a new resolution.

In response to M. Walker, Mr. Sales explained how the $42,000 allocation for Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP) was determined.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Dr. Bellamy, Council by the following vote APPROVED the resolution allocating $42,000 of the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) for Albemarle Housing Improvement Program, Critical Rehab and Emergency Repairs Program: 4-1 (Ayes: Bellamy, Galvin, Hill, Signer. Noes: Walker).

### Allocation of Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) for Virginia Supportive Housing, Crossings II Project --$750,000

**RESOLUTION**

**Allocation of Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) for Virginia Supportive Housing, Crossings II Project -- $750,000**

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the sum of $750,000 be allocated from previously appropriated funds in the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) to Virginia Supportive Housing for the purpose of providing funds for the Crossings II affordable housing development project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund: 426</th>
<th>Project: CP-084</th>
<th>G/L Account: 530670</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Supportive Housing</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Dr. Bellamy, Council by the following vote APPROVED the resolution allocating $42,000 of the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) for Albemarle Housing Improvement Program, Critical Rehab and Emergency Repairs Program: 4-1 (Ayes: Bellamy, Galvin, Hill, Signer. Noes: Walker).
Allocation of Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) for Albemarle Housing Improvement Program, Critical Rehab and Emergency Repairs Program -- $42,000

RESOLUTION
Allocation of Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) for Albemarle Housing Improvement Program, Critical Rehab and Emergency Repairs Program - $42,000

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the sum of $42,000 be allocated from previously appropriated funds in the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) to Albemarle Housing Improvement Program for the purpose of providing funds for the Critical Rehab and Emergency Repairs program.

Fund: 426 Project: CP-084 G/L Account: 530670
Albemarle Housing Improvement Program $42,000

REPORT: Food Equity presentation

Agenda memo; Report Against Objectives; Strategic Review and Action Plan

Ms. Misty Graves, Program Supervisor, introduced the report. Ms. Shantell Bingham and Ms. Jeanette Abi-Nader made the presentation.

Councilors Galvin and Walker commended the organization on its work and for a job well done on the presentation.

Ms. Abi-Nader advised that working at a personal, community, and policy level was instrumental to the program’s success.

Ms. Galvin asked that Council consider matching a $125,000 grant (must match 100%) that the organization has received and requires a three-year match. Dr. Bellamy agreed.

Dr. Richardson advised Council not to over-extend their funding promises.

Ms. Hill asked why the organization did not pursue non-profit funding.

Ms. Abi-Nader explained that they were pursuing non-profit funding, which would be used for program level work, while funding received from city would be used for systems work.

Ms. Galvin asked that the funding request be placed on the agenda for the first match. Ms. Walker said that she would support.

Ms. Hill asked that Council receive staff input for the request.
Ms. Abi-Nader said the decision would need to be made by the end of calendar year.

Mr. Blair advised that the item would be an appropriation with two readings, which could go on the first and second meetings in November.

**REPORT: Estimates for staff costs for Equity & Inclusion Department**

*Agenda memo; Final Report and Recommendations of the City's Advisory Committee on Organizational Equity*

Deputy City Manager Mike Murphy presented the report.

Mr. Ryan Davidson of the Budget and Performance Management Department, provided clarification of funds in the Council Strategic Initiatives Fund.

Ms. Walker explained that she and Dr. Bellamy have a work plan to start the recruitment process for a Director of Equity and Inclusion, and that they planned to hire someone by the end of the calendar year. She went on to say that Albemarle County and UVA have already implemented this department and that the City and its departments should work to properly define, exercise, and participate in the work that is necessary to make the Equity and Inclusion Department most effective.

Dr. Richardson responded that the Human Resources (HR) Director was slated to begin work on October 21st, and that his goal is to have the Director define what is needed within the Equity and Inclusion Department and have the Director plan for the budgeting cost of the department.

Ms. Walker emphasized the significance of the selection process for the Director.

Ms. Galvin asked for clarity on the HR Director’s responsibility for the Equity Director’s role. Dr. Richardson responded that he was waiting on the HR Director to begin because they possess the necessary expertise to hire for the position.

Ms. Galvin asked if the city needed a resolution indicating that a new department was being created and therefore adding department costs to the annual budget. She voiced concern about using money from the Council discretionary fund to start a department and that Council would need to ensure steady funding. Dr. Richardson agreed.

Mr. Murphy also agreed. He explained that Council has used money monies from their budget as launch funds and the budget would absorb the cost moving forward. He asked if Council and the City Manager were saying to only create and hire for the Director position using FY2020 funds and consider staff, training, and funding in FY2021 budget. He said that he would provide the new HR Director with all of the data and information collected by the committee to help with the hiring process.
Ms. Walker requested that the HR Director engage with committee throughout the hiring process and Dr. Richardson confirmed that this would be part of the process. Ms. Walker also stated that the position would need support - not a one person department.

Mr. Blair read the code for creating a new department, which places the decision within the power of the City Manager. He advised that Council could have an ordinance for the Office of Equity and Inclusion, but the City Manager would have to give permission if they want the department.

Ms. Galvin said that she envisioned it as a department working with other city departments. Dr. Richardson elaborated on additional responsibilities of the director of the department.

Mr. Signer suggested resolving to have the City Manager implement the office/position within the values of the organization.

Ms. Galvin said that Council would need to clarify how this department is different from the Human Rights Commission or the Civilian Review Board and that she would like to know if support staff for new department could be cross-trained with existing support staff.

Ms. Walker iterated that existing racial disparities amongst current staff underscores the inability of current staff to be effective in this position.

Mr. Signer clarified next steps for the City Manager to consult with new HR Director and bring a proposal before Council. Dr. Richardson agreed.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

On motion by Dr. Bellamy, seconded by Mr. Signer, Council by the following vote APPROVED a resolution authorizing the City Attorney to appeal the final order or decree entered by the Charlottesville Circuit Court decision in Payne, et al. v. City of Charlottesville, et al. (Civil case no. CL-17-145): 5-0 (Ayes: Bellamy, Galvin, Hill, Signer, Walker; Noes: None).

**RESOLUTION**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Charlottesville City Council that the City Attorney is hereby authorized to appeal the final order or decree entered by the Charlottesville Circuit Court in Payne, et al. v. City of Charlottesville, et al. (Civil case no. CL-17-145)

**MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC**

No one came forward for public comment.

Mayor Walker adjourned the meeting at 10:21 p.m.
October 21, 2019
Charlottesville City Council Special Meeting

A special meeting of the Charlottesville City Council was held on Monday, October 21, 2019, at 5:15 p.m. in the Second Floor Conference Room, City Hall, 605 E. Main Street, Charlottesville, Virginia, with the following members in attendance: Mayor Nikuyah Walker, Vice Mayor Heather Hill, Ms. Kathy Galvin, and Mr. Mike Signer. Dr. Wes Bellamy arrived at 6:10 p.m.

Ms. Walker called the meeting to order at 5:25 p.m.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Ms. Galvin, Council voted (Ayes: Walker, Hill, Galvin and Signer. Noes: None. Absent: Bellamy) to meet in closed session as authorized by Va. Code Sections 2.2-3711 and 2.2-3712, specifically:

- as authorized by Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(8) for consultation with legal counsel concerning employment law advice about a specific City employee; and
- as authorized by Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(3) discussion or consideration of acquisition of real property where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Charlottesville City Council, specifically discussing a piece of property located on the 250 Bypass within the City limits of Charlottesville.

Dr. Bellamy arrived at 6:10 p.m.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Mr. Signer, Council certified by the following vote (Ayes: Bellamy, Hill, Galvin, Signer, Walker. Noes: None), that to the best of each Council member’s knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the Motion convening the closed session were heard, discussed or considered in the closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 6:37 p.m.
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CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

Agenda Date: December 2, 2019
Action Required: Reappropriation of Funds
Presenter: Nikuyah Walker, Mayor
Staff Contacts: Hollie Lee, Chief of Workforce Development Strategies
Chris Engel, Director of Economic Development
Title: Reappropriation of Home to Hope Funds from the Department of Human Services to the Office of Economic Development - $321,103.35

Background:

In February 2019, City Council appropriated $405,000.00 to the Department of Human Services from the Council Reserve Fund for Racial Equity and Engagement (hereinafter “Equity Fund”) for the creation of a peer support services program, Home to Hope, that would be staffed by individuals having “lived experience” with the criminal justice system. The program was seen as an opportunity to increase community capacity to provide high quality peer support services to those reentering the community from incarceration through training and the creation of a dedicated unit of peer navigators.

The funds would be used for three purposes:

1.) To create and offer a peer support training program – $30,000.00
2.) To establish a Home to Hope Peer Navigator Unit with five full-time staff – $275,000.00
3.) To provide flexible funds to address the needs of people returning to the community including things such as: clothing, first month’s rent and security deposit, transportation, health care, etc. – $100,000.00

Discussion:

As a result of the appropriation, a seven-week Home to Hope training program was administered from mid-August 2019 to early October by the Office of Economic Development (OED). Eight individuals with lived experience were selected for the program, and all eight successfully graduated. The students received a Peer Support Specialist Certificate, a Wellness and Recovery Action Plan Facilitator’s Certificate, a Basic Administration and Computer Literacy Certificate, and training in workplace readiness and public speaking.

Ultimately, four individuals were selected for employment with the City of Charlottesville Department of Human Services as full-time Peer Navigators to staff the Home to Hope program. The four Home to Hope staff began employment with the Department of Human Services on Monday, October 21, 2019.

On Friday, November 15, 2019, Mayor Nikuyah Walker, who spearheaded the Home to Hope
initiative made the final decision to move the program and the four full-time Peer Navigators from the Department of Human Services to the Office of Economic Development/Downtown Job Center. As a result of this decision, the funds originally allocated to the Department of Human Services now need to be reappropriated to the OED.

The funds to be moved are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Appropriation - February 2019</td>
<td>$ 405,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds spent in FY 2019</td>
<td>(6,579.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Carried over to FY 2020</td>
<td>398,420.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Spent in FY 20 through November 20, 2019</td>
<td>(72,037.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Encumbered as of November 20, 2019</td>
<td>(5,280.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds to be moved to Economic Development **</td>
<td>$ 321,103.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Note: Given that the program is still in operation and expenses will continue to be incurred until this appropriation is approved, the amount actually moved to the new project code in the General Fund (105-1621004000) will reflect the actual balance of available funds at the time the appropriation is approved.

**Alignment with Council Vision Areas and Strategic Plan:**

This effort supports City Council’s “Economic Sustainability” vision and aligns directly with the SAT’s *Growing Opportunity* report that was approved by City Council in 2013.

It also contributes to the following goals and objectives in the City’s Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: An Inclusive Community of Self-sufficient Residents

Goal 2: A healthy and safe community.

Goal 4: A Strong, Creative and Diversified Economy

**Community Engagement:**

City staff consulted with multiple service providers, community members, and the Steering Committee for the Re-entry Council in the development of the original proposal. Additionally, since the launch of the program many community partners have been engaged including: On Our Own, The Fountain Fund, Georgia’s House, Piedmont House, Offender Aid and Restoration, and The Haven.

**Budgetary Impact:**

No new funds are being requested of the General fund. Previously appropriated program funds will be transferred from the Human Services (Fund 213) and reappropriated to a separate project cost center in the General Fund (Fund 105).
**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends reappropriation of the funds.

**Alternatives:**

If the funds are not reappropriated, the OED will not be able to operate the Home to Hope program.

**Attachments:**

- City of Charlottesville City Council Agenda Memo – Home to Hope Peer Navigators - $405,000 (January 22, 2019)
REAPPROPRIATION
Home to Hope Funds from the Department of Human Services to the Office of Economic Development - $321,103.35**

WHEREAS, the City Council previously appropriated funds for the Home to Hope program that were transferred from the Equity Fund to the Human Services Fund in the amount of $405,000.00; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the sum of $321,103.35** will hereby be transferred back from the Human Services Fund (213-3413016000-561105) to a project code in the City’s General Fund to be managed by the Office of Economic Development in the following manner:

Revenue – $321,103.35**

$321,103.35** Fund: 105 Cost Center: 1621004000 G/L: 498010

Expenditures - $321,103.35**

$321,103.35** Fund: 105 Cost Center: 1621004000 G/L: 599999

**Note: Given that the program is still in operation and expenses will continue to be incurred until this appropriation is approved, the amount actually moved to the new project code in the General Fund (105-1621004000) will reflect the actual balance of available funds at the time the appropriation is approved.
Background:

On November 14, 2018, City Council held a worksession on the re-entry population and local best practice approaches. At that worksession, council heard presentations from a wide variety of local providers and community members about the Prisoner Re-entry Council, the use of risk assessments, the resource room at the jail, the Coming Home to Work program, the homecoming guide, loan programs at The Fountain Fund, and peer navigation. Peer navigation was identified repeatedly by speakers and community members as an effective approach to connecting people returning to the community after incarceration with community supports. Council requested additional information on the cost of a transitional housing program for individuals returning to the community and expanding our community’s capacity to provide peer support services.

Discussion:

While peer navigation is gaining interest in the community of service providers, there remain many opportunities to benefit from the lived experience of peer support specialists. To that end, what follows is an opportunity to increase community capacity to provide high quality peer support services through training and the creation of a dedicated unit of peer navigators.

1) Create and offer a GO Peer Support training program - $30,000*

A GO Peer Support training program will provide an opportunity for up to 15 participants to receive six weeks of formal training on:

- peer navigation
- professional boundaries
- the local system of care
- group facilitation skills
- financial literacy
- workplace readiness
- computer skills
Successful participants would gain preliminary credentials including:

- Peer Support Specialist Certification
- Wellness Recovery Action Plan (W.R.A.P.) Facilitator Certification

2) **Establish Home to Hope Peer Navigator Unit - $275,000**

Hire 5 successful participants of the GO Peer Support Training Program to provide peer support services to individuals returning to community after a period of incarceration. Recently released individuals are at significant risk:

- They are 12 times more likely to die in the first 90 days than the general population*, and
- They are most likely to be re-incarcerated for a probation violation in the first 45 days*.

In an attempt to mitigate this risk, Home to Hope will focus its efforts on individuals released to community within the last two years, while prioritizing those who have returned within 90 days. Home to Hope peer navigators will maintain caseloads of 12 individuals and work on practical goals including:

- Obtaining identification
- Addressing the tasks identified on the jail case plan
- Connecting to probation unit in a timely way as required
- Connecting to services available at Offender Aid & Restoration (O.A.R.)
- Obtaining stable housing
- Obtaining employment or enrolling in training/education program
- Create plan for paying off restitution, fines and/or fees
- Assessing and address behavioral health needs
- Creating a plan for prosocial connections and support

Home to Hope is proposed as a two year pilot program to understand:

1. The impact of peer navigation on probation violations and subsequent jail stays
2. The extent of the practical and financial need of the re-entry population

Home to Hope will be re-assessed at the end of year one to determine what mid-course changes should be made and then evaluated against anticipated individual and community outcomes at the end of year two.

3) **Provide flexible funds to address the needs of people returning to the community - $100,000**

A flexible fund will be established to assist individuals returning to the community after incarceration. Individuals may apply to use these funds to address practical needs including clothing, first month’s rent and security deposit, transportation, health care, etc. Applications will be reviewed by peer navigators as a group. This fund allows for immediate needs to be addressed and provides the basis for evaluating the full scope of the financial need of the returning population.

**Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:**

Home to Hope is aligned with City’s Strategic Goals # 1: An inclusive community of self-sufficient residents and #2: A healthy and safe city.
Community Engagement:

City staff consulted with multiple service providers, community members and the steering committee of the Re-entry Council in the development of this proposal.

Budgetary Impact:
No new funding will need to be appropriated. Funding would be transferred from the General Fund to the Human Services Fund. Should council determine that a special re-entry program is warranted, the budget impact would vary based on the program components selected:

GO Peer Support Training Program: $30,000
Home to Hope Peer Navigator Unit: $275,000
Flexible Funds for Practical Needs: $100,000

TOTAL: $405,000

Funding for the GO Peer program would come from funding previously appropriated to the Council Priority Initiatives fund. Funding for the Peer Navigator Unit and Flexible Funds would come from funding previously appropriated for the Equity fund.

Recommendation:
Staff recommend funding all three components as effective mechanisms to expand peer navigation and support services for individuals returning to community after a period of incarceration.

Staff recommend funding the training component in FY19 to take advantage of available grant funding using the priority initiatives fund.

Staff recommend funding peer navigation and flexible funding pool in FY20 using the equity fund.

Alternatives:
Council could fund one, two, three or none of these approaches.
Council could determine that Home to Hope should be supported by a community agency and not housed within the Department of Human Services.

Attachments:
* If this program were offered prior to the end of the current fiscal year, a TANF grant obtained by the City’s Office of Economic Development would reimburse up to 85% of these expenses.
* Neal Goodloe, Criminal Justice Planner
APPROPRIATION
Home to Hope Peer Navigators Funding
$405,000

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the sum of $30,000 is hereby transferred for to the GO Peer Support Training Program from currently appropriated funds in the Council Priority Initiatives Fund in the General Fund as follows:

**Transfer From:**
$30,000  
Fund: 105  
Cost Center: 1011001000  
G/L Account: 599999

**Transfer To:**
$30,000  
Fund: 213  
Cost Center: 3411001000  
G/L Account: 599999
$30,000  
Fund: 213  
Cost Center: 3411001000  
G/L Account: 498010

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the sum of $375,000 is hereby transferred for to the Home to Hope Peer Navigator Unit ($275,000) and the Flexible Funds for Practical Needs ($100,000) programs from currently appropriated funds in the Equity Fund in the General Fund as follows:

**Transfer From:**
$375,000  
Fund: 105  
Cost Center: 1011001000  
G/L Account: 599999

**Transfer To:**
$375,000  
Fund: 213  
Cost Center: 3411001000  
G/L Account: 599999
$375,000  
Fund: 213  
Cost Center: 3411001000  
G/L Account: 498010
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Background:

The City of Charlottesville, through the Commonwealth’s Attorney’s Office, has received the Victim Witness Program Grant from the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services in the amount of $168,018 in Federal Funds and $56,006 in State General Funds, and $41,000 supplement from the Commonwealth Attorney’s operating budget for a total award of $265,024.

Discussion:

The victim’s rights movement began in the 1970s as a result of victims being re-victimized by the criminal justice process. Victims had difficulty navigating the complexities of the criminal justice system and no voice or recourse when their cases were continued or pled out without their knowledge or consent. Prosecutors did not have the time or skills to respond to victims who were traumatized, but knew that in order to proceed with their case, many victims would need more services than the prosecutor’s office could provide. In response to this need, the federal Victims of Crime Act was passed in 1984 and funds became available through the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice to respond to the needs of victims. The Charlottesville Victim/Witness Assistance Program was established in 1989 and has been meeting the needs of Charlottesville crime victims ever since. The Program is one of more than 60 such programs in the state that provides crisis intervention and advocacy, information and support during and after criminal justice proceedings, access to compensation and restitution, referrals to local community agencies and ensures victims are afforded their rights as outlined in Virginia’s Crime Victim and Witness Rights Act. The Program also provides training on victim issues to law enforcement and allied agencies. It regularly serves more than 800 victims and 20 witnesses each year.

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:

Approval of this agenda item aligns directly with Council’s vision for Charlottesville to be America’s Healthiest City, a Community of Mutual Respect and a Smart, Citizen-Focused Government. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the total economic loss to crime victims was $1.19 billion for violent offenses and $16.2 billion for property crime in 2008. Statistics vary on the amount of intangible losses victims accumulate, such as the effects of the crime on their sense of security, mental health and relationships. The Charlottesville Victim Witness Assistance Program contributes
to the health of the community by connecting crime victims with medical and mental health providers through the Criminal Injury Compensation Fund. The Program helps create a **Community of Mutual Respect** by responding to the needs of crime victims and helps achieve a **Smart, Citizen-Focused Government** by ensuring their rights are recognized throughout the local criminal justice system, including police, prosecution, judges and probation.

**Community Engagement:**

The Victim Witness Assistance Program is engaged daily with victims of crime who access services through referrals from police, court services, social services and other allied agencies. Program staff contacts crime victims within 48 hours of their reported victimization. Program staff serves on several coordinating councils, such as the Multi-Disciplinary Team on Child Abuse, the Domestic Violence Coordinating Council, the Sexual Assault Response Team, the Monticello Area Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team and the Charlottesville/Albemarle Evidence Based Decision Making Policy Team. The program regularly provides outreach in the forms of government services day, training and speaking engagements at U.V.A., P.V.C.C. and other allied agencies as requested.

**Budgetary Impact:**

There is no impact to the General Fund. The City’s match of $41,000 was previously appropriated as part of the Commonwealth’s Attorney’s Office F.Y. 2020 Adopted Budget. The Victim Witness Assistance Program Grant is renewed annually and the funds will be received and expensed in the grants fund.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval and appropriation of grant funds.

**Alternatives:**

If grant funds are not appropriated, Charlottesville crime victims will have no access to compensation, advocacy or services afforded to them under Virginia’s Crime Victim and Witness Rights Act.

**Attachments:**

Appropriation Memorandum
APPROPRIATION
Charlottesville Victim Witness Assistance Program Grant
$265,024

WHEREAS, The City of Charlottesville, through the Commonwealth Attorney’s Office, has received an increase in the Victim Witness Program Grant from the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services in the amount of $224,024; and

WHEREAS, the City is providing a supplement in the amount of $41,000, the source of which is the Commonwealth’s Attorney’s operating budget;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the sum of $224,024 is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 56,006</td>
<td>Fund: 209</td>
<td>Cost Center: 1414001000</td>
<td>G/L Account: 430110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$168,018</td>
<td>Fund: 209</td>
<td>Cost Center: 1414001000</td>
<td>G/L Account: 430120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$  41,000</td>
<td>Fund: 209</td>
<td>Cost Center: 1414001000</td>
<td>G/L Account: 498010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$251,000</td>
<td>Fund: 209</td>
<td>Cost Center: 1414001000</td>
<td>G/L Account: 519999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 14,024</td>
<td>Fund: 209</td>
<td>Cost Center: 1414001000</td>
<td>G/L Account: 599999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer from:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$  41,000</td>
<td>Fund: 105</td>
<td>Cost Center: 1401001000</td>
<td>G/L Account: 561209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of $224,024 from the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services.
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The City of Charlottesville, through Parks and Recreation, has received an award from the Virginia Outdoors Foundation (VOF) in the amount of $50,000 to assist with efforts to purchase land in order to construct a bicycle and pedestrian trail along the north side of the 250 bypass. The grant does not require local match. The award of $50,000 will be appropriated into the Parkland Acquisition Account P-00534.

Use of VOF funding for this acquisition includes placing the parcel to be acquired and approximately 5 acres of the wooded section of western McIntire Park into an open space easement with the VOF. This area is already designated as a Managed Conservation Area in the approved master plan for western McIntire Park. This easement will not affect fire station expansion/renovation or any other facilities in the park.

Use of VOF funds will also initiate a one dollar fee per real estate closing fee to be allocated to the VOF. This has been discussed and is recommended for approval by the Circuit Court Clerk. Charlottesville is one of few localities in the Commonwealth that has not yet joined this program.

The bicycle, pedestrian and trail master plan was developed with multiple public meetings and was approved by council to be an addendum to the City Comprehensive Plan.

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:
Construction of this trail will further council goals of being a Connected City by establishing a portion of the bicycle and pedestrian trail system that enhances our residential neighborhoods.

**Budgetary Impact:**

If these grants funds are appropriated there is no impact to the City budget as there is no required match.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends appropriation of grant funds.

**Alternatives:**

If grants funds are not appropriated, Parks and Recreation will have to use local CIP funds for the acquisition, leaving less money for other potential parkland acquisitions.

**Attachments:**

Appropriation
Letter From Clerk of Court
WHEREAS, the City of Charlottesville, through Parks and Recreation, has been awarded $50,000 from the Virginia Outdoors Foundation to purchase land adjacent to McIntire Park; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the sum of $50,000 is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

**Revenue**

$50,000  
Fund: 426  
WBS: PR-001  
G/L Account: 430120

**Expenditures**

$50,000  
Fund: 426  
WBS: PR-001  
G/L Account: 599999

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of $50,000 from the Virginia Outdoors Foundation.
CIRCUIT COURT  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
315 EAST HIGH STREET  
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA 22902-5195  
(434) 970-3766  

Tracy D. Smith  
Anita D. Spivey  
Julie S. Moats  
Dana M. Porter  
DEPUTY CLERKS  

Llezelle A. Dugger  
CLERK  

Gwendolyn T. Williams  
Dianne P. Pugh  
Jennifer J. Turner  
DEPUTY CLERKS  

April 18, 2018  

Brian Daly, Director  
Parks & Recreation  
City of Charlottesville  
501 East Main Street  
Charlottesville, VA 22902  

RE: Fee for open-space preservation  

Dear Brian:  

Pursuant to Va. Ccde §58.1-817, there is a $1.00 fee imposed on every deed admitted to record in those jurisdictions in which open-space easements are held by the Virginia Outdoors Foundation.  

Once this statute is triggered, I will have my real estate records vendor program the $1.00 fee into our recording system. From that date forward, the $1.00 fee will be automatically assessed when a deed is admitted to record in my office. The impact on my budget and on my staff is minimal.  

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.  

Sincerely,  

Llezelle A. Dugger  
Clerk of Court
Agenda Date: November 18, 2019
Action Required: Appropriation
Presenter: Riaan Anthony, Park and Recreation Management Specialist
Staff Contacts: Riaan Anthony, Park and Recreation Management Specialist II
              Vic Garber, Deputy Director, Parks and Recreation

Title: Virginia Department of Education Special Nutrition Program
Child and Adult Care Food Program - $35,000

Background:

The City of Charlottesville, through Parks and Recreation, has received approval for a reimbursement of up to $35,000 from the Virginia Department of Education Special Nutrition Program to provide free dinner to children 18 and under attending our drop-in afterschool programs through their Child and Adult Care Food Program.

Discussion:

Charlottesville Parks and Recreation will operate an afterschool meals program for 36 weeks, during the course of the regular school year. There are currently 4 locations, Friendship Court, Greenstone on 5th, South First Street and Westhaven Community Centers that serve children 18 years and under. This year we have added a 5th location, Crow Recreation Center. The reimbursement will cover the costs of a nutritious dinner at these locations, which also have an educational/enrichment component. Dinner will be served from 4-8 pm at the various community centers. Most of the children served receive free or reduced meals during the school year. Over 400 children will be served each week during the school year.

The dinners are purchased through the City of Charlottesville School Food Service. The Parks and Recreation Department pays the bills to the City of Charlottesville Food Service and is then reimbursed by the Virginia Department of Education Special Nutrition Programs.

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:

Approval of this agenda item aligns directly with Council’s vision for Charlottesville to be America’s Healthiest City and it contributes to Goal 2 of the Strategic Plan - Healthy and Safe
City. Children will receive a nutritious dinner, hopefully replacing a meal that did not exist or providing a healthier balanced option for them.

**Community Engagement:**

N/A

**Budgetary Impact:**

There is no impact to the General Fund. The funds will be appropriated, expensed and reimbursed to a Grants Fund. There is no required local match for this program.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval and appropriation of funds,

**Alternatives:**

If money is not appropriated, the free dinner program will not be offered to youth, most of whom receive free or reduced meals during the school year.

**Attachments:**

N/A
WHEREAS, the City of Charlottesville, through Parks and Recreation, has received approval for reimbursement up to $35,000 from the Virginia Department of Education Special Nutrition Program to provide free dinner to children attending select drop-in afterschool centers; and

WHEREAS, the grant award covers the period from period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the sum of $35,000, received from the Virginia Department of Education Special Nutrition Program is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

**Revenue – $35,000**

Fund: 209  Internal Order: 1900342  G/L Account: 430120

**Expenditures - $35,000**

Fund: 209  Internal Order: 1900342  G/L Account: 530670

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of $35,000 from the Virginia Department of Education Special Nutrition Program.
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CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

Agenda Date: November 18, 2019
Action Required: Appropriation of Grant Funds
Presenter: Hollie Lee, Chief of Workforce Development Strategies
Staff Contacts: Hollie Lee, Chief of Workforce Development Strategies
Title: Virginia Department of Social Services (V.D.S.S.) Employment Advancement for Temporary Aid to Needy Families (T.A.N.F.) Participants Grant - $130,259.83

Background:

For the past two years, the City of Charlottesville, through the Office of Economic Development (OED), has been receiving matching grants from the Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS) in order to provide workforce development training to individuals residing in the City of Charlottesville living at or below 200% poverty. The first grant in the amount of $50,000.00, was awarded in 2017 and required a 15 percent match of local dollars. Funding was used for workplace readiness skills training, technical training, and/or supportive services required for employment (e.g., childcare, transportation, rental assistance, etc.). VDSS has renewed this for the past two fiscal years in the same amount of $50,000. The OED matched the grant from the Workforce Investment Fund (P-00385).

In January 2019, VDSS expanded the funding pool and issued a Request for Proposal for additional funding available from January 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020. The OED was awarded a grant in the amount of $56,630.00, which also required a 15 percent match of local dollars. The match was made from the Workforce Investment Fund (P-00385). The funding is being used to support a full-time long term temporary position in the Downtown Job Center. This individual, who was hired in September 2019, assists with the day-to-day operations of the Job Center, as well as events and training programs.

More recently, the OED has was given an intent to award letter by VDSS for another grant in the amount of $130,259.83 for October 2019 to June 30, 2020. Grant funding will be used for workforce development training (GO programs) and supportive services, as well as business development training (GO Start-Up) and grants (ACE Grant for Start-Ups). This grant does not require a match.

Discussion:

In July 2013, the City’s Strategic Action Team on Workforce Development (SAT) issued a report to City Council entitled, Growing Opportunity: A Path to Self-Sufficiency. The report, which was subsequently endorsed by Council, examines the barriers to employment for low-income City residents and makes recommendations on how to address these barriers. One of the recommendations is to “work to ensure that training programs align with the needs of new and existing businesses.”
In an effort to make progress towards this recommendation, the OED has been actively engaged in developing jobs-driven workforce development training programs in partnership with local employers. The flagship program, GO Driver, has been conducted eleven times and trains City residents to get their Class B Commercial Driver’s License and become Relief Transit Bus Operators with Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) and/or Pupil Transportation at a rate of $16.53 per hour. In addition to technical training, GO programs also include assistance with supportive services such as rental assistance, car repair, exam fees, etc. These costs, which average about $200 per participant, are also included as part of the programming. Nearly 30 GO programs have been administered since 2014.

Additionally, the City recently launched the Minority Business Program, which is designed to promote the startup of minority- and woman-owned businesses in the City and the growth and expansion of existing City minority- and woman-owned business. The OED sees business creation and retention as a potential means to self-sufficiency either through full-time business ownership or supplemental income. The grant funding will be used to provide new services/programs specifically for startups. This includes a GO Start-Up program for individuals who want to start a business but need the basic fundamentals to begin the process. This will be a precursor to the Charlottesville Investment Collaborative’s 15-week entrepreneurship class. Funds will also be used to augment the OED’s Advancing Charlottesville Entrepreneurs (ACE) program by offering mini grants to newly created businesses in business for one day to six months. The grants will be for products/services that will enhance a business’s revenues. Grant awards will be up to $500 per business.

Alignment with Council Vision Areas and Strategic Plan:

This effort supports City Council’s “Economic Sustainability” vision and aligns directly with the SAT’s Growing Opportunity report that was approved by City Council in 2013.

It also contributes to the following goals and objectives in the City’s Strategic Plan:

Goal 4: A Strong, Creative and Diversified Economy
- Objective 4.1: Develop a quality workforce

Goal 1: An Inclusive Community of Self-sufficient Residents
- Objective 1.2: Prepare residents for the workforce

It aligns with Chapter 3 on Economic Sustainability in the Comprehensive Plan, and more specifically Goal 6, which focuses on workforce development and being an effective partner in creating a well-prepared and successful workforce.

Community Engagement:

Like practically all of the City’s workforce development efforts, its employment training programs are supported by numerous community agencies and organizations. Examples include: Albemarle County, Piedmont Virginia Community College, Virginia Career Works, and employer partners. Similarly, on the business development side, partners include the Chamber Business Diversity Council, the Community Investment Collaborative, the Central Virginia Small Business Development Center, and private sector organizations. None of the work that is currently being done could be possible without this strong community engagement.
**Budgetary Impact:**

There is no impact to the General Fund. All funds will be budgeted and expended in the grants fund and the awarded grant does not require a local match.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval and appropriation of grant funds.

**Alternatives:**

If grant funds are not appropriated, more local dollars will have to be used for training or fewer low-income, underemployed City residents will be able to be trained. Additionally, the OED will not have the additional staff hours needed to support the training programs.

**Attachments:**

- VDSS BEN-113-03 Sub-Award Agreement
APPROPRIATION

Virginia Department of Social Services (V.D.S.S.) Employment Advancement for Temporary Aid to Needy Families (T.A.N.F.) Participants Grant

$130,259.83

WHEREAS, the City of Charlottesville has received funds from the Virginia Department of Social Services in the amount of $130,259.83; and

WHEREAS, the funds will be used to support workforce development training programs and business development programs provided by the Office of Economic Development; and

WHEREAS, the grant award covers the period from October 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the sum of $130,259.83 is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

Revenue – $130,259.83

$130,259.83 Fund: 209 IO: 1900343 G/L: 430120 State/Fed pass thru

Expenditures - $130,259.83

$130,259.83 Fund: 209 IO: 1900343 G/L: 599999 Lump Sum

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of $130,259.83 from the Virginia Department of Social Services.
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

SUB-AWARD AGREEMENT

Agreement Number: BEN-19-113-03

THIS AGREEMENT for a subgrant award is entered into this 1st day of October 2019, by the City of Charlottesville, Office of Economic Development hereinafter called the “Subrecipient” or “Subgrantee” and Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Social Services, Division of Benefit Programs called the “VDSS,” “DBP,” “BP” or Grantee.”

WITNESSETH that the Subrecipient and the VDSS, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises and agreements herein contained, agree as follows:

SCOPE OF AGREEMENT: The Subrecipient shall provide the services to the VDSS as set forth in the Agreement Documents.


COMPENSATION AND METHOD OF PAYMENT: The Subrecipient shall be paid by the VDSS a maximum reimbursement of $130,259.83 upon submission of itemized invoices as specified in Section X - Payment Terms of the Request for Applications (RFA).

The agreement documents shall consist of:

1. This signed form;
2. The Request for Application dated June 24, 2019;
3. Addendum #1, Dated June 25, 2019; and Addendum #2, Dated July 23, 2019;
4. The Subrecipient’s Application dated August 1, 2019 and the negotiated modifications to the Application dated September 12, 2019, all of which documents are incorporated herein.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Agreement to be duly executed intending to be bound thereby.

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

BY: ________________________________
(Signature)
Christopher V. Cullinan
(Name)
Director of Finance
(Print)

DATE: 9/24/2019

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

BY: ________________________________
(Signature)
Michele S. Skaggs
(Name)
Director, General Services
(Print)

DATE: 9/30/19

Note: Note: This public body does not discriminate against faith-based organizations in accordance with the Code of Virginia, § 2.2-4343.1 or against a bidder or offeror because of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, political affiliation, or veteran status or any other basis prohibited by state law relating to discrimination in employment. Faith-based organizations may request that the issuing agency not include subparagraph 1.e in General Condition C Anti-Discrimination. Such a request shall be in writing and explain why an exception should be made in that request for proposal or request for application.
Faye Palmer  
Manager, Workforce Development  
Virginia Department of Social Services  
801 E. Main St.  
Richmond, VA 23219  

September 12, 2019  

Dear Ms. Palmer,  

I am writing to formally accept our receipt of grant awards in regards to BEN-19-113: Employment Advancements for TANF Participants from the Virginia Department of Social Services in the amount of $130,259.83 to the City of Charlottesville Office of Economic Development. Our organization exists to serve our community by acting as a catalyst for initiatives that create employment opportunities that contribute to a vibrant and sustainable economy. This grant will be very helpful in assisting us to continue to reach our current goals of facilitating training for citizens of Charlottesville to achieve rewarding and stable career opportunities, as well as promoting opportunities for entrepreneurship to improve opportunities for self-sufficiency in our target population.  

Based on the award for grant funding, we would propose the following amendments to our budget:  

1) The removal of salary for a new employee, totaling $49,636.16 including benefits.  

2) We would like to have the remainder of the award differential, $704.17, taken from the supplies line item in the budget (originally $1,000.00). The remaining $295.83 will be equally redistributed to workforce development training programs and business development programs.  

3) We also propose to amend our budget to move $10,000 from line item 21, operating costs for existing GO programs, into line item 22, expenses for our entrepreneurial programming development and implementation. This would change our budget to $60,129.91 for line item 21 and line item 22.  

If any further discussion is needed in regards to this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at (434) 970-3117 or LEEH@charlottesville.org and I will get back to you as quickly as possible. We look forward to sending you positive reports on our progress.  

Thank you,  

Hollie Lee  

Hollie Lee  
Chief of Workforce Development Strategies  
City of Charlottesville  
Office of Economic Development  
434-970-3117  
lee@charlottesville.org
Dual Models of GO Programming

APPLICATION SUMMARY

PURPOSE AND GOALS

The City of Charlottesville’s Office of Economic Development (OED) has a proven track record of designing and delivering quality workforce development programming. The purpose of the Growing Opportunities (GO) programs are to provide training to unemployed and underemployed residents of Charlottesville in order to facilitate sustainable employment in appropriate industries that offer a living wage. The OED seeks to continue providing innovative and directed instruction to local residents who face significant barriers to fill needs identified by local employers. There is also opportunity to promote entrepreneurship as a route for low-income citizens to achieve economic self-sufficiency, given that many newly created jobs offer non-living wages and limited potential for economic mobility. The goal of the OED in these endeavors is twofold: to provide workforce development training to impart necessary skills to participants in order for them to secure gainful employment at a self-sufficient wage, and to offer entrepreneurial based training as a means to self-employment and supplemental income opportunities, leading to self-sufficiency.

COMMUNITY PARTNERS

Community partners will include the Charlottesville Department of Social Services (CDSS) staff, who will help identify and recruit participants to programs. CDSS staff will also assist with case management of their clients and identify potential barriers to consistent employment (e.g. transportation, childcare, housing, etc.) in order for proper services to be implemented.

For workforce development programs, Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) or Charlottesville Albemarle Technical Education Center (CATEC) will provide a majority of the customized training that the participants will receive throughout the GO training programs. Additionally, numerous private sector vendors will be utilized for specific sections of training to ensure the highest quality instruction. For entrepreneurial training the OED will partner with business assistance providers such as the Community Investment Collaborative (CIC), the Central Virginia Small Business Development Center (CVSBDC), and other private vendors.

Employer partners are equally as critical as educational providers to the success of GO programs. The key employer partner for GO Driver is Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT). CAT is actively engaged in the recruitment and selection of program participants and also provides participants tours of their facilities, aid in the completion of online applications, and engage in mock interviewing. CAT facilities are used as the primary training location, and several CAT staff are part of the curriculum instruction team.
Concerning GO Cook, Chef Antwon Brinson with Culinary Concepts AB, the training provider contracted through CATEC, employs a diverse network of restaurant and hospitality partners to prepare GO Cook students for employment by allowing on-site internships in professional kitchens, showing prospective employees the unique responsibilities of different aspects of the culinary arts field.

Other GO programs identify and collaborate with employer partners based on the industry the training is focused on (e.g. Sun Tribe Solar for GO Solar, UVA Health System for GO CNA, the City of Charlottesville’s Public Utilities and Public Works departments for GO Trades, etc.). The ultimate goal for those in GO Start-Up entrepreneurial training is for participants to become self-employed. For those already self-employed and participating in a program like GO Contractor’s Academy, the vision is for individuals to grow their existing businesses and receive additional training to increase revenue and marketability, thereby increasing their self-sufficiency.

**SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED**

GO training programs are generally between five and seven weeks long, depending on the industry, and include industry-specific training as well as workplace readiness training, customer service training, and financial literacy. Other supportive services to be provided on an as needed basis include, but are not limited to: rental assistance, transportation assistance, and childcare assistance.

**PROJECTED SERVICE NUMBERS AND PLANNED OUTCOMES**

The projected number of City residents to be served by the combined GO programming is 53 individuals. Based on historical graduation rates, it is anticipated that 46 will complete the GO training curriculums and graduate. Projections from prior classes indicate that 34 individuals not already employed will obtain employment through opportunities gained from the programs. Graduates of GO Driver are provided the opportunity to be considered for employment with CAT and/or City of Charlottesville pupil transportation at $16.51 hourly salary. GO Cook graduates have varying roles in the restaurants they are hired in. Line and prep cooks in the Charlottesville area can expect to make $12-$14/hour or more, with consistent opportunities for advancement. Other GO program variants may be implemented based on identified employer need and the employer offering a sustainable living wage for graduates who are offered employment.

**USE OF FUNDS**

The use of funds for traditional GO programming will be for the purpose of paying for training provided by training vendors such as PVCC and CATEC, as well as for providing supportive services to program participants. Additional funding for GO Start-Up and the GO Contractor’s
Academy will be allocated to program development and training costs, as well as grants for enrollees.

APPLICATION NEEDS STATEMENT

i. Charlottesville is an independent city located in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains and serves as the county seat for Albemarle County as well as the hub of the Charlottesville Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which includes Albemarle, Fluvanna, Buckingham, Greene and Nelson Counties. According to U.S. Census data, the Charlottesville Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) had a population of 232,182 people in 2017.\(^1\) 70.1% of residents identify as Caucasian, 18.9% African-American and just over 5% Hispanic or Latino.\(^2\) The median household income in the City of Charlottesville measured at $66,853 according to the American Community Survey (ACS) one year estimate for 2017.\(^3\)

Estimates based on the 2017 ACS snapshot show that nearly 25% (57,207 individuals in the Charlottesville MSA) are at 200% or less of the Federal Poverty Guidelines.\(^4\) The poverty level for a family of four in 2019 has been established at $25,750 annual income (see figure 1 below). Census Bureau data indicates that over 16,000 individuals in the area work full-time year-round and make less than $50,000/year.\(^5\) This evidence supports the argument that skilled jobs training and entrepreneurial initiatives will make significant headway in providing families the opportunity to earn a living wage. Furthermore, FY2018 reports from Virginia DSS show that 706 households in the Charlottesville MSA received TANF benefits during that timeframe and DSS spent $1,782,399 on TANF in the area.\(^6\) These facts suggest that targeted recruitment for training and workforce development opportunities will yield a substantial number of candidates.

\(^1\) https://data.census.gov/cedsci/map?q=Population&table=B01003&tid=ACSDT1Y2017.B01003&vintage=2017&layer=cbas&cid=B01003_001E&g=310M300US16820
\(^2\) https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF
\(^3\) https://data.census.gov/cedsci/map?q=economic&table=DP03&tid=ACSDP1Y2017.DP03&vintage=2017&layer=cbas&cid=DP03_0062E&g=310M200US16820_310M300US16820
\(^4\) https://data.census.gov/cedsci/map?q=poverty&table=S1701&tid=ACSSST1Y2017.S1701&Poverty%3APoverty&vintage=2017&layer=cbas&cid=S1701_C01_042E&g=310M300US16820
\(^6\) https://www.dss.virginia.gov/geninfo/reports/agency_wide/dss_profile.cgi
2019 POVERTY GUIDELINES FOR THE 48 CONTIGUOUS STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONS IN FAMILY/HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>POVERTY GUIDELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For families/households with more than 8 persons. add $4,420 for each additional person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$16,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$21,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$30,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$34,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$39,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$43,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: 2019 Federal Poverty Guidelines

The unemployment rate for the Charlottesville MSA remains low at 2.7% as of May 2019 according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), although that has trended slightly upward.\(^7\)

The BLS gives further information regarding median wages for fields encompassed by GO programming. Restaurant cooks make a median wage of $30,930 annually, first line supervisors an average of $41,680/year, and transit bus drivers $34,340.\(^8\) These all represent compelling support of job skills training.

ii. Growing Opportunities (GO) programs resulted from the Orange Dot report in 2011, which explored the prevalence and root causes of poverty in the Charlottesville area. The Charlottesville Office of Economic Development has spearheaded efforts to identified City Council objectives to create opportunities for area residents to achieve self-sufficiency through employment that pays appropriate living wages. The jobs-driven pre-employment training model was brought into fruition with the first GO Driver program in fall 2014 in response to an expressed need for bus drivers by Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT). Since that initial program 25 GO programs have successfully graduated 162 residents, with a job placement rate of over 86%. The GO initiative continues today as we are currently implementing our 11\(^{th}\) GO Driver class and our 5\(^{th}\) GO Cook cohort. Other employer identified needs have led to programs focusing on training for CNAs, public utilities workers, solar panel installers and call center representatives. GO programs have demonstrated their utility as means by which residents can achieve economic self-sufficiency, pride in professional accomplishments, and a clear path to reaching career goals.

\(^{7}\)https://www.bls.gov/news.release/metro.t01.htm

\(^{8}\)https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_16820.htm#53-0000
GO Training Programs – Employment with Area Employers

This proposal places an emphasis on GO Driver and GO Cook, with the former being our original program that has been recognized around the Commonwealth for its’ excellence, and the latter as offering a consistent pipeline of trained and motivated graduates to fill needs in the demanding field of culinary arts.

GO Driver is a five and a half week, 180 hour training program that allows participants to earn a Class B Commercial Driver’s License (CDL) learner’s permit and prepares them for a career as a Relief Transit Operator with the Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) system. Although CAT has been our main employer partner, it is important to recognize that opportunities exist with other local employers including the University of Virginia Transit System (UTS), JAUNT (a local para-transit service), and Pupil Transportation for Charlottesville City Schools and Albemarle County Schools.

GO Cook is a five week, one-hundred hour program that offers a ServSafe certification, a Certified Cook certification recognized in the hospitality industry nationwide, essential workplace and life skills, and the invaluable opportunity to shadow with multiple restaurant partners to gain real-world experience prior to job placement. Currently, 58 area culinary establishments have a working relationship with Chef Antwon Brinson, the proprietor of Culinary Concepts AB and lead trainer, to deliver stable employment opportunities to graduates based on skill level and interest, while also providing upward mobility lacking in other fields.

The GO Solar Program is a five and half-week training program that prepares City residents for a career as a solar panel installer. The program is a partnership with local clean energy organization Sun Tribe Solar and offers training that will equip residents with a North American Board of Certified Energy Practitioners PV Installation Professional Certification, OSHA 10 Certificate, Forklift and Airlift Certifications, a CPR/First Aid Certificate, and workplace essential skills. After successful completion of this program, participants will have the opportunity to be considered for employment with Sun Tribe Solar.

GO CNA consists of seven weeks of intensive pre-employment training (176 hours), conducted in partnership with PVCC, whereby participants earn their CNA certificates, complete customer service and workplace readiness training, and obtain their Career Readiness Certificates. Throughout the entire training period, City staff works closely with UVA, integrating the hospital’s Human Resources staff into the program through tours of the facility, assistance with online applications, mock interviewing, and job shadowing.

GO Utilities partners with Charlottesville’s Department of Public Works in a seven week, 147 hour training to prepare graduates for positions as a Maintenance Work with the City’s Public Utilities Division. Certifications earned include a National Center for Construction Education and Research (NCCER) Pipefitting Certification, a Class A Learner’s Permit, Flagging Certification and OSHA 10 Certification.
GO Training Programs – Self-Employment

As previously mentioned, training efforts will be twofold. First, existing pre-employment workforce training programs will be expanded through grant funding. There is a proven track record of placing graduates of these programs into jobs paying a self-sufficient wage using this model. Second, entrepreneurship training will be offered as a way to assist low income Charlottesville residents start their own businesses and gain access to supplemental income, and once these businesses are fully operational, opportunities for self-employment.

Research into low income entrepreneurship in New York City drew the following conclusion: “at a time when so many newly created jobs offer low wages and limited opportunity for economic mobility, it is time for policymakers, economic development officials and workforce development professionals to embrace entrepreneurship as one route for low-income (citizens) to achieve economic self-sufficiency”. Entrepreneurship is a proven commodity in the financial empowerment and economic mobility for many people. Fundamental changes in the economy have created barriers for individuals without post-secondary credentials, meaning entrepreneurship can be an attractive option for low-income individuals. In fact, many poor and disadvantaged residents of the Charlottesville area already demonstrate significant potential in small business management through “side hustles” and other income supplementing ventures. These enterprises include lawn care, landscaping, cutting hair, day care, and other projects that require talent and drive.

Increasing opportunities for entrepreneurs in the Charlottesville community may not be possible without first addressing some of the barriers that often prevent aspiring business owners in taking that leap. People living in poverty often have limited exposure to appropriate role models and mentors to get a business off the ground. Those from low-income backgrounds typically have poor financial literacy skills, little to no savings, bad credit and limited access to funding options to help a small business. Some are deterred from taking the risk because little revenue from starting a business, at least in the beginning, can result in the loss of needed government benefits such as SNAP, TANF, or Medicaid.

According to the Charlottesville Regional Chamber of Commerce, between 2007 and 2010, private enterprise jobs in Charlottesville grew at twice the rate (9.23%) compared to the rest of the state (4.61%). These numbers reflect such enterprises as leisure and hospitality, construction and manufacturing. In 2016 Charlottesville was ranked fourth on Entrepreneur magazine’s list of best cities for entrepreneurs. To support business startups, Charlottesville has developed a network of services, including the Community Investment Collaborative (CIC)
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and the Charlottesville Business Innovation Council (CBIC). This, along with the OED’s Minority Business Development program, has created a vibrant culture of entrepreneurship in our area that will have a positive impact for VDSS’s target population.

GO Start-Up addresses needs by providing basic, grassroots level business training to low-income participants. This is a new venture and will fall under Charlottesville’s new Minority Business Program, which seeks to increase the number of women and minority-owned businesses in the community and providing existing businesses with the opportunity to grow. Over 90% of historic GO participants have been minorities and all program participants meet poverty guidelines outlined for this grant. The entrepreneurial demographics of the area does not reflect its’ population. There is significant disproportionality between the number of minorities and the number of minority-owned businesses. It is believed that diversifying the entrepreneurial community will create more diversity in ideas in the community, benefit the local economy as a whole, and lower-income communities in particular.

GO Contractor’s Academy, by contrast, offers skill development and collaboration options for existing women and minority owned businesses who seek to do business with Charlottesville or other governmental agencies. This program focuses on the construction industry and aims to enhance the technical and managerial skills of small contractors. Training will allow these business owners to take the next step in the successful marketing, procurement, and execution of their business ideas.

**PROGRAM DESIGN/PROPOSED SERVICES AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

1. The traditional GO program models facilitated primarily with grant funds will be GO Driver and GO Cook. The Charlottesville area continues to see demand for trained employees for public transportation and in the restaurant field. Other GO programs could potentially be offered, based on identified employer need, for positions that require skilled training and would require at least five program participants. Any program using VDSS allocated funding would specifically target households currently enrolled in the VIEW program receiving TANF funds, those exempt from VIEW but receiving TANF benefits, and/or families with incomes below 200% of the poverty level.

**GO Driver** consists of five and a half weeks of intensive pre-employment training (180 hours), conducted in partnership with Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT), whereby participants will earn their Class B Commercial Driver’s License learner’s permit, Passenger Sensitivity and Security certification, OSHA 10 certification, CPR/First Aid certificate and customer service and workplace readiness training. Throughout the entire training period, City staff will work closely with Charlottesville Area Transit, integrating CAT’s management into the interviewing and
selection of applications, providing program participants with tours of their facility and buses, assistance with online applications, mock interviewing, and job shadowing.

After successfully completing training, participants will then apply for a Relief Transit Operator position at CAT, which has agreed to flag these individuals’ applications for “extra consideration.” Although these positions are relief, other past GO Driver graduates currently employed with CAT as Relief Transit Operators have routinely worked between 35-40 hours per week and earn overtime pay for anything beyond 40 hours per week. The rate of pay for Relief Transit Operators is $16.51/hour. Once hired, CAT will offer additional on-the-job training relevant to the work that will be performed. Please see Diagram A for a sequential flow chart of the GO Driver program.

Diagram A – GO Driver Program Flow Chart

GO Cook is a five week, one-hundred hour program that offers a ServSafe certification, a Certified Cook certification recognized in the hospitality industry nationwide, essential workplace and life skills, and the invaluable opportunity to shadow with multiple restaurant partners to gain real-world experience prior to job placement. Classes are four hours daily and are broken into three parts: 1) life skills training 2) hospitality and food handling and safety and 3) kitchen practicals. The program is facilitated at the professional kitchen at Culinary Concepts AB owner and renowned chef Antwon Brinson.

At the end of the course, students practice and take a proctored examination for both their ServSafe and Certified Cook certifications. A pop-up dinner is held to showcase students’ cooking skills to stakeholders, families and potential employers. Each student meets one-on-one with Chef Brinson to evaluate their skill level and develop career pathways. Then each student participates in a minimum of two job trails or stages, an industry term for shadowing staff in restaurants to learn the unique culture, procedures and responsibilities of multiple areas of a professional kitchen. Many students are offered employment based on these job trails, while others are referred to and placed with other establishments based on need. Typical placements for program graduates vary, with the most common being as line cooks, prep cooks or pantry cooks. The wages for these positions vary, but characteristically fall in the $12 to $14/hour range, with significant opportunity for advancement. Diagram B below outlines the flow chart for the GO Cook program.
GO Start-Up has been designed to provide entrepreneurship training to low-income individuals. Recruitment for the program will focus on high opportunity neighborhoods where families could benefit the most. The program will deliver 36 hours of directed training over a six-week period to allow flexibility to those who may already be employed. Topics covered will include principles of entrepreneurship, discovery of ideas, execution of an idea, brand basics and messaging. Soft skill training will be incorporated, facilitating such subjects as public speaking, professionalism and other basic business etiquette behaviors. At the end of the training, program participants will present their ideas in a public forum (which will also serve as part of a graduation ceremony). In addition to training, the OED proposes the creation of a micro grant program designed to supply an influx of capital to small business proposals that show the most promise in addressing the needs of the community and the parameters of the funding. Eligible graduates would be able to apply for a one-time grant for up to $1,500 to go toward start up costs associated with their new business. This grant would cover needs in equipment, marketing/advertising campaigns or technical assistance that support the growth model of the business. GO Start-Up will bring an unprecedented focus to minority and disenfranchised business development, building on entrepreneurial successes in the Charlottesville area. Diagram C shows the proposed flow chart for a GO Startup program.

GO Contractor’s Academy will build off of the basic entrepreneurial training of GO Start-Up and focus on already existing woman and minority owned small businesses seeking contract work with the City or a similar governmental agency. Curriculum will touch on key topics related to business development and construction procurement such as:

- Business Basics – marketing to buyers, networking with buyers and general contractors and/or other sub-contractors, financing, etc.
- Construction Accounting and Finance – learning about the dollars and cents of construction and how to do business with the City of Charlottesville. will also offer complete coverage of City purchasing requirements and procedures
- Estimating and Bidding – hands-on training with actual estimating and bidding exercises
ii. Services offered by GO programs are unique in that the training is responsive to needs identified by local employers. Our curriculum is customized based on the needs of these employers, with their input and full participation. Participants in these programs enter into a training program with the common goal of obtaining employment with the same employer. As part of a cohort, they form bonds that last well beyond the training period and carry over to their employment. A key measure of success is the investment of time and resources made by participants and employers.

Some of the supportive services alluded to earlier include: rental assistance, transportation assistance, assistance paying utility bills, and child care assistance. The OED has made these services available to participants in need for all GO programs. This assistance has been crucial to overall graduation rates and has led to tremendous public opinion of the programming.

**Childcare:** We have coordinated with the Thomas Jefferson Area United Way to allow our program participants to have access to fully subsidized childcare during the length of their training through childcare scholarships. The subsidy gradually steps down once the participant obtains employment so the participant gradually pays more and more of the childcare costs with the goal of the participant being able to pay the full amount when the subsidy ends.

**Rent:** Participation in a GO training program is a major time commitment by program participants and often times they are not able to work as much, or at all, during the training period. Because of this, it is important that we are able to provide financial assistance to pay
rent and/or utilities as needed. The OED has partnered with Piedmont Virginia Community College’s Network 2 Work program to help with delinquent rent while a participant is enrolled in GO programming.

**Transportation:** The OED offers 30-day bus passes through CAT for enrollees who have inconsistent transportation to and from class. We make an effort to conduct classes in locations that are convenient to local public transportation pick up and drop off points.

iii. Through five years of successful GO programming the OED has provided supportive services to address a number of challenges. We have learned that it is nearly impossible to anticipate all challenges that may arise. It is our mission to remain flexible to participant barriers and thus develop and maintain strong relationships with participants and community partners to respond quickly and effectively as issues emerge.

Interactions will build on the OED’s existing collaborative relationship with Charlottesville DSS and its’ VIEW program. For the purposes of these programs, that includes consulting with DSS staff to identify potential program participants through existing or prior TANF clients. OED staff and DSS staff will communicate to ensure that GO program participants remain on the right track and potential barriers to successfully completing the program are eliminated through staff assistance and the application of supportive services. We will also work with other workforce development service providers in the community, including the City’s own Downtown Job Center, which is operated by the Office of Economic Development, to identify low income community residents (i.e., anyone at or below 200% poverty level guidelines) for the programs.

iv. Training for program participants will be paid for per unit of service, meaning GO programs are run in cohorts of six to ten students and the OED compensates outside partners to administer the training on a per student basis. For GO Driver, training is facilitated by instructors from PVCC. GO Cook is taught by Chef Antwon Brinson and Ms. Yolunda Harrell. The proposed GO Startup program will involve a consultant being hired to develop all training content in partnership with OED staff. The cost per program fluctuates based on the number of students enrolled in each session of the training, but generally averages around $2,000 per participant.

v. As mentioned above, approximately 25% of the residents within the Charlottesville MSA are below 200% of established federal poverty guidelines. The 2018 update to the original Orange Dot report indicated 12,024 families the Charlottesville region did not meet the report’s defined threshold of $35,000 annual income for families to meet basic needs. The Charlottesville MSA, particularly the City of Charlottesville and surrounding Albemarle County, are areas of general
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affluence interspersed with pockets of poverty. Entire neighborhoods lack the ability to support themselves and their family. This is particularly distressing when considering how many families live under 200% of federal poverty guidelines and the internal estimation of minimum income for families to meet their basic needs in the Charlottesville area, even while maintaining employment on some level. This is the population the OED seeks to serve with its’ GO Training programs and entrepreneurial development. The data below reflects this target population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Number of Families Struggling in the Locality</th>
<th>Annual Family Income and Benefits</th>
<th>Number of Families Struggling in the Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>$0 - $9,999</td>
<td>2,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>1,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvanna</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>$15,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>3,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>$25,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>4,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,014</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,014</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Struggling Families Snapshot*

These numbers reflect a significant racial disparity in poverty levels in the MSA. Based on total population, 10.9% of whites are below the poverty line, compared to 17.7% of Hispanics and 20.7% of blacks. There is also a large contingent of refugees in the region. The International Rescue Committee (IRC) reported in 2017 that over 3,500 refugees had made their initial home

in Charlottesville upon relocating from 32 different countries. The OED has been proud to count a large number of former refugees as graduates from GC programs.

The ACS 5-year estimates show the following numbers for educational attainment and employment amongst those in poverty: Please note that these numbers only reflect population that meets standard federal poverty guidelines. Also note that in Charlottesville (15.6%), Buckingham (12.0%), and Nelson (13.7%), those with some college education or an associate’s degree still fell below poverty levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Charlottesville</th>
<th>Albemarle County</th>
<th>Buckingham County</th>
<th>Fluvanna County</th>
<th>Greene County</th>
<th>Nelson County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Less than High School Education</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% High School Education</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4: Charlottesville MSA Poverty Characteristics*

GO programming has consistently delivered on offering skilled jobs training for many that fit these demographics and will intentionally target this vulnerable population in future cohorts as well.

The OED’s enrollment and retention practices include coordinating with regional social services staff to identify potential program participants, word of mouth from past program participants, and community outreach. GO Driver has graduated 89% of enrollees, GO Cook 88%. OED staff is assigned to oversee the recruitment and applications of interested individuals, participates in the interview process, and monitors class as it occurs on site to address any issues that arise. The OED’s primary goal is to ensure that selected participants are put in the best position to succeed.

By partnering with social services staff we are connecting with professionals who work closely with their clients and know who would make a successful participant. Our partners are also engaged with classes as they run and render assistance to students as needed.

Word of mouth from past program participants is probably our best strategy for recruiting program participants. With 162 (and counting) GO program graduates, they have connections to family, friends, and neighbors and provide an excellent means of program promotion. Many, in fact, stay involved with their respective programs and instructors after graduation, showing that these interventions create a family atmosphere that has led to programs having extensive wait and interest lists.
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Lastly, we use community outreach to recruit program participants. OED staff engages directly with target neighborhoods and public housing projects to speak with potential program participants. Staff also posts flyers and other promotional material in neighborhood grocery stores, barber shops, and hair salons. The OED and Charlottesville Downtown Job Center have a responsive and participatory social media presence that provides an outreach method that consistently reaches thousands of people.

Application for consideration in the GO training program is via a simple paper application obtained on-site at the Downtown Job Center or via email distribution list. OED staff are available to help potential participants with any questions or concerns they may have surrounding the application. In the past, OED staff have helped applicants locate contact information for former employers, obtain information regarding criminal records, and helped applicants obtain their driving records for the GO Driver training program.

With regard to potential impairments and barriers to employment, OED staff was instrumental in the preparation of the Growing Opportunity report. In that report the following barriers to employment were identified: job creation, basic literacy, workplace skills, transportation, childcare, criminal history, and housing. After the seven barriers were identified, action items were created to reduce and eliminate these barriers to employment. GO programs include built in interventions to combat the majority of these barriers.

The barrier of basic literacy is addressed through our partnership with Thomas Jefferson Adult and Career Education (TJACE). Whenever basic literacy is a concern, we partner with TJACE to administer the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) and if a program applicant does not test high enough to participate in a GO program, a referral is made to TJACE for services with the hope that the program candidate will be ready for a program in the future.

The barrier of childcare has been mentioned earlier and is addressed through our partnership with the Thomas Jefferson Area United Way through the use of childcare scholarships which provide fully subsidized childcare during the training program. The subsidy is gradually reduced once employment is obtained.

The barrier of transportation is addressed through our GO Ride program. The GO Ride program provides unlimited use of the Charlottesville Area Transit system to program participants for the duration of the program.

The barrier of criminal history is addressed during the training as well. OED staff has spent a considerable amount of time networking with employer partners and examining their “barrier
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crimes” in an effort to reduce the stigma attached to a criminal record. The majority of past GO program participants have had some type of criminal record that has been a hindrance to employment for them in the past. OED staff also works closely with program participants to ensure that they accurately understand what is on their criminal record and what is not. Staff also coaches program participants on how to explain their criminal record and how to speak to their positive behaviors and what they have learned from their involvement in the criminal justice system.

vii. The only diagnostic test administered prior to enrollment in the GO training programs is the TABE to assess basic literacy as needed.

viii. The proposed services are: _____ X____ Currently in place
     OR
     _____ X____ Not currently in place*

*Traditional GO programs have been successfully implemented. The entrepreneurial programs (GO Start-Up and GO Contractor’s Academy) will be new.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional GO Program 28</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Agency/Individual Responsible</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED, employer partner and DSS staff</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for 8 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begin employment</td>
<td>OED and employer partner</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support program participants during and after training</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional GO Program 29</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Agency/Individual Responsible</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED, employer partner and DSS staff</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for 8 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begin employment</td>
<td>OED and employer partner</td>
<td>December 2019/January 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Support program participants during and after training</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional GO Program 30</strong></td>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED, employer partner and DSS staff</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for 8 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begin employment</td>
<td>OED and employer partners</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional GO Program 31</strong></td>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED, employer partner and DSS staff</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for 8 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begin employment</td>
<td>OED and employer partners</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GO Startup</strong></td>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED and DSS Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for 7 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation and Creation of customized, client-focused plan to navigate small business ownership</td>
<td>OED, Community Investment Collaborative</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support program participants during and after training (to include potential sub-grant funding)</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO Startup 2</td>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for 7 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation and Creation of customized, client-focused plan to navigate small business ownership</td>
<td>OED, Community Investment Collaborative</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Program Participants During and After Training (to include potential sub-grant funding)</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GO Contractor's Academy</th>
<th>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</th>
<th>OED, Division of Procurement and Risk Management and DSS Staff</th>
<th>April 2020</th>
<th>May 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Curriculum for business development and construction procurement</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Completion/Graduation</td>
<td>OED and Division of Procurement and Risk Management</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support of program participants through bidding and administration of contracts</td>
<td>OED and Division of Procurement and Risk Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5: Implementation Plan*
### OUTCOMES AND BENEFITS EXPECTED

*Figure 6: Expected Outcomes and Benefits*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component*</th>
<th>1st Quarter Ending December 31, 2019</th>
<th>2nd Quarter Ending March 31, 2020</th>
<th>3rd Quarter Ending June 30, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#/Enrolled</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Entered Employment</td>
<td>20**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed 3 Months</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed 6 Months</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed 1 Year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hourly Wage at Employment</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed with Benefits</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed Part-Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed Full Time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hourly Wage Increase</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Obtaining Wage Increase</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Who Obtained a Promotion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Who Obtained a GED</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Who Obtained SSI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Number Who Completed Treatment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on historic GO program rates*
**Employment estimates are based on evidentiary analysis of prior programming. The proposed GO Start-Up Program is a departure based on its’ mission to train participants in techniques to start their own small business. GO Contractor's Academy is designed to enhance credentials for pre-existing businesses owned by the service population. It is estimated that the majority of enrollees will already have employment of some kind at the time of programming.**

iii. Tracking and reporting will be in compliance with specific reporting instructions that per the RFA are to be issued after awards are made. All quarterly reports and the final reports will address the required outcomes and benefits as delineated above. This will include keeping all records of grant funded programming for a minimum of three years, or until an appropriate audit is completed.

iv. GO programs have an evidence-based track record on consistently providing means for low-income individuals to receive skilled and directed training to obtain stable employment at a livable wage. GO Driver works directly with CAT, whose starting salary for relief transit drivers is $16.51/hour or $34,000 annually for full time employees. The vibrant and competitive restaurant and hospitality field in the area typically offers around $14/hour for line, prep or pantry cooks, the typical starting point for GO Cook graduates. Projections indicate that the majority of GO Startup candidates will already be employed at some level. The skills and training gained from the entrepreneurial program will allow graduates to prepare for their own small business venture, while also possessing marketable skills in the open job market. Many past graduates have used their GO programming as a springboard to leave public housing and discontinue government benefits.

This project aligns with the following long term community goals for reducing poverty, specifically:

**OED departmental goals and objectives that align with GO programs:**

- Goal 2.1: Be an effective partner in creating a well-prepared and successful workforce
- Goal 2.2: Serve as a workforce development liaison connecting employers with potential employees

**City of Charlottesville strategic plan goals, objectives and initiatives that align with GO programs:**

- Goal 1: Enhance the self-sufficiency of our residents
  - Objective 1.1: Promote education and training
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- Initiative A: Support vocational education workforce development plans
- Initiative B: Implement Growing Opportunity report recommendations
  - Objective 1.2: Reduce employment barriers
  - Initiative C: Develop work plan for targeted employment strategies

- Goal 3: Have a strong, diversified economy
  - Objective 3.1: Develop a quality workforce
    - Initiative A: Prepare residents for employment in high demand industries through workforce development programs
    - Initiative C: Implement initiatives in Growing Opportunity report

ORGANIZATIONAL STAFF AND PROVIDER QUALIFICATIONS AND COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS

i. The Charlottesville Office of Economic Development currently has 7 full-time staff, allowing the office to sustain the workload required for GO programs due to the programs' direct connection to existing workforce development related job responsibilities. Additionally, the OED operates the Downtown Job Center, which offers employment services to job seekers as one of its primary functions. Because of this capacity, 100 percent of requested funds will go directly to participants for training/education and supportive services.

KEY STAFF MEMBERS

Hollie Lee is the Chief of Workforce Development Strategies for the City of Charlottesville and has worked in the Office of Economic Development (OED) for 10 years. She oversees the City's workforce development initiatives, including the Downtown Job Center, the Strategic Action Team on Workforce Development (SAT), and the Workforce Advisory Council. She was the lead author of the SAT report Growing Opportunity: A Path to Self-Sufficiency, which outlines the City's three to five year plans for workforce development efforts/programs. Hollie holds a Master of Public Administration from James Madison University and a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Mary Baldwin College.

Darrell Simpson is the City's Downtown Job Center (DJC) Coordinator in charge of Administration, which is part of the OED and an initiative of the Growing Opportunity report. Through the DJC, he offers direct employment services to job seekers including: job search assistance, help with online applications, resume writing, and mock interviewing. Prior to joining the OED, Darrell has worked in public service for 11 years, including positions in local.
law enforcement, probation, the Department of Corrections and Social Services. Darrell holds a Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice form Virginia Commonwealth University and a Master of Public Administration from James Madison University.

Roy Fitch is the Downtown Job Center’s Coordinator in charge of Community Engagement. Through the DJC, he offers direct employment services to job seekers including: job search assistance, help with online applications, resume writing, and mock interviewing. Roy has previously worked for the Sexual Assault Resource Agency (SARA) in Charlottesville. Roy holds a Bachelor’s degree in Marketing from James Madison University.

Zoie Smith is the Minority Business Development Coordinator with Charlottesville’s Office of Economic Development. Zoie assists in the support and growth of women and minority-owned business enterprises in the City. She also helps with departmental event coordination and GO program administration. She is a Psychology major graduate of Old Dominion University, and will be attending Walden University to obtain a Masters in Criminal Justice beginning in January 2019.

SUPPORTING PROGRAM STAFF

Chris Engel, CECd
Director of Economic Development, Office of Economic Development
16 years of experience in economic development
Bachelor of Arts in Geography from the University of Mary Washington
Master in Urban Planning from Virginia Commonwealth University

Jason Ness
Business Development Manager, Office of Economic Development
8 years of experience in economic and workforce development
Bachelor of Arts in History from the University of Alabama

Patricia Carpenter
Administrative Assistant, Office of Economic Development

COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS & COMMUNITY PARTNERS & DOCUMENTATION OF SUPPORT

See Attached MOAs.
BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE

See Attachment F.

ASSURANCES, CERTIFICATIONS AND OTHER REQUIRED FORMS

- Grant Application Cover Sheet. See Attachment A.
- Employment for TANF Participants Application Information Form. See Attachment B.
- Key Contacts. See Attachment C.
- Pre-Award Questionnaire. See Attachment G.
- FFATA Form. See Attachment H.
- SF 424B Form-Assurances – Non-Construction Programs. See Attachment I.
- Certification Regarding Lobbying. See Attachment J.
- W-9 Request for Taxpayer Identification Number(s). See Attachment K.
- State Corporation Commission Form. See Attachment L.
# Budget Summary - DSS Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgrantee Name</th>
<th>Grant Period</th>
<th>Contract #</th>
<th>Attachment #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020</td>
<td>BEN-19-113</td>
<td>Attachment F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Total Program Budget (Including amount requested from VDSS)</th>
<th>Total VDSS Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; Program</td>
<td>$130,259.83</td>
<td>$130,259.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subawards</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Transportation</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$130,259.83</td>
<td>$130,259.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total Program Budget Requested from DSS: 100%

Awarded funds cannot be used to supplant existing funds.
Dual Models of GO Programming

APPLICATION SUMMARY

PURPOSE AND GOALS

The City of Charlottesville’s Office of Economic Development (OED) has a proven track record of designing and delivering quality workforce development programming. The purpose of the Growing Opportunities (GO) programs are to provide training to unemployed and underemployed residents of Charlottesville in order to facilitate sustainable employment in appropriate industries that offer a living wage. The OED seeks to continue providing innovative and directed instruction to local residents who face significant barriers to fill needs identified by local employers. There is also opportunity to promote entrepreneurship as a route for low-income citizens to achieve economic self-sufficiency, given that many newly created jobs offer non-living wages and limited potential for economic mobility. The goal of the OED in these endeavors is twofold: to provide workforce development training to impart necessary skills to participants in order for them to secure gainful employment at a self-sufficient wage, and to offer entrepreneurial based training as a means to self-employment and supplemental income opportunities, leading to self-sufficiency.

COMMUNITY PARTNERS

Community partners will include the Charlottesville Department of Social Services (CDSS) staff, who will help identify and recruit participants to programs. CDSS staff will also assist with case management of their clients and identify potential barriers to consistent employment (e.g. transportation, childcare, housing, etc.) in order for proper services to be implemented.

For workforce development programs, Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) or Charlottesville Albemarle Technical Education Center (CATEC) will provide a majority of the customized training that the participants will receive throughout the GO training programs. Additionally, numerous private sector vendors will be utilized for specific sections of training to ensure the highest quality instruction. For entrepreneurial training the OED will partner with business assistance providers such as the Community Investment Collaborative (CIC), the Central Virginia Small Business Development Center (CVSBDC), and other private vendors.

Employer partners are equally as critical as educational providers to the success of GO programs. The key employer partner for GO Driver is Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT). CAT is actively engaged in the recruitment and selection of program participants and also provides participants tours of their facilities, aid in the completion of online applications, and engage in mock interviewing. CAT facilities are used as the primary training location, and several CAT staff are part of the curriculum instruction team.
Concerning GO Cook, Chef Antwon Brinson with Culinary Concepts AB, the training provider contracted through CATEC, employs a diverse network of restaurant and hospitality partners to prepare GO Cook students for employment by allowing on-site internships in professional kitchens, showing prospective employees the unique responsibilities of different aspects of the culinary arts field.

Other GO programs identify and collaborate with employer partners based on the industry the training is focused on (e.g. Sun Tribe Solar for GO Solar, UVA Health System for GO CNA, the City of Charlottesville’s Public Utilities and Public Works departments for GO Trades, etc.). The ultimate goal for those in GO Start-Up entrepreneurial training is for participants to become self-employed. For those already self-employed and participating in a program like GO Contractor’s Academy, the vision is for individuals to grow their existing businesses and receive additional training to increase revenue and marketability, thereby increasing their self-sufficiency.

SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED

GO training programs are generally between five and seven weeks long, depending on the industry, and include industry-specific training as well as workplace readiness training, customer service training, and financial literacy. Other supportive services to be provided on an as needed basis include, but are not limited to: rental assistance, transportation assistance, and childcare assistance.

PROJECTED SERVICE NUMBERS AND PLANNED OUTCOMES

The projected number of City residents to be served by the combined GO programming is 53 individuals. Based on historical graduation rates, it is anticipated that 46 will complete the GO training curriculums and graduate. Projections from prior classes indicate that 34 individuals not already employed will obtain employment through opportunities gained from the programs. Graduates of GO Driver are provided the opportunity to be considered for employment with CAT and/or City of Charlottesville pupil transportation at $16.51 hourly salary. GO Cook graduates have varying roles in the restaurants they are hired in. Line and prep cooks in the Charlottesville area can expect to make $12-$14/hour or more, with consistent opportunities for advancement. Other GO program variants may be implemented based on identified employer need and the employer offering a sustainable living wage for graduates who are offered employment.

USE OF FUNDS

The use of funds for traditional GO programming will be for the purpose of paying for training provided by training vendors such as PVCC and CATEC, as well as for providing supportive services to program participants. Additional funding for GO Start-Up and the GO Contractor’s
Academy will be allocated to program development and training costs, as well as grants for enrollees.

**APPLICATION NEEDS STATEMENT**

i. Charlottesville is an independent city located in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains and serves as the county seat for Albemarle County as well as the hub of the Charlottesville Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which includes Albemarle, Fluvanna, Buckingham, Greene and Nelson Counties. According to U.S. Census data, the Charlottesville Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) had a population of 232,182 people in 2017.1 70.1% of residents identify as Caucasian, 18.9% African-American and just over 5% Hispanic or Latino.2 The median household income in the City of Charlottesville measured at $66,853 according to the American Community Survey (ACS) one year estimate for 2017.3

Estimates based on the 2017 ACS snapshot show that nearly 25% (57,207 individuals in the Charlottesville MSA) are at 200% or less of the Federal Poverty Guidelines.4 The poverty level for a family of four in 2019 has been established at $25,750 annual income (see figure 1 below). Census Bureau data indicates that over 16,000 individuals in the area work full-time year-round and make less than $50,000/year.5 This evidence supports the argument that skilled jobs training and entrepreneurial initiatives will make significant headway in providing families the opportunity to earn a living wage. Furthermore, FY2018 reports from Virginia DSS show that 706 households in the Charlottesville MSA received TANF benefits during that timeframe and DSS spent $1,782,399 on TANF in the area.6 These facts suggest that targeted recruitment for training and workforce development opportunities will yield a substantial number of candidates.

---

2https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF
3https://data.census.gov/cedsci/map?q=economic&table=DP03&tid=ACSDP1Y2017.DP03&vintage=2017&layer=cbssa&cid=DP03_0062E&g=310M200US16820_310M300US16820
6https://www.dss.virginia.gov/geninfo/reports/agency_wide/dss_profile.cgi
The unemployment rate for the Charlottesville MSA remains low at 2.7% as of May 2019 according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), although that has trended slightly upward.\(^7\) The BLS gives further information regarding median wages for fields encompassed by GO programming. Restaurant cooks make a median wage of $30,930 annually, first line supervisors an average of $41,680/year, and transit bus drivers $34,340.\(^8\) These all represent compelling support of job skills training.

ii. Growing Opportunities (GO) programs resulted from the Orange Dot report in 2011, which explored the prevalence and root causes of poverty in the Charlottesville area. The Charlottesville Office of Economic Development has spearheaded efforts to identified City Council objectives to create opportunities for area residents to achieve self-sufficiency through employment that pays appropriate living wages. The jobs-driven pre-employment training model was brought into fruition with the first GO Driver program in fall 2014 in response to an expressed need for bus drivers by Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT). Since that initial program 25 GO programs have successfully graduated 162 residents, with a job placement rate of over 86%. The GO initiative continues today as we are currently implementing our 11\(^{th}\) GO Driver class and our 5\(^{th}\) GO Cook cohort. Other employer identified needs have led to programs focusing on training for CNAs, public utilities workers, solar panel installers and call center representatives. GO programs have demonstrated their utility as means by which residents can achieve economic self-sufficiency, pride in professional accomplishments, and a clear path to reaching career goals.

\(^7\) https://www.bls.gov/news.release/metro.t01.htm
\(^8\) https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_16820.htm#53-0000
GO Training Programs – Employment with Area Employers

This proposal places an emphasis on GO Driver and GO Cook, with the former being our original program that has been recognized around the Commonwealth for its’ excellence, and the latter as offering a consistent pipeline of trained and motivated graduates to fill needs in the demanding field of culinary arts.

GO Driver is a five and a half week, 180 hour training program that allows participants to earn a Class B Commercial Driver’s License (CDL) learner’s permit and prepares them for a career as a Relief Transit Operator with the Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) system. Although CAT has been our main employer partner, it is important to recognize that opportunities exist with other local employers including the University of Virginia Transit System (UTS), JAUNT (a local para-transit service), and Pupil Transportation for Charlottesville City Schools and Albemarle County Schools.

GO Cook is a five week, one-hundred hour program that offers a ServSafe certification, a Certified Cook certification recognized in the hospitality industry nationwide, essential workplace and life skills, and the invaluable opportunity to shadow with multiple restaurant partners to gain real-world experience prior to job placement. Currently, 58 area culinary establishments have a working relationship with Chef Antwon Brinson, the proprietor of Culinary Concepts AB and lead trainer, to deliver stable employment opportunities to graduates based on skill level and interest, while also providing upward mobility lacking in other fields.

The GO Solar Program is a five and half-week training program that prepares City residents for a career as a solar panel installer. The program is a partnership with local clean energy organization Sun Tribe Solar and offers training that will equip residents with a North American Board of Certified Energy Practitioners PV Installation Professional Certification, OSHA 10 Certificate, Forklift and Airlift Certifications, a CPR/First Aid Certificate, and workplace essential skills. After successful completion of this program, participants will have the opportunity to be considered for employment with Sun Tribe Solar.

GO CNA consists of seven weeks of intensive pre-employment training (176 hours), conducted in partnership with PVCC, whereby participants earn their CNA certificates, complete customer service and workplace readiness training, and obtain their Career Readiness Certificates. Throughout the entire training period, City staff works closely with UVA, integrating the hospital’s Human Resources staff into the program through tours of the facility, assistance with online applications, mock interviewing, and job shadowing.

GO Utilities partners with Charlottesville’s Department of Public Works in a seven week, 147 hour training to prepare graduates for positions as a Maintenance Work with the City’s Public Utilities Division. Certifications earned include a National Center for Construction Education and Research (NCCER) Pipefitting Certification, a Class A Learner’s Permit, Flagging Certification and OSHA 10 Certification.
GO Training Programs – Self-Employment

As previously mentioned, training efforts will be twofold. First, existing pre-employment workforce training programs will be expanded through grant funding. There is a proven track record of placing graduates of these programs into jobs paying a self-sufficient wage using this model. Second, entrepreneurship training will be offered as a way to assist low income Charlottesville residents start their own businesses and gain access to supplemental income, and once these businesses are fully operational, opportunities for self-employment.

Research into low income entrepreneurship in New York City drew the following conclusion: “at a time when so many newly created jobs offer low wages and limited opportunity for economic mobility, it is time for policymakers, economic development officials and workforce development professionals to embrace entrepreneurship as one route for low-income (citizens) to achieve economic self-sufficiency”.9 Entrepreneurship is a proven commodity in the financial empowerment and economic mobility for many people. Fundamental changes in the economy have created barriers for individuals without post-secondary credentials, meaning entrepreneurship can be an attractive option for low-income individuals. In fact, many poor and disadvantaged residents of the Charlottesville area already demonstrate significant potential in small business management through “side hustles” and other income supplementing ventures. These enterprises include lawn care, landscaping, cutting hair, day care, and other projects that require talent and drive.

Increasing opportunities for entrepreneurs in the Charlottesville community may not be possible without first addressing some of the barriers that often prevent aspiring business owners in taking that leap. People living in poverty often have limited exposure to appropriate role models and mentors to get a business off the ground. Those from low-income backgrounds typically have poor financial literacy skills, little to no savings, bad credit and limited access to funding options to help a small business. Some are deterred from taking the risk because little revenue from starting a business, at least in the beginning, can result in the loss of needed government benefits such as SNAP, TANF, or Medicaid.

According to the Charlottesville Regional Chamber of Commerce, between 2007 and 2010, private enterprise jobs in Charlottesville grew at twice the rate (9.23%) compared to the rest of the state (4.61%).10 These numbers reflect such enterprises as leisure and hospitality, construction and manufacturing. In 2016 Charlottesville was ranked fourth on Entrepreneur magazine’s list of best cities for entrepreneurs.11 To support business startups, Charlottesville has a developed network of services, including the Community Investment Collaborative (CIC)

and the Charlottesville Business Innovation Council (CBIC). This, along with the OED’s Minority Business Development program, has created a vibrant culture of entrepreneurship in our area that will have a positive impact for VDSS’s target population.

GO Start-Up addresses needs by providing basic, grassroots level business training to low-income participants. This is a new venture and will fall under Charlottesville’s new Minority Business Program, which seeks to increase the number of women and minority-owned businesses in the community and providing existing businesses with the opportunity to grow. Over 90% of historic GO participants have been minorities and all program participants meet poverty guidelines outlined for this grant. The entrepreneurial demographics of the area does not reflect its’ population. There is significant disproportionality between the number of minorities and the number of minority-owned businesses. It is believed that diversifying the entrepreneurial community will create more diversity in ideas in the community, benefit the local economy as a whole, and lower-income communities in particular.

GO Contractor’s Academy, by contrast, offers skill development and collaboration options for existing women and minority owned businesses who seek to do business with Charlottesville or other governmental agencies. This program focuses on the construction industry and aims to enhance the technical and managerial skills of small contractors. Training will allow these business owners to take the next step in the successful marketing, procurement, and execution of their business ideas.

**PROGRAM DESIGN/PROPOSED SERVICES AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

1. The traditional GO program models facilitated primarily with grant funds will be GO Driver and GO Cook. The Charlottesville area continues to see demand for trained employees for public transportation and in the restaurant field. Other GO programs could potentially be offered, based on identified employer need, for positions that require skilled training and would require at least five program participants. Any program using VDSS allocated funding would specifically target households currently enrolled in the VIEW program receiving TANF funds, those exempt from VIEW but receiving TANF benefits, and/or families with incomes below 200% of the poverty level.

**GO Driver** consists of five and a half weeks of intensive pre-employment training (180 hours), conducted in partnership with Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT), whereby participants will earn their Class B Commercial Driver’s License learner’s permit, Passenger Sensitivity and Security certification, OSHA 10 certification, CPR/First Aid certificate and customer service and workplace readiness training. Throughout the entire training period, City staff will work closely with Charlottesville Area Transit, integrating CAT’s management into the interviewing and
selection of applications, providing program participants with tours of their facility and buses, assistance with online applications, mock interviewing, and job shadowing.

After successfully completing training, participants will then apply for a Relief Transit Operator position at CAT, which has agreed to flag these individuals' applications for "extra consideration." Although these positions are relief, other past GO Driver graduates currently employed with CAT as Relief Transit Operators have routinely worked between 35-40 hours per week and earn overtime pay for anything beyond 40 hours per week. The rate of pay for Relief Transit Operators is $16.51/hour. Once hired, CAT will offer additional on-the-job training relevant to the work that will be performed. Please see Diagram A for a sequential flow chart of the GO Driver program.

Diagram A – GO Driver Program Flow Chart

GO Cook is a five week, one-hundred hour program that offers a ServSafe certification, a Certified Cook certification recognized in the hospitality industry nationwide, essential workplace and life skills, and the invaluable opportunity to shadow with multiple restaurant partners to gain real-world experience prior to job placement. Classes are four hours daily and are broken into three parts: 1) life skills training 2) hospitality and food handling and safety and 3) kitchen practicals. The program is facilitated at the professional kitchen at Culinary Concepts AB owner and renowned chef Antwon Brinson.

At the end of the course, students practice and take a proctored examination for both their ServSafe and Certified Cook certifications. A pop-up dinner is held to showcase students' cooking skills to stakeholders, families and potential employers. Each student meets one-on-one with Chef Brinson to evaluate their skill level and develop career pathways. Then each student participates in a minimum of two job trials or stages, an industry term for shadowing staff in restaurants to learn the unique culture, procedures and responsibilities of multiple areas of a professional kitchen. Many students are offered employment based on these job trials, while others are referred to and placed with other establishments based on need. Typical placements for program graduates vary, with the most common being as line cooks, prep cooks or pantry cooks. The wages for these positions vary, but characteristically fall in the $12 to $14/hour range, with significant opportunity for advancement. Diagram B below outlines the flow chart for the GO Cook program.
GO Start-Up has been designed to provide entrepreneurship training to low-income individuals. Recruitment for the program will focus on high opportunity neighborhoods where families could benefit the most. The program will deliver 36 hours of directed training over a six-week period to allow flexibility to those who may already be employed. Topics covered will include principles of entrepreneurship, discovery of ideas, execution of an idea, brand basics and messaging. Soft skill training will be incorporated, facilitating such subjects as public speaking, professionalism and other basic business etiquette behaviors. At the end of the training, program participants will present their ideas in a public forum (which will also serve as part of a graduation ceremony). In addition to training, the OED proposes the creation of a micro grant program designed to supply an influx of capital to small business proposals that show the most promise in addressing the needs of the community and the parameters of the funding. Eligible graduates would be able to apply for a one-time grant for up to $1,500 to go toward start up costs associated with their new business. This grant would cover needs in equipment, marketing/advertising campaigns or technical assistance that support the growth model of the business. GO Start-Up will bring an unprecedented focus to minority and disenfranchised business development, building on entrepreneurial successes in the Charlottesville area. **Diagram C shows the proposed flow chart for a GO Startup program.**

**Diagram C – GO Startup Proposed Program Flow Chart**

**GO Contractor’s Academy** will build off of the basic entrepreneurial training of GO Start-Up and focus on already existing woman and minority owned small businesses seeking contract work with the City or a similar governmental agency. Curriculum will touch on key topics related to business development and construction procurement such as:

- Business Basics – marketing to buyers, networking with buyers and general contractors and/or other sub-contractors, financing, etc.

- Construction Accounting and Finance – learning about the dollars and cents of construction and how to do business with the City of Charlottesville, will also offer complete coverage of City purchasing requirements and procedures

- Estimating and Bidding – hands-on training with actual estimating and bidding exercises
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- Contract Administration – understanding and executing contracts
- Scheduling – effective and realistic scheduling to complete projects “on time and within budget”
- Conflict Resolution – protocol, methodology, and legal considerations

There could also be an opportunity to incorporate industry credentials that are required for specific contracts (or would make a contractor more competitive) if they can be obtained within a reasonable amount of time (e.g., OSHA 10 certification, flagging certification, etc.). (Please note that this academy will focus on the construction industry, but opportunities for businesses in other industries will also be provided through various workshops and events.) Diagram D shows a potential flow chart for GO Contractor’s Academy.

ii. Services offered by GO programs are unique in that the training is responsive to needs identified by local employers. Our curriculum is customized based on the needs of these employers, with their input and full participation. Participants in these programs enter into a training program with the common goal of obtaining employment with the same employer. As part of a cohort, they form bonds that last well beyond the training period and carry over to their employment. A key measure of success is the investment of time and resources made by participants and employers.

Some of the supportive services alluded to earlier include: rental assistance, transportation assistance, assistance paying utility bills, and child care assistance. The OED has made these services available to participants in need for all GO programs. This assistance has been crucial to overall graduation rates and has led to tremendous public opinion of the programming.

Childcare: We have coordinated with the Thomas Jefferson Area United Way to allow our program participants to have access to fully subsidized childcare during the length of their training through childcare scholarships. The subsidy gradually steps down once the participant obtains employment so the participant gradually pays more and more of the childcare costs with the goal of the participant being able to pay the full amount when the subsidy ends.

Rent: Participation in a GO training program is a major time commitment by program participants and often times they are not able to work as much, or at all, during the training period. Because of this, it is important that we are able to provide financial assistance to pay
rent and/or utilities as needed. The OED has partnered with Piedmont Virginia Community College’s Network 2 Work program to help with delinquent rent while a participant is enrolled in GO programming.

**Transportation:** The OED offers 30-day bus passes through CAT for enrollees who have inconsistent transportation to and from class. We make an effort to conduct classes in locations that are convenient to local public transportation pick up and drop off points.

iii. Through five years of successful GO programming the OED has provided supportive services to address a number of challenges. We have learned that it is nearly impossible to anticipate all challenges that may arise. It is our mission to remain flexible to participant barriers and thus develop and maintain strong relationships with participants and community partners to respond quickly and effectively as issues emerge.

Interactions will build on the OED’s existing collaborative relationship with Charlottesville DSS and its’ VIEW program. For the purposes of these programs, that includes consulting with DSS staff to identify potential program participants through existing or prior TANF clients. OED staff and DSS staff will communicate to ensure that GO program participants remain on the right track and potential barriers to successfully completing the program are eliminated through staff assistance and the application of supportive services. We will also work with other workforce development service providers in the community, including the City’s own Downtown Job Center, which is operated by the Office of Economic Development, to identify low income community residents (i.e., anyone at or below 200% poverty level guidelines) for the programs.

iv. Training for program participants will be paid for per unit of service, meaning GO programs are run in cohorts of six to ten students and the OED compensates outside partners to administer the training on a per student basis. For GO Driver, training is facilitated by instructors from PVCC. GO Cook is taught by Chef Antwon Brinson and Ms. Yolunda Harrell. The proposed GO Startup program will involve a consultant being hired to develop all training content in partnership with OED staff. The cost per program fluctuates based on the number of students enrolled in each session of the training, but generally averages around $2,000 per participant.

v. As mentioned above, approximately 25% of the residents within the Charlottesville MSA are below 200% of established federal poverty guidelines. The 2018 update to the original Orange Dot report indicated 12,024 families the Charlottesville region did not meet the report’s defined threshold of $35,000 annual income for families to meet basic needs.¹² The Charlottesville MSA, particularly the City of Charlottesville and surrounding Albemarle County, are areas of general

affluence interspersed with pockets of poverty. Entire neighborhoods lack the ability to support themselves and their family. This is particularly distressing when considering how many families live under 200% of federal poverty guidelines and the internal estimation of minimum income for families to meet their basic needs in the Charlottesville area, even while maintaining employment on some level. This is the population the OED seeks to serve with its’ GO Training programs and entrepreneurial development. The data below reflects this target population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Number of Families Struggling in the Locality</th>
<th>Annual Family Income and Benefits</th>
<th>Number of Families Struggling in the Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>$0 - $9,999</td>
<td>2,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>1,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvanna</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>$15,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>3,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>$25,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>4,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Struggling Families Snapshot*

Poverty by Race and Ethnicity

These numbers reflect a significant racial disparity in poverty levels in the MSA. Based on total population, 10.9% of whites are below the poverty line, compared to 17.7% of Hispanics and 20.7% of blacks. There is also a large contingent of refugees in the region. The International Rescue Committee (IRC) reported in 2017 that over 3,500 refugees had made their initial home...

---

in Charlottesville upon relocating from 32 different countries. The OED has been proud to count a large number of former refugees as graduates from GO programs.

The ACS 5-year estimates show the following numbers for educational attainment and employment amongst those in poverty: Please note that these numbers only reflect population that meets standard federal poverty guidelines. Also note that in Charlottesville (15.6%), Buckingham (12.0%), and Nelson (13.7%), those with some college education or an associate’s degree still fell below poverty levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Charlottesville</th>
<th>Albemarle County</th>
<th>Buckingham County</th>
<th>Fluvanna County</th>
<th>Greene County</th>
<th>Nelson County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Less than High School Education</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% High School Education</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4: Charlottesville MSA Poverty Characteristics*

GO programming has consistently delivered on offering skilled jobs training for many that fit these demographics and will intentionally target this vulnerable population in future cohorts as well.

vi. The OED’s enrollment and retention practices include coordinating with regional social services staff to identify potential program participants, word of mouth from past program participants, and community outreach. GO Driver has graduated 89% of enrollees, GO Cook 88%. OED staff is assigned to oversee the recruitment and applications of interested individuals, participates in the interview process, and monitors class as it occurs on site to address any issues that arise. The OED’s primary goal is to ensure that selected participants are put in the best position to succeed.

By partnering with social services staff we are connecting with professionals who work closely with their clients and know who would make a successful participant. Our partners are also engaged with classes as they run and render assistance to students as needed.

Word of mouth from past program participants is probably our best strategy for recruiting program participants. With 162 (and counting) GO program graduates, they have connections to family, friends, and neighbors and provide an excellent means of program promotion. Many, in fact, stay involved with their respective programs and instructors after graduation, showing that these interventions create a family atmosphere that has led to programs having extensive wait and interest lists.

---

Lastly, we use community outreach to recruit program participants. OED staff engages directly with target neighborhoods and public housing projects to speak with potential program participants. Staff also posts flyers and other promotional material in neighborhood grocery stores, barber shops, and hair salons. The OED and Charlottesville Downtown Job Center have a responsive and participatory social media presence that provides an outreach method that consistently reaches thousands of people.

Application for consideration in the GO training program is via a simple paper application obtained on-site at the Downtown Job Center or via email distribution list. OED staff are available to help potential participants with any questions or concerns they may have surrounding the application. In the past, OED staff have helped applicants locate contact information for former employers, obtain information regarding criminal records, and helped applicants obtain their driving records for the GO Driver training program.

With regard to potential impairments and barriers to employment, OED staff was instrumental in the preparation of the *Growing Opportunity* report. In that report the following barriers to employment were identified: job creation, basic literacy, workplace skills, transportation, childcare, criminal history, and housing. After the seven barriers were identified, action items were created to reduce and eliminate these barriers to employment. GO programs include built in interventions to combat the majority of these barriers.

The barrier of basic literacy is addressed through our partnership with Thomas Jefferson Adult and Career Education (TJACE). Whenever basic literacy is a concern, we partner with TJACE to administer the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) and if a program applicant does not test high enough to participate in a GO program, a referral is made to TJACE for services with the hope that the program candidate will be ready for a program in the future.

The barrier of childcare has been mentioned earlier and is addressed through our partnership with the Thomas Jefferson Area United Way through the use of childcare scholarships which provide fully subsidized childcare during the training program. The subsidy is gradually reduced once employment is obtained.

The barrier of transportation is addressed through our GO Ride program. The GO Ride program provides unlimited use of the Charlottesville Area Transit system to program participants for the duration of the program.

The barrier of criminal history is addressed during the training as well. OED staff has spent a considerable amount of time networking with employer partners and examining their “barrier

---

15 [https://www.charlottesville.org/home/showdocument?id=26510](https://www.charlottesville.org/home/showdocument?id=26510)
crimes" in an effort to reduce the stigma attached to a criminal record. The majority of past GO program participants have had some type of criminal record that has been a hindrance to employment for them in the past. OED staff also works closely with program participants to ensure that they accurately understand what is on their criminal record and what is not. Staff also coaches program participants on how to explain their criminal record and how to speak to their positive behaviors and what they have learned from their involvement in the criminal justice system.

vii. The only diagnostic test administered prior to enrollment in the GO training programs is the TABE to assess basic literacy as needed.

viii. The proposed services are:  

1. X Currently in place  

OR  

1. X Not currently in place*

*Traditional GO programs have been successfully implemented. The entrepreneurial programs (GO Start-Up and GO Contractor’s Academy) will be new.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional GO Program 28</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Agency/Individual Responsible</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED, employer partner and DSS staff</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for 8 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begin employment</td>
<td>OED and employer partner</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support program participants during and after training</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional GO Program 29</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Agency/Individual Responsible</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED, employer partner and DSS staff</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for 8 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begin employment</td>
<td>OED and employer partner</td>
<td>December 2019/January 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Description</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional GO Program 30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support program participants during and after training</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED, employer partner and DSS staff</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for 8 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin employment</td>
<td>OED and employer partners</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support program participants during and after training</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional GO Program 31</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED, employer partner and DSS staff</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for 8 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin employment</td>
<td>OED and employer partners</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support program participants during and after training</td>
<td>OED and DSS Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GO Startup</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for 7 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation and Creation of customized, client-focused plan to navigate small business ownership</td>
<td>OED, Community Investment Collaborative</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support program participants during and after training (to include potential sub-grant funding)</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO Startup 2</td>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for 7 participants</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation and Creation of customized, client-focused plan to navigate small business ownership</td>
<td>OED, Community Investment Collaborative</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Program Participants During and After Training (to include potential sub-grant funding)</td>
<td>OED and DSS staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO Contractor's Academy</td>
<td>Identify, interview, screen and enroll participants</td>
<td>OED, Division of Procurement and Risk Management and DSS Staff</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Curriculum for business development and construction procurement</td>
<td>OED and contracted training staff</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Completion/Graduation</td>
<td>OED and Division of Procurement and Risk Management</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support of program participants through bidding and administration of contracts</td>
<td>OED and Division of Procurement and Risk Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5: Implementation Plan*
### OUTCOMES AND BENEFITS EXPECTED

*Figure 6: Expected Outcomes and Benefits*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1st Quarter Ending December 31, 2019</th>
<th>2nd Quarter Ending March 31, 2020</th>
<th>3rd Quarter Ending June 30, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#/Enrolled</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Entered Employment</td>
<td>20**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed 3 Months</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed 6 Months</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed 1 Year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hourly Wage at Employment</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed with Benefits</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed Part-Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Employed Full Time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hourly Wage Increase</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Obtaining Wage Increase</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Who Obtained a Promotion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Who Obtained a GED</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Who Obtained SSI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Number Who Completed Treatment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on historic GO program rates*
**Employment estimates are based on evidentiary analysis of prior programming. The proposed GO Start-Up Program is a departure based on its' mission to train participants in techniques to start their own small business. GO Contractor's Academy is designed to enhance credentials for pre-existing businesses owned by the service population. It is estimated that the majority of enrollees will already have employment of some kind at the time of programming.**

iii. Tracking and reporting will be in compliance with specific reporting instructions that per the RFA are to be issued after awards are made. All quarterly reports and the final reports will address the required outcomes and benefits as delineated above. This will include keeping all records of grant funded programming for a minimum of three years, or until an appropriate audit is completed.

iv. GO programs have an evidence-based track record on consistently providing means for low-income individuals to receive skilled and directed training to obtain stable employment at a livable wage. GO Driver works directly with CAT, whose starting salary for relief transit drivers is $16.51/hour or $34,000 annually for full time employees. The vibrant and competitive restaurant and hospitality field in the area typically offers around $14/hour for line, prep or pantry cooks, the typical starting point for GO Cook graduates. Projections indicate that the majority of GO Startup candidates will already be employed at some level. The skills and training gained from the entrepreneurial program will allow graduates to prepare for their own small business venture, while also possessing marketable skills in the open job market. Many past graduates have used their GO programming as a springboard to leave public housing and discontinue government benefits.

This project aligns with the following long term community goals for reducing poverty, specifically:

**OED departmental goals and objectives that align with GO programs:**
- Goal 2.1: Be an effective partner in creating a well-prepared and successful workforce
- Goal 2.2: Serve as a workforce development liaison connecting employers with potential employees

**City of Charlottesville strategic plan goals, objectives and initiatives that align with GO programs:**
- Goal 1: Enhance the self-sufficiency of our residents
  - Objective 1.1: Promote education and training
Charlottesville Office of Economic Development
DUAL MODELS OF GO PROGRAMMING

- Initiative A: Support vocational education workforce development plans
- Initiative B: Implement Growing Opportunity report recommendations
  - Objective 1.2: Reduce employment barriers
    - Initiative C: Develop work plan for targeted employment strategies

- Goal 3: Have a strong, diversified economy
  - Objective 3.1: Develop a quality workforce
    - Initiative A: Prepare residents for employment in high demand industries through workforce development programs
    - Initiative C: Implement initiatives in Growing Opportunity report

ORGANIZATIONAL STAFF AND PROVIDER QUALIFICATIONS AND COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS

i. The Charlottesville Office of Economic Development currently has 7 full-time staff, allowing the office to sustain the workload required for GO programs due to the programs' direct connection to existing workforce development related job responsibilities. Additionally, the OED operates the Downtown Job Center, which offers employment services to job seekers as one of its primary functions. Because of this capacity, 100 percent of requested funds will go directly to participants for training/education and supportive services.

KEY STAFF MEMBERS

Hollie Lee is the Chief of Workforce Development Strategies for the City of Charlottesville and has worked in the Office of Economic Development (OED) for 10 years. She oversees the City’s workforce development initiatives, including the Downtown Job Center, the Strategic Action Team on Workforce Development (SAT), and the Workforce Advisory Council. She was the lead author of the SAT report Growing Opportunity: A Path to Self-Sufficiency, which outlines the City’s three to five year plans for workforce development efforts/programs. Hollie holds a Master of Public Administration from James Madison University and a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Mary Baldwin College.

Darrell Simpson is the City’s Downtown Job Center (DJC) Coordinator in charge of Administration, which is part of the OED and an initiative of the Growing Opportunity report. Through the DJC, he offers direct employment services to job seekers including: job search assistance, help with online applications, resume writing, and mock interviewing. Prior to joining the OED, Darrell has worked in public service for 11 years, including positions in local
law enforcement, probation, the Department of Corrections and Social Services. Darrell holds a Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice form Virginia Commonwealth University and a Master of Public Administration from James Madison University.

Roy Fitch is the Downtown Job Center’s Coordinator in charge of Community Engagement. Through the DJC, he offers direct employment services to job seekers including: job search assistance, help with online applications, resume writing, and mock interviewing. Roy has previously worked for the Sexual Assault Resource Agency (SARA) in Charlottesville. Roy holds a Bachelor’s degree in Marketing from James Madison University.

Zoie Smith is the Minority Business Development Coordinator with Charlottesville’s Office of Economic Development. Zoie assists in the support and growth of women and minority-owned business enterprises in the City. She also helps with departmental event coordination and GO program administration. She is a Psychology major graduate of Old Dominion University, and will be attending Walden University to obtain a Masters in Criminal Justice beginning in January 2019.

SUPPORTING PROGRAM STAFF

Chris Engel, CECd
Director of Economic Development, Office of Economic Development
16 years of experience in economic development
Bachelor of Arts in Geography from the University of Mary Washington
Master in Urban Planning from Virginia Commonwealth University

Jason Ness
Business Development Manager, Office of Economic Development
8 years of experience in economic and workforce development
Bachelor of Arts in History from the University of Alabama

Patricia Carpenter
Administrative Assistant, Office of Economic Development

COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS & COMMUNITY PARTNERS & DOCUMENTATION OF SUPPORT

See Attached MOAs.
BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE

See Attachment F.

ASSURANCES, CERTIFICATIONS AND OTHER REQUIRED FORMS

- Grant Application Cover Sheet. See Attachment A.
- Employment for TANF Participants Application Information Form. See Attachment B.
- Key Contacts. See Attachment C.
- Pre-Award Questionnaire. See Attachment G.
- FFATA Form. See Attachment H.
- SF 424B Form-Assurances – Non-Construction Programs. See Attachment I.
- Certification Regarding Lobbying. See Attachment J.
- W-9 Request for Taxpayer Identification Number(s). See Attachment K.
- State Corporation Commission Form. See Attachment L.
## ITEMIZED BUDGET - SALARIES

**Grant Period:** October 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Staff (List names of program staff to be funded in whole or part by DSS only)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total hours per week</th>
<th># of hours per week spent on this program</th>
<th># of hours per week spent on program to be paid by DSS</th>
<th>% of time spent on this program</th>
<th>% of program salary to be paid by DSS</th>
<th>Total Gross Annual Salary</th>
<th>Amount of salary devoted to this program</th>
<th>Amount of salary to be paid by DSS</th>
<th>Maximum % of benefits that DSS will pay for this employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**

- Total Gross Annual Salary: $0.00
- Amount of salary devoted to this program: $0.00
- Amount of salary to be paid by DSS: $0.00
- Maximum % of benefits that DSS will pay for this employee: 0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Employee</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FICA per employee</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% requested from DSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt requested from DSS</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total RETIREMENT</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% requested from DSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt requested from DSS</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LIFE INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% requested from DSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt requested from DSS</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total UNEMPLOYMENT</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% requested from DSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt requested from DSS</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total WORKERS COMP</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% requested from DSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt requested from DSS</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total HEALTH INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% requested from DSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt requested from DSS</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total OTHER BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% requested from DSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt requested from DSS</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits per employee</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total benefits requested from DSS</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ITEMIZED BUDGET - OTHER PROPOSED EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBGRANTEE Name:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Period:</td>
<td>October 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Only list expenses directly related to this program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE ITEM</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>LINE ITEM</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>SUBAWARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STAFF TRAVEL &amp; TRAINING</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFFICE and PROGRAM EXPENSES**

- **Printing**: $130,259.83
- **Postage**
- **Supplies**: $0.00
- **Utilities**
- **Phone**
- **Participant Support Costs**
- **Program Expenses (Training costs for GO programs including GO Driver, GO Cook, GO Start-Up, GO Contractor's Academy, and)**
  - $60,129.91
- **Program Expenses (Grant funds for the GO Start-Up program for participants who successfully complete. Funds will go towards start)**
  - $60,129.92
- **Program Expenses (Supportive services such as transportation assistance, rental assistance, childcare subsidies, assistance with)**
  - $10,000.00

**EQUIPMENT**

- $ -

**Equipment Purchase over $5,000 (Specify)**

**Equipment Lease**

**Total** $130,259.83

* Awarded funds cannot be used to supplant existing funds.*
## INDIRECT COSTS

**Subgrantee Name:**

**Grant Period:** October 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020

If you have a federally approved indirect costs rate, **skip this page and go to Tab P-5 (2).**

### INDIRECT COSTS -- DE MINIMUS CALCULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECT COSTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNTP</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+ICE &amp; PROGRAM</td>
<td>$130,259.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBAWARDS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING/TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,259.83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXCLUDED EXPENSES

- **Rent**
  - $0.00
- **Equipment over $5,000**
  - $0.00
- **Subcontracting Expenses: Amount >$25,000**
  - FALSE
- **Other Excluded Costs**

**Total Excluded Costs**

- $0.00

**Total Direct Costs - Excluded Costs = Base**

- **$130,259.83**

**Indirect Costs Percentage Rate**

**Base x Percentage Rate = Indirect Costs**

- **$0.00**
**INDIRECT COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgrantee Name:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Period:</td>
<td>October 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skip this sheet if you filled out TAB P-5 Indirect.

**Indirect Costs Calculation with NICRA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE &amp; PROGRAM</td>
<td>$130,259.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBAWARDS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING/TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,259.83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXCLUDED EXPENSES**
Please enter the total amount of all excluded expenses from above (according to your NICRA).

| Total Direct Costs - Excluded Costs = Base | $130,259.83 |

Federally Approved Indirect Costs Percentage Rate

<p>| Base x Percentage Rate = Indirect Costs | $0.00 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Narrative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENEFITS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE and PROGRAM EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Support Costs</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>GO programs that requested during by employers during FY 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Expenses (Training costs for GO programs)</td>
<td>$60,129.91</td>
<td>Funds for business development program development and implementation. Grant funds for business development programs for participants who successfully complete. Funds will go towards start up costs associated with the business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Expenses (Grant funds for the GO Start-Up program)</td>
<td>$60,129.92</td>
<td>Funds for business development program development and implementation. Grant funds for business development programs for participants who successfully complete. Funds will go towards start up costs associated with the business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Expenses (Supportive services such as transportation assistance, rental assistance, childcare subsidies, assistance with utility/phone bills, etc.)</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Supportive services such as transportation assistance, rental assistance, childcare subsidies, assistance with utility/phone bills, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Expenses (Specify)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Purchase over $5,000 (Specify)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Purchase over $5,000 (Specify)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Leases</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBAWARDS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF TRAVEL &amp; TRAINING</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIRECT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,259.83</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA  CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

Background:
In September 2018, the City of Charlottesville entered into a purchase agreement with Blue Ridge Rescue Suppliers/E-One Fire Apparatus for the purchase of one fire engine. The original contract build estimate was 300 calendar days from the contact date and a pre-payment was made to the vendor to begin the build. As the 300 calendar days came and went, the fire department was notified that due to a backlog of apparatus with this manufacturer, our build dates/delivery date would need to be pushed out. The date we were given in September of 2019 was a delivery date of July 1, 2020. A subsequent contract modification was made, and through consultation with city staff a decision was made to have the FY19 pre-pay money returned to the city.

Discussion:
The rationale for the decision to cancel the pre-pay for the E-one fire engine was based on the state of the fire department’s current reserve fire engine fleet. The fire department currently has two reserve fire engines that should have already rotated out of use, but due to deferments are still in-service. The oldest reserve should have gone out of rotation/use in 2015 and is not reliable for the frequency that it gets called upon. The next oldest reserve should have gone out of rotation in 2018 and is also becoming increasingly unreliable. This being the case a recommendation was made to city staff to use the FY19 monies that served to pre-pay the fire engine order in September 2018 to purchase a permanent/new reserve engine with these funds. This purchase will replace the oldest reserve we have.

Alignment with Council Vision Areas and Strategic Plan:
This allocation supports the City’s mission “We provide services that promote equity and an excellent quality of life in our community” by providing funding for firefighting apparatus and equipment. With the addition of this permanent reserve engine we are better able to deliver reliable
emergency services to the citizens, students, business community members, and guests of the City.

The allocation also aligns with Goal 2.1, Reduce adverse impact from sudden injury and illness and the effects of chronic disease, as well as the elements within Goal 5 - A Well-managed and Responsive Organization.

**Community Engagement:**

N/A

**Budgetary Impact:**

The vendor refund was received on November 1, 2019. This appropriation will restore the expenditure budget so that a new contract can be signed for the purchase of another engine. There is no impact to the current budget for this apparatus purchase.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval.

**Alternatives:**

If the returned monies cannot be used, our reserve engine fleet will continue to not be reliable. Continued deferments mean that the City will incur more frequent and costly repair expenses and at some point fail our ability to field four in-service fire engines on a daily basis.

**Attachments:**

N/A
APPROPRIATION
Fire Apparatus Payment Reimbursement
$642,609

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville Fire Department has received a payment reimbursement from a vendor for fire apparatus that they are unable to deliver on time;

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that a refund amount of $642,609 be appropriated in the following manner:

Revenues -

$642,609  Fund: 426  WBS Element: P-00976  G/L Account: 451999

Expenditures -

$642,609  Fund: 426  WBS Element: P-00976  G/L Account: 541011
Background:

Staff is seeking City Council approval to use $9,319 in funding previously appropriated to the Small Area Plans project to fund an initial, non-invasive archeological investigation to determine the presence of human graves outside the walls of a cemetery located at Pen Park. There are no stones or records to indicate these are burials, however a 2003 study of the cemetery completed for the City’s Department of Parks and Recreation advised that the visible depressions may indicate graves of persons who had been enslaved at Pen Park. Staff recently consulted with qualified experts who visited the site and it is recommended that the City take steps to determine if these depressions are, in fact, human burials and the extent of any additional burials that may not be evident on the surface. If present, the City would take appropriate steps to keep them from being disturbed.

Discussion:

Acquired by the City several decades ago, Pen Park is 280-acre, City park featuring recreational activities including picnic shelters, a playground, tennis courts, and the 18-hole Meadowcreek Golf Course. Approximately 800-feet southeast of the course’s Club House is a cemetery of three family plots that have long existed on the property. Within the three plots there are at least 30 known interments, spanning from the late-18th century to the most recent burial in 2008. At the north end, a low brick wall encloses the Gilmer plot; in the center, within a stone wall is the Craven family plot; at the south end, an iron fence borders the Hotopp family plot. (The Gilmers occupied the property, Pen Park, from 1786 to 1812. The Cravens, from 1819 to the mid-1800s. The Hotopps, from 1866 to the early 1900s.)

On August 20, 2019 staff was contacted by a member of the Gilmer family regarding the condition of the cemetery at Pen Park. Not being familiar with this site, staff researched the cemetery and found two qualified reports that suggested the possibility of slave burials outside of the family plots. (See attachments.)
On September 2, 2019 archeologists from Rivanna Archeological Services visited the site and outside the Craven section noticed six to eight depressions aligned east-west. In their professional opinion the depressions were “suspicious” and “worth determining” if they indicate human burials and, if there are graves, determining if there are others, outside the family plots, that are not apparent from the surface evidence. (Among their related work, RAS was involved in the work at Daughters of Zion Cemetery, in 2012 the examination of slave burials at UVA, and in 2016 the evaluation of a slave cemetery in Roanoke.)

Recommended Evaluation:
Using Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR), examine an initial Area of Interest extending on a 25 foot wide zone surrounding the north, west, and south sides of the cemetery enclosure and extending to a maximum width of 55 feet on the east side of the enclosure. This survey area will be covered as completely as vegetation and other immovable obstructions allow by close-interval (2 – 3 feet) GPR transects oriented parallel to the long axis of the cemetery. GPR data returns recorded digitally during the survey will be examined in both profile and plan view visualizations to enable the detection of GPR “anomalies” potentially consistent with expectations for the geophysical signatures of unmarked grave shafts.

Following the completion of GPR survey and data analysis, archeologist will undertake controlled, shallow excavations that will investigate two or more surface and/or GPR anomalies potentially indicative of unmarked grave shafts. The purpose of the archaeological test excavations is to provide more definitive evidence concerning the presence/absence of unmarked graves outside of the cemetery enclosure and is not intended to provide a full and accurate delineation of the overall extent of unmarked graves. Archaeological excavation will be extend only to a depth sufficient to determine the presence of grave shafts (< 12 inches) and does not intend or anticipate disturbing human remains and/or burial furniture that may be present.

If the examinations indicate burials that extend beyond the initial Area of Interest, additional discussion will be necessary to revise the scope of work and associated costs.

This process can only affirm the location of likely human burials. The grave shafts will not be disturbed nor will any human remains be disinterred. The research proposed here is in full compliance with the standards and guidelines for archaeological investigations established by the Secretary of the Interior (48 FR 44716-44742), and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR Part 800) as well as guidelines for cultural resources surveys promoted by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR 2011). (Note: The attached proposal fully explains the regulatory and professional protocols that will be followed.)

Furthermore, this evaluation cannot and will not determine the identity or race of any interred bodies. The available evidence strongly suggests that any graves located here are those of people once enslaved on this property. However, if graves are located, regardless of the race or identity of those interred, they are located on city-owned property and should be treated with respect and steps should be taken to prevent their disturbance.

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:

- Council’s Vision 2025:
  o Charlottesville cherishes and builds programming around the evolving research and interpretation of our historic heritage and resources.
• City Strategic Plan:
  o Goal 3.5: Protect historic and cultural resources.
• Additionally, from the recommendations of the BRC on Race, Memorials, & Public Spaces:
  o Highlighting and Linking Historic Places: […] council provide financial and planning support for historic resource surveys of African American, Native American and local labor neighborhoods and sites, seeking National Register listing and zoning and design guideline protection, where appropriate.

Community Engagement:

This matter was discussed briefly by the Historic Resources Committee, but there has been no community dialogue. Furthermore, the sensitive nature of burials sites requires discretion.

Budgetary Impact:

No additional funding will need to be appropriated for this project. Funding for the recommended archeological evaluation will come from previously appropriated Capital Improvement Program funds in the Small Area Plans project.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that Council approve the resolution authorizing the usage of $9,319 from the Department of Neighborhood Development Services Small Area Plans fund for the initial archeological evaluation; instruct staff to coordinate and monitor that work; update Council on findings; and, should burials be confirmed, request from the Historic Resources Committee recommendations on possible next steps.

Alternatives:

Should these funds not be appropriated, there will be no confirmation that there are unmarked graves, possibly of formerly enslaved individuals, outside the established and recorded boundaries of a cemetery located on City property. Without identification and, if necessary, delineation and formal recording, any existing graves will not be protected from later disturbance.

Attachments:

1. Resolution
2. Map and photos of site
3. Excerpt from African-American Cemeteries in Albemarle and Amherst Counties
4. Excerpt from Preliminary Site Evaluation, Charlottesville City Cemeteries, study completed in 2003 by Lynette Strangstad for the Department of Parks and Recreation
5. Rivanna Archaeological Services, LLC proposal, October 28, 2019, Ground Penetrating Radar Survey and Archaeological Ground-Truthing Excavations at the Pen Park (Gilmer-Craven-Hotopp) Cemetery Charlottesville, Virginia
RESOLUTION

Approval for usage of Small Area Plans funding for the examination of possible burials near the Gilmer/Craven/Hotopp Cemetery at Pen Park

$9,319

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the sum of $9,319 be allocated from previously appropriated funds in the Small Area Plans project for an examination of possible burials, believed to be of formerly enslaved persons, near the Gilmer/Craven/Hotopp Cemetery at Pen Park.

Fund: 426
Project: P-00819
G/L Account: 530670

Pen Park Cemetery Examination $9,319
Sept. 2019: Approximate location of observed depressions—east of and outside walls of the Craven section.
Burials at Pen Park Cemetery

Gilmer Cemetery
1 Lucy, wife of Dr. George Gilmer; 16 May 1751-22 Apr 1800
2 George Gilmer, MD; 19 Jan 1742-29 Nov 1795
3 Mildred Gilmer Wirt; 15 Aug 1772-17 Sep 1799
4 Francis Walker Gilmer; 9 Oct 1790-25 Feb 1826
5 George Gilmer, Jr.; 7 May 1925-18 May 1991

Craven Cemetery
1 Sarah Ann L. Crawford; 20 Nov 1830-22 Feb 1847
2 William C. Crawford; 25 Jan 1845-4 Jul 1846
3 Dr. William S. Whitehurst; 6 Apr 1823-7 Nov 1844
4 Lucretia Whitehurst; d. 25 Feb 1860, aged 65
5 Arthur Whitehurst; d. 6 Dec 1857, aged 67
6 Sarah Talafaro Lewis Craven; 26 Dec 1842-25 Jul 1843
7 Elizabeth N. Craven; d. 19 Dec 1819, aged 43
8 John Alexander Craven; 11 Feb 1839-2 Feb 1840
9 unreadable
10 Lewellyn Craven, d. 5 Jun 1825, aged 20
11 Mary Maria Craven; d. 20 Aug 1817, aged 5 yr 6 mo & 12 da
12 George W. Craven; 28 Jan 1815-10 May 1852
13 John H. Craven; 19 Mar 1774-7 Feb 1845
14 grave depression

Hotopp Cemetery
1 Emma F. Isenmann; 26 Sep 1866-4 Apr 1913
2 Frederick E. Hotopp; 23 Dec 1881-18 Jan 1907
3 Heinrich Adolph Hotopp; 23 Dec 1875-5 Nov 1902
4 Emma F. C. Hotopp; 29 Aug 1842-15 Mar 1914
5 Wilhelm Friedrich Hotopp; 13 Dec 1832-4 May 1898
6 Christine A. Kandah; 1 Jan 1801-13 Dec 1880
7 Agnes, dau of W. & E. Hotopp; 28 Feb 1808-21 Jan 1870
8 Johanna A. Hotopp; 26 Mar 1800-19 Jun 1867
9 Pauline Agnes, dau of W.D., & A.P. Duke; 1 Jul 1905-5 Jan 1907
10 footstone, (no headstone?)
11 Will H. Hotopp; 14 Apr 1863-7 Jan 1927
12 Doris L. Hotopp; 13 Apr 1883-6 Sep 1883
13 E.L. & H.L. Isenmann (twins?); 11 Jan 1895-12 Jan 1895
14 Arthur M. Tessmann, Jr.; 29 Jul 1926-10 Aug 1926

Sept 2019: Approx. location of observed depressions

Source: Bob Vernon, CVHR
Pen Park Cemetery - memo to CC (Nov 22, 2019)

Gilmer/Craven/Hotopp Cemetery, Pen Park
September 6, 2019 (J Werner photos)

Looking west, from outside the family plots, towards the Craven section of cemetery. Yellow lines indicate depressions observed outside of wall.
Attachment 3. Excerpt from African-American Cemeteries in Albemarle and Amherst Counties

From *African-American Cemeteries in Albemarle and Amherst Counties*:
(www2.vcdh.virginia.edu/cem/db/cemetery/details/PPK/): “The cemetery is included here because there is an oral tradition that slaves were buried outside of the ‘family plot.’ Moreover, unmarked depressions in association with periwinkle are visible along the outside edge of the metal and stone boundary. Although there is no proof that these mark the burials of enslaved individuals, several of the white families who lived here owned slaves. One ante-bellum burial practice was to bury slaves within or adjacent to white cemeteries.”

Attachment 4. Excerpt from Preliminary Site Evaluation, Charlottesville City Cemeteries

From a 2003 study completed for the City’s Department of Parks and Recreation by Lynette Strangstad: *Preliminary Site Evaluation, Charlottesville City Cemeteries*

“In Addition, numerous apparent grave depressions were noted outside the enclosures of Pen Park. Periwinkle and century plant were also found outside, underscoring the likelihood of multiple burials beyond the enclosures. It is essential that these likely slave graves be included as part of the Pen Park cemetery site.

Dowsing and/or GPR are essential here to determine how many graves are here and where they are located. Once located, graves should be mapped. When true perimeters are established, the entire area must be included as part of the cemetery and effectively set aside from the surrounding gold course. A buffer zone around the graves should be included, both to protect the graves from incursion from the recreational site and also to preserve the site as a burial site. A fence or other enclosure would help to protect this important part of Pen Park.”
Ground Penetrating Radar Survey and Archaeological Ground-Truthing
Excavations at the Pen Park (Gilmer-Craven-Hotopp) Cemetery
Charlottesville, Virginia

Proposal and Cost Estimate
October 28, 2019

Introduction
Rivanna Archaeological Services (RAS) is pleased to submit this proposal and cost estimate to coordinate a short program of ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey coupled with archaeological ground-truthing excavations at the Gilmer-Craven-Hotopp Family Cemetery located within Pen Park in Charlottesville, Virginia. The GPR survey will be conducted on terrain immediately surrounding all sides of the ca. 130-ft by 30-ft cemetery enclosure with a particular focus on the eastern side where surface indications suggest the presence of unmarked burials, possibly of enslaved periods, outside of the walls of the historic burial ground. The total area to be examined by GPR is approximately 12,800 square feet (0.28 acre) (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Aerial photograph over Pen Park showing the location of the Gilmer-Craven-Hotopp Family Cemetery and the proposed GPR survey area.
Field Research Design

Ground-Penetrating Radar Survey
The GPR survey, data processing, and analysis will be performed by NAEVA Geophysics (Charlottesville, Virginia) according to the methods, equipment, and standards detailed in their “Proposal for Geophysical Investigation” appended to this document. Briefly, GPR survey as outlined in Figure 1 will focus on a 25-ft-wide zone surrounding the north, west, and south sides of the cemetery enclosure and extending to a maximum width of 55 ft on the east side of the enclosure. This survey area will be covered as completely as vegetation and other immovable obstructions allow by close-interval (2 – 3 ft) GPR transects oriented parallel to the long axis of the cemetery. GPR data returns recorded digitally during the survey will be examined in both profile and plan view visualizations to enable the detection of GPR “anomalies” potentially consistent with expectations for the geophysical signatures of unmarked grave shafts. GPR survey requires that vegetation be mowed/cropped as low as possible at the time of survey and this proposal assumes that the City of Charlottesville will ensure that all turf and other vegetation within the proposed GPR survey area will be mowed no more than one week in advance of the GPR survey.

Archaeological Test Excavations
Following the completion of NAEVA’s GPR survey and data analysis, RAS will undertake controlled, shallow excavations that will investigate two or more surface and/or GPR anomalies potentially indicative of unmarked grave shafts. The purpose of the archaeological test excavations is to provide more definitive evidence concerning the presence/absence of unmarked graves outside of the cemetery enclosure and is not intended to provide a full and accurate delineation of the overall extent of unmarked graves. Archaeological excavation will be extend only to a depth sufficient to determine the presence of grave shafts (< 12 inches) and does not intend or anticipate disturbing human remains and/or burial furniture that may be present.

Total excavation area will not exceed 50 square feet and will be comprised of two 3-ft by 8-ft excavation units oriented parallel to the long axis of the cemetery and perpendicular to the presumed prevailing, roughly east-west orientation of inhumations. Excavation will be carried out manually with shovel and trowel and will include screening of all removed soil through ¼-inch wire mesh to ensure recognition and recovery of artifacts that might be present. Excavation will extend only to the upper surface of natural, red clay subsoil—anticipated at a depth of 8 – 10 inches below existing grade—at which point the outlines of back-filled grave shafts, if present, should be recognizable based on differences in soil color, texture, and compaction.

Archaeological excavations will be manually backfilled and compacted upon completion. If grave shafts are encountered during this work, prior to backfilling RAS will cover their upper, exposed surface with permeable landscaping fabric and set temporary stakes marking these feature/s. Turf removed at the onset of excavation will be replaced as possible, however the City of Charlottesville may wish to re-sod or re-seed and straw the areas disturbed by excavation.

Protocol for the Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains
Although grave shafts not evidenced by surface indications may well be discovered within the work area, given the shallow nature of archaeological excavation proposed in this work plan, RAS does not anticipate that human remains will be encountered or disturbed during field work.
Furthermore, it is not this project’s intent to recover or to relocate human remains interred in or adjacent to the Gilmer-Craven-Hotopp Cemetery at Pen Park. Nevertheless and solely as a precaution against the unlikely event that human remains are encountered, RAS will not initiate any aspect of the cemetery delineation research design described herein until the project has successfully secured a Permit for Archaeological Excavation of Human Remains from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. Securing this permit in advance of fieldwork ensures that the delineation work plan receives an additional layer of review and oversight while also enabling RAS staff to handle and manage inadvertently encountered human remains in the unlikely event of their discovery.

Should human remains or possible human remains be encountered during field work associated with cemetery delineation, RAS will initiate the following action plan:

1) Immediately halt all excavation and other work within 25 feet of the discovered remains, record the location on project maps, record the conditions and items of discovery with photographs and notes, secure all human remains and any associated artifacts within a sealed container, cover the discovery area with plastic sheeting, and mark the perimeter with barricade tape;

2) Similarly record, cover, and mark with barricade tape all spoil piles that may contain additional human remains;

3) Contact Virginia Department of Historic Resources and City of Charlottesville staff (Neighborhood Development and Parks & Recreation departments) to notify them of the unanticipated discovery of human (or potentially human) remains and to seek guidance on the temporary care of the recovered material; if so directed, contact and/or provide assistance to law enforcement personnel in further securing the location;

4) As directed, facilitate examination of all recovered bone by a qualified physical anthropologist and/or a State Medical Examiner;

5) If approved by VDHR and other project stakeholders, RAS will initiate controlled, manual cleaning and shallow excavation across the discovery area to delineate potential surviving burial features and to determine whether additional human remains are, or are likely to be, present in near-surface contexts;

6) In consultation with VDHR and other project stakeholders, RAS will develop, as directed, a broader work plan that more fully considers further examination of the discovery locale, the temporary treatment of human remains, and that establishes through consultation and deliberation a suitable place and process for the reinternment of inadvertently recovered human remains and associated burial artifacts.

**Documentary Research**

This project will draw heavily on existing historical studies of the Pen Park estate and associated Gilmer-Craven-Hotopp Family Cemetery, including research already completed by RAS staff in association with other projects. Documentary research is anticipated to concern primarily secondary sources sufficient to provide a general historical context for the cemetery. Limited research into primary sources may be conducted but will not be extensive or exhaustive.
Laboratory Processing, Analysis, and Artifact Curation

Minimal quantities of artifacts or other objects of enduring material culture are anticipated to be collected during this project. Should marker stones or other significant funerary or memorial objects be encountered during archaeological fieldwork, every effort will be made to leave them in or return them to their original locations. Small artifacts recovered during excavation and screening of surface soils will be returned to RAS’s lab in Charlottesville for cleaning, analysis, and cataloging following the completion of fieldwork.

Reporting and Project Documentation

Following completion of fieldwork, Rivanna Archaeological Services will prepare a brief technical report summarizing the history of the Pen Park plantation property, the background and objectives of the current project, and presenting its findings, conclusions, and recommendations regarding future treatment and management of the Gilmer-Craven-Hotopp Family cemetery and immediately surrounding area. The report will be illustrated, as needed, with photographs and scaled drawings. The report will be provided in both printed and bound (one copy) and digital (pdf) format. One printed and bound and one digital copy of the report will also be provided to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources for inclusion in the Department’s archives. In addition, a Virginia Department of Historic Resources site form will be completed for the cemetery project using the VDHR’s online V-CRIS system.

Investigation Standards and Relevant Project Experience

The research proposed here is in full compliance with the standards and guidelines for archaeological investigations established by the Secretary of the Interior (48 FR 44716-44742), and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR Part 800) as well as guidelines for cultural resources surveys promoted by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR 2011). One or more archaeologists meeting or exceeding the Secretary of the Interior’s minimum professional requirements and with significant first-hand experience with cemetery delineation will be present at all times during all components of the field research design proposed here, including the initial stage of tree and debris clearing. Past projects undertaken by Rivanna Archaeological Services in which machine-assisted wide-area clearing of surface soils has been employed to identify human burials and delineate cemetery boundaries include the following:

As detailed in the accompanying itemized budget, RAS will coordinate GPR survey, archaeological test excavations, and reporting for a total cost, inclusive of NAeva’s work, of $9,319.00.
Ground Penetrating Radar Survey and Archaeological Ground-Truthing Excavations at the Gilmer-Craven-Hotopp Cemetery
Pen Park, Charlottesville, Virginia

Acceptance of Proposal and Fee

By my signature below, I accept the scope of work, work schedule, and $9,319.00 fee detailed herein for a Ground Penetrating Radar survey, archaeological test excavations, and associated reporting the grounds of Pen Park in Charlottesville, Virginia. I further agree that payment for these services will be made in full to Rivanna Archaeological Services, LLC within 30 days of receipt of invoice. Invoices not paid within 30 days of receipt will be assessed a late payment fee of $250. Any legal costs and any other expenses that may be incurred by Rivanna Archaeological Services to recover payment for work performed under this agreement will be borne by City of Charlottesville.

Signature:

Title: Date:

Rivanna Archaeological Services LLC
410 E. Water Street, Suite 1100, Charlottesville VA 22902
Tel: 434-293-3108; Fax: 434-293-3183; Email: info@rivarch.com
# GPR and Archaeological Investigations

**Pen Park**  
**Charlottesville, Virginia**  

**Cost Estimate**  
**October 28, 2019**  
submitted to City of Charlottesville

## Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAS Project Planning &amp; Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Administration</td>
<td>Project Archaeologist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Acquisition &amp; Review</td>
<td>Project Archaeologist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAS Archaeological Fieldwork</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Excavation (48 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>Project Archaeologist (1)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Technician (2)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>$1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAEVA Fieldwork, Data Processing, Reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>two-person crew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR Field Survey</td>
<td>two-person crew</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR Equipment Cost</td>
<td>0.5-day</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600/day</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR Data Processing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Charge</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAS Report Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis &amp; Write-up</td>
<td>Project Archaeologist</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td>GIS / Graphics Tech.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$61.00</td>
<td>$366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDHR Site Form completion</td>
<td>Project Archaeologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAS Planning &amp; Coordination</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Research</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS Fieldwork</td>
<td>$3,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAEVA Fieldwork, Data Processing, Reporting</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS Report Preparation</td>
<td>$3,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,319</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 24, 2019

Dr. Stephen Thompson
Rivanna Archaeological Services, LLC
410 E. Water Street, Suite 1100
Charlottesville, VA 22902
434-293-3108 (office) | 434-981-9466 (mobile)

RE: Proposal for Geophysical Investigation

Dear Dr. Thompson:

NAEVA Geophysics Inc. is pleased to submit for your review the following scope of work associated with a geophysical investigation to be conducted at Pen Park, in Charlottesville, Virginia. The purpose of the survey is to attempt to detect the presence and map the locations of historic burials in the area immediately adjacent to the marked Gilmer-Craven-Hotopp cemetery.

A ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey will be conducted in the area outlined in blue below, covering a total of approximately 0.28 acres. Closely spaced parallel transects will be surveyed across the areas to attempt to image burials in the area of interest.

Proposed GPR Survey Area
The aerial imagery shows the presence of vegetative canopy, precluding the use of Real Time Kinematic (RTK) GPS for data location. NAEVA will use measuring tapes, pin flags and spray paint for ground control, with fiducial marks placed in the data for local coordinates. NAEVA will mark the corners of the surveyed area, however we will not record the locations of the surveyed area using GPS or other methods.

GPR depth penetration is affected by soil type, soil moisture, and the presence of conductive fluids. In general, dry sandy soils offer the best penetration, while wet clay soil permits only very shallow penetration. Residual clay soil developed over Piedmont metamorphic rocks is typically not conducive to deep penetration of GPR signals. Detection of a burial site is dependent on contrasts between the soil and the remains or enclosure, which may be affected by the condition of the materials. Interference from cultural sources such as steel reinforced concrete, underground utilities, power lines, nearby surface metal, tree roots, etc. may degrade the GPR signal.

NAEVA will use a Sensors and Software Noggin Plus GPR system, equipped with a 250 MHz antenna. The Noggin system uses shielded antennas making it well suited for use in urban environments. Data will be stored in the electronics consoles of the instruments for later review and processing.

Below are the estimated costs for this scope of work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Hour Travel</td>
<td>$100/hour</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hours labor (crew of 2)</td>
<td>$160/hour</td>
<td>$640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 Day GPR</td>
<td>$300/ half day</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hours Data Processing</td>
<td>$90/hour</td>
<td>$360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Charge</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hours Report</td>
<td>$80/hour</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,600.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSIDERATIONS**

The above estimated cost is based on the information provided; assumes smooth and level ground, sparse vegetation, minimal snow cover, and easy vehicle access. Please also note the following considerations.
Investigations Using Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR)

- GPR is affected by site conditions such as the building material and moisture content, therefore, the depth of penetration and usefulness of GPR data cannot be known until our arrival on site.

  - If NAEVA is awarded this contract and a subcontract with your company is required, please fax a copy of the agreement to:

    Mr. John J. Breznick  
    NAEVA Geophysics Inc.  
    Post Office Box 7325  
    Charlottesville, Virginia 22906  
    (434) 978-3187 and (434) 973-9791 Fax

Please allow time for contract negotiation.

  - The terms and conditions on the reverse side of purchase orders are considered contracts and sufficient time should be allowed for their negotiation.

  - No purchase orders which include terms and conditions or subcontracts will be accepted after the fieldwork begins.

  - Once fieldwork has commenced, no additional terms or conditions may be appended to this proposal.

Billing

  - This estimate does not include stand-by time, which will be charged at the normal labor rate.

  - Payment terms are net 30 days. Late payments are subject to 1.5% monthly fee.

  - Unless otherwise notified, this project will be billed on a time and materials basis.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this proposal. We look forward to working with you soon. Please call me if I may answer any questions.

Best Regards,

Mark Howard
Senior Geologist/Project Manager
NAEVA Geophysics, Inc.
Charlottesville, Virginia
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Background:
On September 26, 2019, President Trump issued Executive Order 13888 (EO), which will go into effect on December 25, 2019. Starting on that date, refugees will not be permitted to resettle into a state or locality unless written consent is provided by the governor and a local official. According to the terms of the EO, both the state and locality must consent to refugee resettlement.

Discussion:
Harriet Kuhr, the International Rescue Committee’s Executive Director, requested the Council to endorse the attached letter and asked for Mayor Walker to sign the letter addressed to Secretary of State Michael Pompeo.

Budgetary Impact:
None.

Attachments:
Proposed Letter to Department of State
Resolution
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR WALKER TO SIGN CORRESPONDENCE TO THE UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZING REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT IN CHARLOTTESVILLE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that Mayor Nikuyah Walker is hereby authorized to sign the attached correspondence to the United States Department of State.
December 2, 2019

Secretary Michael R. Pompeo  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street NW  
Washington DC, 20520

Dear Secretary Pompeo:

This letter is in reference to Executive Order 13888, "On Enhancing State and Local Involvement in Resettlement."

As Mayor of Charlottesville, Virginia, I consent to initial refugee resettlement in Charlottesville as per the terms of the Executive Order.

I would also like to have noted that it would be my preference to have individuals voluntarily settle in our community by ensuring that the U.S. does not act as a disruptive agent in the homeland of those who later seek refuge.

Sincerely,

Nikuyah Walker  
Mayor

Cc:  
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Carol T. O'Connell  
Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration  
U.S. Department of State
Background: Burnet Commons Three LLC submitted a major subdivision for Burnet Commons Phase 3, located off the northern side of Elliott Avenue, as shown on the attached plat. Burnet Commons Phase 3 plans were originally approved on November 7, 2014. The final site as-built plan was submitted October 11, 2019. The proposed street infrastructure improvements have been completed and the developer has requested that those new portions of street right of way, referred to in the attached final plat sheet 2 of 10, be accepted for inclusion in the City Street system. At this time, all work required to be completed for road acceptance is done to the satisfaction of all reviewing City Departments.

Discussion: The Burnet Commons Phase 3 development was approved with the requirement that all new streets be built to the city’s standards and satisfaction. These streets would be extended from existing city street system with the intent to become a public street.

Budgetary Impact: The Burnet Commons Phase 3 project has resulted in additional property taxes for the City. The City will incur costs to maintain this public street. These include plowing snow, trash collection to eventual resurfacing. While snow plowing could begin in the near future, other
maintenance is projected to be several years off. The SWM facilities within the ROW will be maintained by the HOA and will not create a maintenance obligation for the City.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends these road improvements be accepted into the City street system as shown on the attached plat sheet 2 of 10.

**Attachments:**
Final Plat, with highlighted street right of way to be accepted on sheet 2 of 10.
RESOLUTION
ACCEP廷G BURNET STREET, INTERNATIONAL DRIVE AND AMSTEL AVENUE INTO THE CITY STREET SYSTEM FOR MAINTENANCE, EXCLUDING CERTAIN ENCROACHMENTS

WHEREAS, the Burnet Street, International Drive and Amstel Avenue rights-of-way have been constructed within Phase 3 of the Burnet Commons development and the developer has asked the City to accept these streets into the City’s street system;

WHEREAS, certain stormwater management features have been constructed within the public rights-of-way, in the locations generally depicted within the following Exhibit and labeled “new SWM easement (shaded)”:

Exhibit:
WHEREAS, all of said stormwater management features have been installed for the benefit of the lots within Phase 3 of the Burnet Commons development, and said features are owned by, and are to be maintained by, said lot owners or an owners’ association of which the owners are members; and

WHEREAS, all of said stormwater management features are encroachments into City-owned public rights-of-way and, notwithstanding the reference to “new easements” within the foregoing Exhibit, no easements have been granted by City Council in accordance with Va. Code §15.2-1800(B);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, Burnet Street, International Drive, and Amstel Avenue, as improved, are hereby accepted into the City’s public street system for maintenance, excluding the existing stormwater management features in the locations depicted within the foregoing Exhibit; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the stormwater management features are hereby authorized to remain within the public rights-of-way as encroachments, until those features are destroyed or removed, pursuant to the provisions of Va. Code §§ 15.2-2009 and 2011. The stormwater features shall owned and maintained by the owners of lots within Phase 3 of the Burnet Commons development or an owners’ association of which the owners are members, who shall be liable for negligence on account of such encroachments. Pursuant to Va. Code §15.2-2009, authorization of these encroachments may be revoked by resolution of this City Council, and City Council hereby reserves the right, at its option, to institute and prosecute a suit or action in ejectment or other appropriate proceedings to recover possession of the public rights of way occupied by the stormwater management features.
SUBDIVISION PLAT
TMP 29-266 & 29-272.1
BURNET COMMONS PHASE III
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA

SUBDIVISION NOTES
1. SOURCE OF TITLE: TMP 29-266=0B 118 PG 191 AND 29-272.1=0B 198 PG 61.
2. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY SHOWN HEREON APPEARS TO BE LOCATED IN ZONE "X" AND DOES NOT FALL WITHIN FLOOD HAZARD ZONE "AE" FOR A 100 YEAR FLOOD AS SHOWN ON FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP NUMBER 100303C0288D EFFECTIVE DATE FEBRUARY 4, 2005. THIS DETERMINATION HAS BEEN MADE BY GRAPHIC METHODS. NO ELEVATION STUDY HAS BEEN PERFORMED AS A PORTION OF THIS PROJECT.
3. PARCELS ARE ZONED PUD.
4. SETBACKS ARE: 5' FRONT, 5' SIDE AND 5' REAR.
5. ALL COMMON AREAS, OPEN SPACE AND SWM EASEMENTS SHALL BE OWNED AND MAINTAINED BY THE HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION TO BE NAMED LATER.
6. ALL PUBLIC DRAINAGE AND WATERLINE EASEMENTS SHOWN HEREON WILL BE MAINTAINED BY THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE.
7. PROPOSED USE IS RESIDENTIAL.
8. A PERIMETER FIELD BOUNDARY SURVEY WAS PERFORMED BY DOMINION ENGINEERING. BEARING ROTATION IS BASED ON VA STATE GRID (VA SOUTH ZONE).
9. THIS PLAT HAS BEEN PREPARED WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF A TITLE REPORT AND THEREFORE DOES NOT NECESSARILY INDICATE ALL ENCUMBRANCES ON THE PROPERTY SHOWN HEREON AND SAID PROPERTY MAY BE SUBJECT TO INFORMATION DISCLOSED ON A TITLE REPORT BY A LICENSED ATTORNEY.
10. ALL PROPERTY CORNERS WILL BE MONUMENTED WITH IRON PINS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.

OWNER'S APPROVAL
THE DIVISION OF THE LAND DESCRIBED IS WITH THE FREE CONSENT OF AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DESIRES OF THE UNDERSIGNED OWNER, TRUSTEES, OR PROPRIETORS. ANY REFERENCE TO FUTURE POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IS TO BE DEEMED AS THEORETICAL ONLY. ALL STATEMENTS ATTACHED TO THIS PLAT ARE TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

LOIS A. HAVRESTROM
NOTARY PUBLIC
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JULY 31, 2016
REGISTRATION NO. 298946
Curve Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curve</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Radius</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Tangent</th>
<th>Chord</th>
<th>Chord Bearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>7.14'</td>
<td>24.00'</td>
<td>17/02/03'</td>
<td>3.59'</td>
<td>7.11'</td>
<td>S 85°36'26&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>2.44'</td>
<td>24.00'</td>
<td>54/61/47&quot;</td>
<td>1.22'</td>
<td>2.44'</td>
<td>S 82°35'37&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>31.83'</td>
<td>56.00'</td>
<td>32/21/36&quot;</td>
<td>16.25'</td>
<td>31.21'</td>
<td>N 84°08'28&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>14.38'</td>
<td>9.00'</td>
<td>91°32'18&quot;</td>
<td>9.24'</td>
<td>12.90'</td>
<td>N 66°16'11&quot; E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Line Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>N 48°09'13&quot; E</td>
<td>51.57'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>N 43°58'16&quot; E</td>
<td>47.17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>N 43°20'52&quot; E</td>
<td>38.88'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>N 53°54'19&quot; E</td>
<td>32.91'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>N 54°06'16&quot; E</td>
<td>33.23'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>N 53°05'37&quot; E</td>
<td>96.79'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>N 56°08'10&quot; W</td>
<td>67.10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>N 24°32'56&quot; E</td>
<td>4.68'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9</td>
<td>N 67°57'40&quot; W</td>
<td>26.94'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>S 67°57'40&quot; E</td>
<td>2.36'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>N 48°09'13&quot; E</td>
<td>1.05'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBDIVISION PLAT

TMP 29-266 & 29-272.1
BURNET COMMONS PHASE III
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA

DATE: 07-02-14
DRAWN BY: BRV
REVISION: 08-28-2014
CHECKED BY: KCW
PROJECT NO: 13.0069
REVISION: 10-30-2014
COMMENTS FROM CITY
LAND SURVEYOR: V2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curve</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Radius</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Tangent</th>
<th>Chord</th>
<th>Chord Bearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>35.10'</td>
<td>19.04'</td>
<td>105°37'59&quot;</td>
<td>25.10'</td>
<td>30.34'</td>
<td>S 76°58'43&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>24.84'</td>
<td>149.00'</td>
<td>9°33'10&quot;</td>
<td>12.45'</td>
<td>24.81'</td>
<td>S 19°23'09&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>5.00'</td>
<td>5.00'</td>
<td>57°14'59&quot;</td>
<td>2.73'</td>
<td>4.79'</td>
<td>S 14°00'56&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>33.58'</td>
<td>193.00'</td>
<td>9°58'08&quot;</td>
<td>16.83'</td>
<td>33.54'</td>
<td>S 18°57'15&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>3.83'</td>
<td>193.00'</td>
<td>1°08'16&quot;</td>
<td>1.92'</td>
<td>3.83'</td>
<td>S 24°30'28&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>29.63'</td>
<td>193.00'</td>
<td>8°47'46&quot;</td>
<td>14.84'</td>
<td>29.60'</td>
<td>S 29°28'29&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>10.35'</td>
<td>29.00'</td>
<td>20°26'47&quot;</td>
<td>5.23'</td>
<td>10.29'</td>
<td>N 65°08'26&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>32.13'</td>
<td>58.00'</td>
<td>32°52'38&quot;</td>
<td>16.52'</td>
<td>31.68'</td>
<td>N 71°21'22&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>16.48'</td>
<td>29.00'</td>
<td>32°33'07&quot;</td>
<td>8.47'</td>
<td>18.26'</td>
<td>S 85°37'49&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>5.16'</td>
<td>56.50'</td>
<td>51°34'16&quot;</td>
<td>2.58'</td>
<td>5.16'</td>
<td>N 80°42'31&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>10.70'</td>
<td>10.00'</td>
<td>61°17'04&quot;</td>
<td>5.92'</td>
<td>10.19'</td>
<td>N 52°40'52&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>11.57'</td>
<td>8.00'</td>
<td>82°49'50&quot;</td>
<td>7.06'</td>
<td>10.58'</td>
<td>S 19°22'37&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>5.16'</td>
<td>56.50'</td>
<td>51°40'08&quot;</td>
<td>2.58'</td>
<td>5.16'</td>
<td>N 58°10'28&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>38.20'</td>
<td>29.00'</td>
<td>75°28'23&quot;</td>
<td>22.44'</td>
<td>35.50'</td>
<td>N 86°42'25&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>62.32'</td>
<td>136.00'</td>
<td>26°15'16&quot;</td>
<td>31.72'</td>
<td>61.78'</td>
<td>N 32°51'39&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>5.04'</td>
<td>335.28'</td>
<td>0°51'42&quot;</td>
<td>2.52'</td>
<td>5.04'</td>
<td>S 62°48'09&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>37.74'</td>
<td>141.00'</td>
<td>15°20'08&quot;</td>
<td>18.98'</td>
<td>37.63'</td>
<td>N 12°19'55&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>37.12'</td>
<td>189.00'</td>
<td>11°15'13&quot;</td>
<td>18.62'</td>
<td>37.06'</td>
<td>N 01°06'38&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>34.81'</td>
<td>1177.82'</td>
<td>1°41'36&quot;</td>
<td>17.40'</td>
<td>34.81'</td>
<td>N 63°14'14&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>50.28'</td>
<td>1177.82'</td>
<td>2°26'45&quot;</td>
<td>25.14'</td>
<td>50.28'</td>
<td>N 61°10'04&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>5.69'</td>
<td>10.00'</td>
<td>32°36'33&quot;</td>
<td>2.93'</td>
<td>5.61'</td>
<td>S 38°20'36&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>7.03'</td>
<td>5.00'</td>
<td>80°34'46&quot;</td>
<td>4.24'</td>
<td>6.47'</td>
<td>N 18°17'20&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>21.03'</td>
<td>1177.82'</td>
<td>1°01'22&quot;</td>
<td>10.51'</td>
<td>21.03'</td>
<td>N 58°04'02&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>27.78'</td>
<td>19.00'</td>
<td>83°46'49&quot;</td>
<td>17.04'</td>
<td>25.37'</td>
<td>N 85°01'25&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30</td>
<td>23.35'</td>
<td>19.00'</td>
<td>70°25'31&quot;</td>
<td>13.41'</td>
<td>21.91'</td>
<td>N 07°56'40&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>19.25'</td>
<td>181.00'</td>
<td>6°05'36&quot;</td>
<td>9.63'</td>
<td>19.24'</td>
<td>N 24°13'18&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C32</td>
<td>0.95'</td>
<td>19.00'</td>
<td>2°51'06&quot;</td>
<td>0.47'</td>
<td>0.95'</td>
<td>N 22°36'03&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C33</td>
<td>8.05'</td>
<td>5.00'</td>
<td>92°14'04&quot;</td>
<td>5.20'</td>
<td>7.21'</td>
<td>N 70°08'38&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C34</td>
<td>122.68'</td>
<td>1136.82'</td>
<td>61°10'00&quot;</td>
<td>61.40'</td>
<td>122.62'</td>
<td>S 60°38'51&quot; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>7.95'</td>
<td>5.00'</td>
<td>91°07'38&quot;</td>
<td>5.10'</td>
<td>7.14'</td>
<td>N 02°54'45&quot; E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AREA 'X' OF TMP 29-266
HEREBY DEDICATED
TO PUBLIC R/W 0.008 ACRES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L17</td>
<td>S 29°58'41&quot; E</td>
<td>60.00'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L18</td>
<td>N 25°05'48&quot; E</td>
<td>158.74'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L19</td>
<td>S 33°34'37&quot; W</td>
<td>87.01'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L20</td>
<td>S 30°28'23&quot; E</td>
<td>25.63'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L21</td>
<td>S 12°52'45&quot; E</td>
<td>25.48'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L22</td>
<td>S 45°32'25&quot; W</td>
<td>33.63'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L23</td>
<td>N 45°57'40&quot; W</td>
<td>13.76'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L24</td>
<td>S 55°17'02&quot; E</td>
<td>9.75'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L25</td>
<td>S 34°41'11&quot; W</td>
<td>21.56'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L26</td>
<td>S 23°39'37&quot; W</td>
<td>48.99'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L27</td>
<td>N 66°01'13&quot; W</td>
<td>12.60'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L28</td>
<td>N 27°29'39&quot; W</td>
<td>9.79'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L29</td>
<td>S 67°57'40&quot; E</td>
<td>16.01'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L30</td>
<td>S 21°57'24&quot; W</td>
<td>13.00'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L31</td>
<td>N 68°02'36&quot; W</td>
<td>16.03'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L32</td>
<td>S 87°57'40&quot; E</td>
<td>8.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L33</td>
<td>S 22°02'10&quot; W</td>
<td>73.07'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L34</td>
<td>S 87°34'55&quot; W</td>
<td>12.80'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L35</td>
<td>S 76°44'36&quot; W</td>
<td>17.32'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L36</td>
<td>N 46°55'24&quot; W</td>
<td>116.34'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L37</td>
<td>N 42°39'32&quot; E</td>
<td>18.76'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L38</td>
<td>N 50°52'54&quot; E</td>
<td>2.13'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L39</td>
<td>N 39°07'06&quot; W</td>
<td>49.23'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L40</td>
<td>N 08°29'47&quot; E</td>
<td>13.83'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L41</td>
<td>N 27°16'05&quot; E</td>
<td>16.02'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L42</td>
<td>N 62°43'55&quot; W</td>
<td>2.00'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L43</td>
<td>N 22°11'29&quot; E</td>
<td>6.91'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L44</td>
<td>N 47°55'05&quot; E</td>
<td>23.88'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L45</td>
<td>N 22°11'29&quot; E</td>
<td>10.83'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L46</td>
<td>N 85°17'41&quot; W</td>
<td>34.16'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page intentionally left blank
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Date:</th>
<th>December 2, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Required:</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter:</td>
<td>Brennen Duncan, Traffic Engineer, NDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Contacts:</td>
<td>Brennen Duncan, Traffic Engineer, NDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>2019 Permit Parking Requests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

Every year per city code, permit parking requests are submitted to Neighborhood Development services. All requests submitted prior to February 28th are evaluated against the guidelines set forth in city code section 15-206.

**Discussion**

This year we received 1 application for Permit Parking from the neighborhoods. This was the block of 11th Street NW between Gordon Avenue and West Street. Parking Data was collected on three different days in May. This request met the threshold for percentage of commuter parking.

**Budgetary Impact**

Minimal for signs.

**Recommendations**

Traffic Engineering’s recommendation is to accept the portion 11th Street NW, between Gordon Avenue and West Street, into the City’s Permit Parking system.

**Council Action**

Approve the acceptance of 11th Street as a residential permit parking block.
Attachments

Memo to City Manager

Resolution
MEMO

TO: Mike Murphy, Interim City Manager
CC: Alexander Ikefuna, NDS Director
     Brennen Duncan, City Traffic Engineer
FROM: Jerry Allen II, Assistant Traffic Engineer
DATE: 4/29/2019
RE: 2019 PERMIT PARKING

Residents of 11th St NW submitted petitions requesting their street be surveyed to determine if permit parking is warranted. Neighborhood Development Services has completed the survey of 11th St NW between West St and Gordon Ave.

Data was collected on four (4) separate weekdays per City code. City code requires that 75% of available on-street parking be occupied and that 50% of those spaces be occupied by commuters on at least (3) occasions. [See chart below]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Data</th>
<th>% Commuter</th>
<th>% Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>≥50</td>
<td>≥75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 4/17/19</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 4/22/19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 4/23/19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 4/24/19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: 11th St NW*

The data collected shows that 11th St NW meets the thresholds defined by City Code.

It is my recommendation that this go to City Council for approval per section 15-203 of the City Code. Once a Council date has been established, notification letters will go out to the residents who submitted petitions.
RESOLUTION
APPROVING CERTAIN STREETS
AS RESTRICTED PARKING BLOCKS

WHEREAS, certain residents of 11th Street Northwest between Gordon Avenue and West Street, and/or the City Traffic Engineer have requested that City Council designate those streets or portions of streets as restricted parking areas; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with §15-203 of the Charlottesville City Code, 1990, as amended, the City Traffic Engineer has conducted on-street parking surveys and mailed notice to all residents of the affected areas that Council will consider this request; and

WHEREAS, the surveys have shown that at least 75% of the total number of on-street parking spaces in the proposed restricted parking blocks were occupied, and at least 50% of the total number of on-street parking spaces in those blocks were occupied by commuter vehicles; and

WHEREAS, Council has considered:

(a) the purpose and intent of Chapter 15, Article 5, Division 3 of the Charlottesville City Code, 1990, as amended;

(b) the alternate means of transportation, if any, to and from the restricted parking areas being established;

(c) the impact, if any, that establishment of a restricted parking area may have on nearby neighborhoods or blocks that do not have permit parking; and

(d) the impact, if any, that a restricted area may have on persons who do not reside within that area and their ability to find parking near their place of work; and

(e) the hours, if any, during which the proposed restricted parking areas are affected by commuter vehicles.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville that, pursuant to §15-203 of the City Code, the following areas are each hereby designated restricted parking areas: 11th Street Northwest between Gordon Avenue and West Street.
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Background:

In F.Y. 2018, as part of the original Equity Package discussions, City Council dedicated $15,000 for the creation/delivery of an Ethnic Study Course, with the organization to deliver this course and the design and curriculum of this course to be determined at a later date. The Jefferson School African American Heritage Center has begun the development of a teacher training institute to promote a greater appreciation for, and understanding of, the contributions of African Americans and peoples of the Diaspora locally, nationally and globally. This request is seeking Council approval for the allocation of the $15,000 previously dedicated for the Ethnic Study course to the Jefferson School African American Heritage Center for the teacher training institute.

Discussion:

The Jefferson School African American Heritage Center is proposing a two-year pilot program which will engage in its first year, 15 City of Charlottesville Schools (C.C.S.) teachers and 10 other teachers regionally, and result in the rewriting of curriculum in all learning areas. They believe that the development of a teacher training institute for Charlottesville teachers is a natural extension of the work they have done to support our public schools since their inception.

The 2019/2020 teacher training program pilot is directed at a 25 teacher cohort, over half of which will be drawn from the 129 instructors in the city of Charlottesville who teach social studies and reading. In subsequent years, we will expand to include teachers within the 70-mile radius served by the Heritage Center. The pilot will unfold in three phases. Phase I, conducted in direct partnership with Charlottesville Schools (M.O.U. attached), creates a series of programs during the 2019/2020 school year that educates teachers about African American history from the Antebellum period to present day. In Phase II, these teachers participate in a one-week intensive summer education program that immerses them more deeply into subjects addressed in
the small group meetings from a local perspective, and provides tools & resources that can be
used in the classroom to further support student engagement. In the final phase of the pilot,
teachers will meet with Heritage Center staff and with each other to evaluate efficacy of tools
and developed resources.

Teachers will be meeting once a month after school to engage in professional learning
experiences, including podcast/book studies, a critical examination of our current curricula using
antiracism tools and frameworks, culturally responsive teaching methodologies, national
frameworks for teaching “hard history,” field experiences at national historic sites, a Teaching
Tolerance workshop in conjunction with Albemarle County Public Schools, and examination of
the inquiry design (I.D.M.) model for having students engage with compelling questions through
a series of performance tasks. The work done around local history will take place at the Jefferson
School Summer Institute.

The purpose of this series of professional learning opportunities is to support teachers’ interests
and efforts to learn more about and embed local history and culturally responsive pedagogy in
their social studies curricula. Throughout the school year, teachers will further develop language
and frameworks for having critical discussions and more accurate teaching and learning of
history while addressing the legacies of racism, slavery, and inequity. Another anticipated
outcome is that students will develop not only a more complex understanding of the past through
the integration of multiple perspectives, but also a framework and mindset for seeking multiple
perspectives and complex understandings as they encounter new content and their own
community.

Evaluation of this project will incorporate both quantitative and qualitative techniques.
Evaluation will include pre- and post- measurement of teacher and student knowledge of African
American history. Teachers will report their relative confidence in before and after intervention.
Teachers will report their use of this curriculum and resources within their classroom at intervals
throughout the following year. Teachers will report the impact of the curriculum on their
students.

**Community Engagement:**

Jefferson School African American Heritage Center has partnered with Charlottesville City
Schools to integrate local history into social studies curriculum since 2011 and has continued to
receive feedback from both teachers and students since that time.

**Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:**

The Ethnic Study Course through the Jefferson School African American Heritage Center
contribute toward Strategic Goal #1: Inclusive, Self-sufficient Community, and specifically Goal
1.5 “Intentionally address issues of race and equity” and Goal 1.1 “Preparing students for the
academic and vocational success”.
Recommendation:

Staff has prepared a resolution that allocates $15,000 from Council’s Strategic Initiative Account should Council choose to fully fund this request. City Council could also amend the resolution if the decision is to fund at a lesser amount.

Budgetary Impact:

No new money is required since these funds would be allocated coming from previously appropriated funding. $15,000 from the Council Strategic Initiatives funds were previously dedicated but unspent by City Council for an Ethnic Study Course, therefore staff is recommending this funding come from those Council Strategic Initiatives Account dollars.

Alternatives:

To fund this program at a lesser amount or not at all.

Attachments:

Resolution

MOU between Jefferson School African American Heritage Center and Charlottesville City Schools

Teacher Training Program Project Description
RESOLUTION
City Funding to Jefferson School African American Heritage Center for
Ethnic Study Course
$15,000

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of
Charlottesville, Virginia that the sum of $15,000 is hereby paid from currently appropriated
funds in the Council Strategic Initiatives account in the General Fund to Jefferson School
African American Heritage Center in support of the Ethnic Studies Course work being
undertaken.

$15,000 Fund: 105 Cost Center: 10110010000
WHEREAS, the Jefferson School African American Heritage Center (hereafter ‘JSAAHC’) is entering into a partnership with the Charlottesville City Schools (hereafter ‘CCS’) to provide assistance and support in teacher professional learning and integration of local history into the division-wide instructional curriculum K-12. This agreement sets forth the terms and conditions of this partnership.

WHEREAS, the partnership between JSAAHC and CCS will provide grade K-12 educators access to a weeklong summer professional learning experience hosted by the JSAAHC during the week of June 8-12, 2020 from 9 am to 3 pm. Primary funding will be provided by a grant to JSAAHC from VA Humanities, and the Kellogg Foundation “Changing the Narrative” grant.

WHEREAS, the partnership between JSAAHC and CCS will provide ongoing, job-embedded opportunities for professional learning for K-12 educators during the 2020-21 school year on division designated professional learning days, as well as voluntary participation in other community sponsored events related to local history.

JSAAHC and CCS, in consideration of the mutual promises and consideration herein, hereby agree to the following:

1. CCS will support and promote attendance and participation for up to ten K-12 educators in the summer institute, and ongoing professional learning opportunities on division designated professional learning days from June 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021. These teachers should have had some level of cultural bias training.

2. In preparation for teacher participation in program CCS would provide some mutually agreed upon funding to cover the cost of food and materials.

3. JSAAHC will develop and maintain a website of local history curriculum resources which will be made available to CCS as well as other local school divisions and community members. All materials will be shared free of charge and be made available for educators to link and share via school division learning management systems such as Canvas, or via free GSuite apps.

4. Program will be supported by an advisory committee comprised of JSAAHC alumni, UVA History and Curry School Faculty, JSAAHC board members, local history researchers, a CCS Leadership Team Member, Instructional Coach, a CCS Social Studies Coordinator, and the Director of Education and Outreach for New American History at the University of Richmond. The Advisory committee's role is to review curriculum development and aid in identifying funding.

5. CCS will provide release time for one staff member designated as the division Social Studies Coordinator to meet periodically with JSAAHC to plan for and implement the local history curriculum professional learning experiences and curriculum development.
6. JSAAHC will offer additional training and place-based learning experiences for educators and students as the local history curriculum is implemented in CCS grades K-12. CCS will work with division and building administrators to promote and approve student and educator participation in curriculum implementation, as well as place-based learning experiences (visits to the JSAAHC and other local sites of historic and cultural significance within the Charlottesville Community) during the 2020-21 school year and subsequent years.

7. Non-discrimination: Each party agrees that, in the performance of this Agreement, services shall be provided without regard to sex, gender, race, color, national origin, disability, religion, ancestry, age, marital or veteran’s status, physical or mental genetic information, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, political affiliation or any classification protected by applicable law.

8. This Agreement shall be construed and enforced pursuant to the laws and in the courts of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

9. The validity or unenforceability of any particular provision of this Agreement shall not affect the other provision hereof, and this Agreement shall be construed in all respects as though such invalid or unenforceable provision(s) were eliminated.

10. This Agreement, including any and all amendments, and any documents that are attached and integrated hereto, shall comprise of the ENTIRE AGREEMENT between the parties and neither party shall rely upon any other oral communication or document. This Agreement may only be amended or modified in writing as agreed upon by both parties.

11. This Agreement is subject to the approval of and shall not be binding upon either party unless approved by both.

APPROVED BY:

______________________________  ______________________
Dr. Andrea Douglas, Executive Director  Date
Jefferson School African American Heritage Center

______________________________  ______________________
Dr. Rosa Atkins, Superintendent  Date
Charlottesville City Schools
Embracing Our Narratives: Teaching Local History

Project Overview
The Jefferson School African American Heritage Center (JSAAHC) mission is to honor and preserve the rich heritage and legacy of the African-American community of Charlottesville-Albemarle, Virginia and to promote a greater appreciation for, and understanding of, the contributions of African Americans and peoples of the Diaspora locally, nationally and globally. We do this through our K-12 and adult education programs that includes exhibitions, lectures and interdisciplinary public programming. Our k-12 program is at the core of our work. Our development of a teacher training institute for Charlottesville teachers is a natural extension of the work we have done to support our public schools since our inception. We propose a two year pilot program which will engage in its first year, 15 City of Charlottesville Schools (CCS) teachers and 10 other teachers regionally, and result in the rewriting of curriculum in all learning areas.

The JSAAHC teacher training program hopes to cause teachers in varied disciplines to unlearn an American history that privileges white narratives and only marginally addresses the African American presence in the building of America. In Virginia, this history was largely written by the United Daughters of the Confederacy, the organization that propagated the Lost Cause Narrative¹ as the true history of the South. A version of this narrative was taught in Virginia schools well into the last third of the 20th century. Moreover, through our program we hope to aid in reducing the inherent bias of schools where the teaching faculty does not reflect the racial makeup of the majority of students who attend them. These teachers have little or no connection to the lived experience of their students. By providing more focused information, we hope these teachers connect with the history of place rather than a history of the “other”.

With our teacher training program we will create a deeper relationship that provides teachers with direct access to Heritage Center research and resources. While our overall intent is to develop a curriculum that speaks more broadly to the history of African Americans regionally and nationally, we believe that Charlottesville’s local history, which we know best, is a microcosm of American history writ large. Our intent is to create a teacher curriculum where Charlottesville becomes a case study for embedding African American history into our state curriculum. Through research done in support of our permanent exhibition Pride Overcomes Prejudice, our oral history and

mapping projects conducted through our Isabella Gibbons Local History Center, the Jefferson School will provide teachers with direct access to the African American lived experience. A recent survey conducted with local teachers suggests that they also believe this to be a necessary element to the successful fulfillment of their teaching goals.

JSAAHC and CCS Partnerships
JSAAHC has partnered with CCS to integrate local history into social studies curriculum since 2011. Its first foray was to refine our exhibition based curriculum to meet the specific needs of an already established social studies curriculum for middle school students. At that time we also began to offer guided tours to area schools. In 2018, JSAAHC was part of a team of museum professionals that developed teacher resources to support a kindergarten curriculum. Through our Community Remembrance Project partnership with Albemarle County, we developed an essay contest where 175 11th grade students wrote essays about local history. In that same year, noted Civil War historian Kevin Levin, was brought to Charlottesville on two occasions to work with CHS teachers to prepare them to guide students in research needed to participate in our essay contest. In 2019, we are working with Albemarle County and Charlottesville City schools to help students to participate in 2020 Liberation Day celebrations. Our active 4-12 grade tour program, Trailblazers program and Veteran's Day program engage hundreds of CCS students each year.

In our local community the need for more informed teachers is also being addressed by Albemarle County and Virginia Humanities. The county recently announced its partnership with James Madison Montpelier to create its Reframing the Narrative initiative aimed at bringing more "diverse points of view" to how history is taught. And, for the last two years, the Virginia Humanities through their receipt of a Kellogg Teaching New Narratives grant, has held a Teaching New Narratives session that follows curriculum created by the Southern Poverty Law Center's Teaching Tolerance program.

Program Description
Virginia Governor Ralph Northam has convened a commission to audit Virginia’s standards of learning for equity and inclusion of the African-American experience in Social Studies education across the Commonwealth. The Commission is charged with reviewing Virginia history standards and the instructional practices, content and resources currently used to teach African American history in the commonwealth. As a member of this committee, Dr. Rosa Atkins will be collaborating to make

recommendations for inclusion of Black history in our standards. Two members of the advisory committee, Derrick Alridge and Anne Evans also serve on this Commission. In order to lead the way in these endeavors, it is critical for Charlottesville City Schools to take action now to prepare teachers to incorporate more inclusive narratives into their instruction.

According to a report from Teaching Tolerance, only 8% of high school students correctly identified slavery as the reason why the south seceded from the union in the run-up to the Civil War. Fundamentally, we continue to propagate a narrative that emphasizes progress and American exceptionalism at the expense of teaching and learning about “hard history.” According to Jelani Cobb,

The unwillingness to confront this narrative is tied ... to the reluctance to countenance anything that runs contrary to the habitual optimism and self-anointed sense of the exceptionalism of American life. It is this state-sanctioned sunniness from which the view of the present as a middle ground between an admirable past and a halcyon future springs. But the only way to sustain that sort of optimism is by not looking too closely at the past. And thus the past can serve only as an imperfect guide to the troubles of the present.

The 2019/2020 teacher training program pilot is directed at a 25 teacher cohort, over half of which will be drawn from the 129 instructors in the city of Charlottesville who teach social studies and reading. In subsequent years, we will expand to include teachers within the 70 mile radius served by the Heritage Center. The pilot will unfold in three phases. Phase I, conducted in direct partnership with Charlottesville Schools, creates a series of programs during the 2019/2020 school year that educates teachers about African American history from the Antebellum period to present day. In Phase II, these teachers participate in a one week intensive summer education program that immerses them more deeply into subjects addressed in the small groups meetings from a local perspective, and provides tools & resources that can be used in the classroom to further support student engagement. In the final phase of the pilot, teachers will meet with Heritage Center staff and with each other to evaluate efficacy of tools and developed resources.

Phase I: Overview CCS Changing the Narrative Program


A group of approximately thirty teachers and instructional coaches, K-12, will join a “Changing the Narrative” cohort in Charlottesville City Schools. This group will be doing preliminary work throughout the 2019-2020 school year facilitated by the Coordinator of Social Studies for Charlottesville City Schools and supported by Jefferson School education staff. Teachers will be meeting once a month after school to engage in professional learning experiences, including podcast/book studies, a critical examination of our current curricula using antiracism tools and frameworks, culturally responsive teaching methodologies, national frameworks for teaching “hard history,” field experiences at national historic sites, a Teaching Tolerance workshop in conjunction with Albemarle County Public Schools, and examination of the inquiry design (IDM) model for having students engage with compelling questions through a series of performance tasks. The work we do around local history will take place at the Jefferson School Summer Institute.

The purpose of this series of professional learning opportunities is to support teachers’ interests and efforts to learn more about and embed local history and culturally responsive pedagogy in their social studies curricula. Throughout the school year, teachers will further develop language and frameworks for having critical discussions and more accurate teaching and learning of history while addressing the legacies of racism, slavery, and inequity. Another anticipated outcome is that students will develop not only a more complex understanding of the past through the integration of multiple perspectives, but also a framework and mindset for seeking multiple perspectives and complex understandings as they encounter new content and their own community. In the context of public history, teachers and students will gain a deeper understanding of curriculum that encompasses multiple narratives and critical inquiry in order to develop greater efficacy in understanding themselves in the context of their community and global interdependence.

In the 5 months they meet, teachers will learn how to “change the narrative” in their Social Studies classrooms in order to tell the truth about the past and present, provide a full picture of history, and create cultural relevance and equity. This process will result in larger changes in the future in the direction of antiracism and equity.

Specifically, teachers will learn how to:

● have students explore counter-narratives.
● tie local Charlottesville history to student learning experiences.
● design experiences wherein students see themselves in the Social Studies content.
● have students grapple with “hard history.”
design inquiries for students that engage complexities of historical time periods and perspectives across content areas.

Timeline
The grant period will encompass Phase I and II of the timeline.

Phase I Cultural Bias training
Fall 2019
- Schedule teacher meetings to establish teacher advisory cohort
- Schedule student meetings with BSA, Avid, Youth Council and others to discussion potential desires for curriculum
- Teacher PD days focused on local history in September and November
- Create schedule in concert with social studies coordinator, meetings of Changing the Narrative teacher cohorts
- Convene two meetings of advisory committee to craft & review teacher curriculum
- Begin to work with museum experts to establish grade appropriate curriculum
- Establish teacher recruitment process

Phase II
Winter/Spring 2020
- Identify and hire area experts for teacher training
- Begin to create evaluation matrix for teacher preparedness program
- Continue to meet w/teacher reading group-offer 3 local history based sessions to teachers in cohort
- Recruit first teacher cohort of 20
- Identify childcare needs - establish partnership w/YMCA and Carver Recreation Center
- Define & refine evaluation tools for teacher training

Phase III Teacher training and curriculum development
Summer/Fall 2020 (June 8-15)
- Train teachers
- Assess program through teacher feedback
- Begin to develop process for teacher incorporation of new information into classroom work plans/curriculum
- Work with teacher cohort to effectively use established resource materials and tools to develop teaching plan
- Develop meeting schedule to allow teachers to hear successes and areas of rethinking
Project Outcomes and Evaluation

Our expected outcomes are as follows:

- Changes in teacher affect - teachers feel more empowered and confident to teach history
- An innovative program that results in teachers that are more aware of local history and feel a greater empathy for students whose lives are largely determined by this history
- Students have a more complex understanding of the past through the integration of multiple perspectives, but also a framework and mindset for seeking multiple perspectives and complex understandings as they encounter new content and their own community.

Evaluation of this project will incorporate both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Evaluation will include pre- and post- measurement of teacher and student knowledge of African American history. Teachers will report their relative confidence in before and after intervention. Teachers will report their use of this curriculum and resources within their classroom at intervals throughout the following year. Teachers will report the impact of the curriculum on their students.
Staffing
We have created an advisory group comprised of educators, local research practitioners, program evaluators, students, and parents who will guide the process in the first year, and beyond.

Program Manager is the main liaison between the advisory committee, JSAAHC education and digital humanities staff as well as school staff. The appropriate candidate demonstrates research and digital skills and content expertise in African American/American history of the Antebellum period through the late 20th century. The position reports directly to the Center’s Executive Director and is part of the Center’s education staff.

- The program manager will meet directly with City of Charlottesville Public Schools social studies coordinator and elementary/secondary instructional coaches to design personal development day programs as well as small book reads aimed at familiarizing interested teachers in broader African American history.
- The program manager will coordinate museum professionals from Monticello, Montpelier, University of Virginia Nau Center, and the Albemarle Charlottesville Historical Society amongst others, to create teacher resource guide.
- They will meet with JSAAHC education staff and area experts to develop curriculum for teacher training in Summer 2020 and conduct periodic evaluations of teacher progress leading up to training.
- The program manager will also work with advisory committee work teams to create content evaluation matrix
- Manages logistics of teacher training
- Works directly with Executive Director to secure program funding

Education Curator
The education curator leads our k-12 education program. They will act as lead content specialist for the program. They, along with the Digital Humanities fellow and other area specialists will develop teacher curriculum.

Digital Humanities Fellow
Primarily responsible for collecting of local history data. They will participate throughout the pilot period by engaging with individual classes and train teachers in the use of Zooniverse and ArcGis Storymaps.

Budget
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Curator</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Humanities Fellow</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Stipend</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care, YMCA</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care, Carver Rec</td>
<td>825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Stipend</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Material and Supplies</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost for Field Experiences</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Development</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$120,710</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background:

The Voter Registration Department is seeking approval for the transfer of $24,617.60 in previously appropriated capital improvement program funding for the purchase of new electronic poll books and software. These devices and software will replace existing laptops and software that are over 10 years old. The total cost for the purchase of this equipment and software is $44,290. There is currently a balance in the Voting Equipment C.I.P. project account in the amount of $19,762.40, the remaining funding ($24,617.60) will be provided for through the transfer of capital funds remaining from two previously appropriated technology projects that are now completed.

Replacing this aging technology with modern devices is essential in ensuring continued free, fair and accurate elections for Charlottesville voters. The upcoming Presidential Election year will bring a great deal of scrutiny onto local registrar offices. The replacement of outdated and deteriorating poll book equipment will contribute greatly to the efficiency and integrity of a high volume and heavily scrutinized election period. In addition, the technology will continue to serve the Voter Registration Department and voters of Charlottesville for the long term.

Discussion:

As our community continues to participate in the electoral process at historic levels, it is critical that the City provides sufficient infrastructure to support the demands of increasing voter turnout. The Charlottesville Office of Voter Registration and Elections has taken several steps to ensure that the appropriation of new electronic poll books combines high functionality, reliability and fiscal responsibility. The process of identifying the most appropriate digital tools has included extensive internal research, consulting jurisdictions throughout the Commonwealth, as well as extensive interviews with potential vendors. The local Electoral Board, Voter Registration Office management and staff viewed three comprehensive demonstrations from three vendors which are certified by the State Board of Elections - Evid/B.E.C., Poll Pad/Hart/Knowink and Advocate/DemTech. Software
as well as electronic poll book devices were presented. The Vendors were questioned regarding the
security, flexibility and customizable features of their products. In addition, questions were asked
about accommodating both the current Absentee Voting process as well as the Absentee No Excuse
Early Voting period which is set to commence during the November 2020 Presidential Election. The
Advocate/DemTech software and equipment was not only best suited to meet the Voter Registration
Department’s needs, but also the price quote was significantly lower than that of the other two
vendors. DemTech products also demonstrated the most flexibility in terms of security. We can
utilize encrypted device-to-device wi-fi features to expedite election setup. We can choose to hard
wire the electronic poll books in the precincts for tighter security. In addition to modern touch screen
technology, key boards can be attached to the DemTech electronic poll books. Given the wide
difference in both age and background of our election officers, the ability to utilize both familiar and
new technology was also an important factor to consider.

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:

Trust is a vital component of the relationship between City Government and the community. Trust
begins with citizens who feel well-represented in City Government and that the people who
represent them were elected fairly by a community with free access to the election process.

An Inclusive Community of Self-Sufficient Residents

Elections are fundamental in creating an inclusive community of self-sufficient residents. The more
citizens who participate in the voting process translates to more citizens who feel they have a voice
in government and their community. Citizens who trust and engage in the election process will be
more likely to respect the results of that process as well as City Government and each other.

Smart, Citizen-Focused Government

Transparent, fair and free elections are the foundation upon which all other government services
and aspirations are built. The quality of election administration is the cornerstone of a well-
managed community. This reassures citizens that their decision makers represent their
community with integrity and provides citizens with a vehicle to ensure accountability in the
democratic process.

Community Engagement:

Voting Equipment is often highly specialized. Security concerns can limit the amount of specific
information that can be released publicly. This being the case, many of the conversations
surrounding this purchase have taken place among election professionals. However,
Charlottesville voters have been interacting with this technology for the past ten years. Electronic
poll books are used to help election officers determine a voter’s eligibility to participate in a
particular election. Citizens of Charlottesville are participating in elections at historic rates as is
much of the rest of the country. As this trend continues, it becomes increasingly important for
citizens to feel confident in both the electoral process and electoral outcomes. If there are
irregularities or equipment failures – as are more likely with outdated equipment – public trust in
the election process erodes. Even if the public does not fully understand every aspect of the
election process, it is tremendously important that they are confident in it. Well-functioning
voting equipment contributes greatly to that trust and confidence.
**Budgetary Impact:**

No new funding is being appropriated. All funds will be transferred from funding previously appropriated in the Capital Improvement Program Fund.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval of resolution transferring existing capital funds for the purchase of Electronic Poll Books.

**Alternatives:**

Not approve the transfer of funds in which case new equipment could not be purchased. However, if outdated and deteriorating electronic poll books are not replaced it could lead to further equipment failures, which would hamper the ability to accurately check in voters and issue ballots. Extremely long lines at polling places and a significant increase in provisional voting would raise concerns regarding the integrity of the election process. An equipment failure during a high turnout Presidential election could bring national scrutiny and/or negative media attention. It is important to maintain public trust in elections (and the equipment used to run them) so that the community does not become skeptical or disengage with the process.

**Attachments:**

Resolution
RESOLUTION

Capital Funding Transfer for Purchase of Electronic Poll Books for the Office of Voter Registration and Elections

$24,617.60

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the funding for the purchase of Electronic Poll Books is hereby transferred in the following manner:

Transfer From:
$13,550.50  Fund: 426  WBS: P-00664  G/L Account: 599999
$11,062.10  Fund: 426  WBS: P-00666  G/L Account: 599999

Transfer To
$24,617.60  Fund: 425  WBS: P-00566  G/L Account: 599999
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### Background:
Upon Dr. Tarron Richardson’s appointment as Charlottesville City Manager, he has initiated a practice of requiring each City department to appoint a deputy director. Virginia Code Section 15.2-1502 authorizes a deputy to act as a substitute in matters in which the principal may act. The City Manager’s reorganization in 2019 including the appointment of a Deputy City Manager/Chief Operating Officer.

### Discussion:
The City Manager is appointed by the City Council and is vested with all executive and administrative authority for the City of Charlottesville. The Deputy City Manager/Chief Operating Officer may exercise the City Manager’s authority in their absence.

Mayor Walker believes that, in consideration of the authority that a Deputy City Manager/Chief Operating Officer exercises upon city affairs, the Council should approve a candidate before the City Manager hires someone for this position.

The proposed ordinance would allow the City Manager to continue to select the Deputy City Manager/Chief Operating Officer. However, similar to the Chief of Police, the City Council would need to vote to confirm a candidate as the Deputy City Manager/Chief Operating Officer before the City Manager could hire the individual to serve in the role.

The current Deputy City Manager/Chief Operating Officer, Letitia Shelton, would not be subject to the proposed ordinance. Any successor to the office would be subject to the proposed ordinance’s confirmation vote.

### Budgetary Impact:
None.

### Alternatives:
The Council could decline to adopt the proposed ordinance.

### Attachments:
Proposed Ordinance
BE IT ORDAINED by the Council for the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that:

Section 2-159 of Chapter 2 of the Code of the City of Charlottesville (1990) is enacted as follows:

Sec. 2-159. – Deputy City Manager/Chief Operating Officer.

The city manager, with the advice and consent of the city council, may appoint a deputy city manager/chief operating officer.
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**Background:**

In November 2018, the City approved a temporary pilot program to provide structure to the operation and use of Shared Electric Bicycles (e-bikes) and Electric Scooters (e-scooters) (collectively referred to as Dockless Mobility) in the public right of way. Interested companies were required to complete and obtain approval of a Permit Application for their fleet and agree to the approved Permit Program Regulations. The City received and approved applications from two operators: Lime (100 scooters and 40 electric bikes) and Bird (100 scooters). Lime began operation in December 2018 and Bird began in January 2019. After permit approval of these two operators, the City also received inquiries from Spin, Gotcha, Jump, and VeoRide. 

In March 2019, the General Assembly passed HB 2752, which gives localities the authority to establish regulations regarding e-scooters and e-bicycles. However, the new law allows the companies to operate free from regulation starting January 1, 2020 in the absence of any local ordinance or administrative action. 

In June 2019, City Council approved an extension of the pilot program through Dec. 18, 2019 to provide for additional outreach and education, as well as the development of recommendations for ordinance changes in response to new State legislation. Around that time, Bird stopped operations in the City.

Key takeaways from the pilot program include:

1. Deployment and utilization of e-scooters in Charlottesville has surpassed expectations with more than 200,000 scooter rides and 30,000 users with approximately 200,000 miles traveled and with a generally positive response from Charlottesville residents (users and non-users). This
indicates that dockless mobility provides a viable complement to the City’s transportation network increasing mobility options and possibly providing sustainability benefits.

2. There are specific challenges with the integration of dockless mobility devices with other street and sidewalk users that should be addressed in any permanent program. These include safety concerns from the standpoint of riders, pedestrians and drivers in Charlottesville, as well as concerns about parking impacts on sidewalk users, both of which point to the pressing need for public investment in more appropriate infrastructure (e.g. protected bike lanes for users of wheeled devices and wider, accessible sidewalks for pedestrians).

It is likely that the technology will endure and continue to evolve as businesses try to provide a product that responds to this transportation demand. This emerging means of transportation could become even more prevalent in the future and local measures will be needed to address the identified concerns. In light of the reality that dockless mobility devices are here to stay, staff proposes revisions to the City Code to respond to the recent changes in the Virginia Code and to incorporate the results of the Pilot evaluation. These revisions would amend existing provisions of the City Code regarding safe riding and parking of vehicles and would establish a new permit program for dockless mobility devices for hire to be administered by the City Manager.

Discussion:
In 2018, a number of communities across the US experienced private companies placing electric scooters on their streets and rights-of-way with no public notice and without authorization. In this service model, dockless mobility devices are owned and maintained by a private company offering short-term rentals of the devices for personal transportation. The rentals are controlled by smart phone app, and the devices may be picked up and dropped off anywhere in the service area defined by the company. These device rentals are part of an emerging transportation innovation, known as micro-mobility, that utilizes small, battery powered, low-speed devices for personal travel.

In an effort to get ahead of this trend, staff initiated a pilot project to test out a regulatory and operational framework for these new mobility options. City Council authorized the pilot at its November 5, 2018 meeting. Interested companies were required to complete and obtain approval of a Permit Application for their fleet (bicycles, electric bicycles (e-bikes), and electric scooters (e-scooters) are considered different modes) and agree to certain operating parameters including, but not limited to the following:

1. Up-front payment of a one-time pilot permit fee of $500 per mode per company, regardless of fleet size, plus $1/day/device for the duration of the program.
2. A fleet limited to a cumulative total of 200 vehicles between all permittees with an opportunity to expand the fleet by 25% based on performance standards. Electric bicycles were exempt from this maximum.
3. Safety features for all devices consistent with state regulations and standard practice.
5. Minimum age of eighteen (18) for riders of e-scooters and e-bikes.
6. Contact information and operations management from each company.
7. Outreach to low-income communities and reduced cost payment plans.
8. Provide device parking and use regulations to all users and require users to abide by those regulations.
9. Respond to customer and community complaints/issues in a timely fashion.
10. Provide monthly data to the City for staff analysis.

The City received and approved applications from two operators: Lime (100 scooters and 40 electric bikes) and Bird (100 scooters). Lime began operation in December 2018 and Bird began in January 2019. After permit approval of these two operators, the City also received inquiries from Spin, Gotcha, Jump, and VeoRide. Lime pulled their fleet of bikes in February and Bird left the Charlottesville area in June. Bird is not currently allowed to operate in Charlottesville, but staff recently approved a permit for VeoRide to operate 150 scooters and 50 e-bikes. To date, the City has operated with an average fleet size of 125 scooters (not including VeoRide’s operations).

In March 2019, Governor Northam signed legislation amending various provisions regarding e-scooters and e-bikes and making explicit a local governments’ ability to regulate services offered by private companies. The State’s legislation specifically requires municipalities to adopt an ordinance by January 1, 2020 if the municipality desires to prohibit sidewalk riding by motorized skateboards or scooters.

More than 200,000 trips were taken on for-hire scooters in Charlottesville during the first nine months of the Pilot (December 2018 through October 2019) on an average fleet of 125 scooters. Nearly 80,000 of these were taken between August and October 2019, demonstrating the growth potential for these devices. An unknown number of trips are currently being made on personally owned scooters, skateboards and other forms of micro-mobility as data on their use is not available. This growth in use and ownership offers new opportunities for local travel, potentially replacing daily automobile trips.

The initial intent of this program was to decide whether dockless mobility devices, such as scooters and electric bikes, should have a place within the City’s transportation context. However, the 2019 General Assembly actions require staff to reframe the question and ask how these devices can fit within the City.

During the initial consideration of this new form of mobility, staff identified a number of potential concerns. The following section outlines the initial concerns relayed in the Nov. 5, 2018 Council Memo, as well as data collected relative to those concerns, actions taken, lessons learned during the pilot program and recommendations for a future program:

**Concern #1: Riding on sidewalks** – As mentioned, they are battery powered (silent motor) and can go fast, especially for unsuspecting pedestrians. In 2019, the General Assembly updated Virginia Code Sec. § 46.2-903, to allow e-scooters on sidewalks unless prohibited from local ordinance. This is a change from when the pilot started. City Code Sec. 15-246, prohibits scooters from riding on the Downtown (DT) Mall only.
Pilot Findings - Despite regulations and technology in place to curb riding in places where it’s not allowed, sidewalk and DT mall riding is an issue. It is difficult to assess the exact rate of sidewalk riding due to the accuracy of the GPS on the devices. However, in an observational study conducted by City staff and UVA student researchers in spring 2019, nearly 30% of observed scooter rides were on sidewalks. In addition, 13% of survey respondents reported riding on the sidewalk as their preferred riding location. Users indicated that riding on the street feels unsafe, and that they switch to riding on the sidewalk when they feel blind corners, fast drivers, or other conditions that make it feel unsafe to share the road.

Data from the companies shows that 5.5% of trips passed through the DT mall and 1.5% stopped/start ed in the DT mall no-go zone. Sidewalk/DT mall riding accounted for 8% and 11% of complaints received respectively. To address this issue, staff worked with the companies to develop in-app messaging emphasizing the no-go zones, proper riding in bike lanes, and has installed temporary signage on the mall reminding users to “walk your wheels.” If the goal is to have 100% compliance, additional signage and enforcement resources will be needed, including fines for violation.

Program Recommendations: Revisions to the State Code Sec. § 46.2-903 as part of the 2019 General Assembly now allow the operation of scooters on motor vehicle travel lanes on local streets, as well as sidewalks and trails. Unless local ordinances with different rules are adopted beforehand, on January 1, 2020, scooters will be allowed unrestricted access to sidewalks under State law. Staff recommends updating City Code Sec. 15-246 to prohibit scooters from riding on the sidewalk.

Concern #2: Safety – Users must acknowledge they will abide by all traffic laws and wear helmets. Of course this doesn’t always happen. There is anecdotal evidence that head injuries are increasing in the communities where scooter systems are employed.

Pilot Findings - A number of communities have been evaluating the safety implications of scooters. A recent report by the Public Health and Transportation departments in Austin, Texas (in partnership with the Centers for Disease Control) reported nearly half of those hurt in e-scooter crashes sustained head injuries. The implication is that e-scooter head injuries are preventable with helmet use.

Of the complaints received, 11% had to do with lack of helmets. To evaluate helmet use, City staff and UVA student researchers observed 121 scooter riders during the spring of 2019. None of the riders wore helmets. An additional, 63% of survey respondents e-scooter users reported never wearing a helmet when riding, most of which stems from the spontaneous nature of most e-scooter trips. Despite the safety concerns, there is a clear distaste for mandatory helmet use from a large portion of those who submitted written responses. State law does not require helmet use for scooter or bicycle riders over the age of 14.

In Charlottesville, approximately 50 people have visited the UVA Emergency Department for scooter related injuries (data reported through October 15, 2019). This represents an injury rate of approximately 25 per 100,000 scooter trips taken (or .0025%). This is consistent with the
Austin (TX) Public Health Department Study conducted in association with the CDC that was published in April 2019, which noted an injury rate of 20 per 100,000 scooter trips. Of these local emergency department visits, approximately 10-15 of local injuries were considered severe and involved head injuries, reiterating the need for helmets on these devices. Results of the user survey indicated less than 5% of users reported to have had a crash on a scooter and 10% responded that they’ve had close calls.

Visibility and lighting have also been raised as a common safety concern, as well as the previously discussed issue of scooters riding on sidewalks and observed unsafe scooter riding (such as wearing headphones and double riding).

To address these concerns, City staff published rules, etiquette on a dedicated website, promoted proper scooting via social and news media and worked with the companies to communicate laws/rules/etiquette via in-app messaging. Despite these efforts, 20% of users responded that they did not know the laws or regulations in Charlottesville for e-scooter use. This fall, UVA created a video that was shared on social media to promote safe riding behavior and City staff worked with companies to promote in-app messages and install hang tags on the devices reminding users of the rules.

Program Recommendations: On-going safety messaging and development of appropriate infrastructure is critical to the safety of all roadway users. Staff will work with operators to improve customer communication about safety and ordinance changes. Staff will also ensure that the Dockless Mobility webpage is current to any new regulations. In addition, Staff will weave these concepts into safety and other messaging campaigns to raise public awareness about safe and proper use of Micro-Mobility Devices.

In response to stakeholder concerns about the safety of using Micro-Mobility Devices during evening hours or in certain locations where there may be a higher potential for conflict, staff proposes the ordinance provide the City Manager authority to address those concerns if necessary.

Speed limits are another issue that affect the safety of people using micro-mobility devices. Staff proposes that the City establish permit requirements to address the need for Micro-Mobility Devices to be operated at safe speeds that are consistent with the nature of the infrastructure being used and the other travelers sharing that space. Staff recommends setting the maximum speed to 15 mph for motorized skateboards or e-scooters while operating on streets or shared use paths. Electric power-assisted bicycles would be permitted to operate at up to 20 mph on streets and shared use paths.

In response to concerns about unsafe riding, the proposed ordinance clarifies where scooters can ride in the roadway, prohibits double riding, and headphone use.
**Concern #3: Scooters improperly parked** – Since this is a dockless system, scooters are required to follow certain parking restrictions, prohibiting parking near fire hydrants, curb ramps, and building entrances. However, they can be knocked over, moved or just incorrectly parked by the rider.

Pilot Findings - The nature of a dockless system has proven to increase ridership, both by using data to respond to demand and providing riders with the flexibility to leave their device at their destination. However, lack of designated parking areas creates concerns about visual clutter and the impacts on sidewalks which create barriers particularly for people with disabilities. Based on observational studies, 39% of scooters blocked pedestrian access and 4% were tipped over. Bird scooters tip more frequently than Lime. Among non-user survey respondents, blocking pedestrian access was a top concern (26%). In addition, blocking access represented 37% of complaints received by staff.

City staff published parking etiquette on a dedicated website, promoted a proper scooter parking video via social and news media and worked with the companies to communicate etiquette via in-app messaging.

Over the summer, staff installed designated scooter parking locations along the Water Street/West Main Street/University Ave corridor to encourage better parking in high demand locations. Lime has used these corrals consistently as deployment zones, but there is not sufficient data to assess whether the corrals are improving parking behavior.

To date, neither the City nor UVA have impounded vehicles that are damaged or improperly parked, though that could be a technique that is used if a dedicated staff person is hired.

Program Recommendations: Staff proposes that a new Code section is added to address the need for clear and enforceable guidance on the appropriate manner to park micro-mobility devices in a way that minimizes conflicts with other roadway and sidewalk users. The enforcement provision includes a $50 civil penalty for inappropriate parking consistent with state code.

In addition, staff will continue to work with operators to offer incentives for good parking and require that repeat bad parking offenders be penalized. City will continue to identify and act on opportunity areas for corral installation using revenues generated from the permit fees.

**Concern #4: Workload on local government employees** – Not surprisingly, the public addresses their concerns to local government officials. From our discussions with other localities, there is a flurry of complaints and questions within the first two weeks but as riders understand their responsibilities and residents understand how to contact the participating company directly, calls and complaints decline after the initial few weeks.

Pilot Findings – To date the City has received 220 complaints from 90 individual users. Additional complaints were sent directly to the companies. To date, we have not received the
exact number reported directly to the companies. While the volume of daily complaints directed to City staff has tapered off, dedicated staff time is needed to coordinate with the companies and regional partners, promote safety and low-income ridership programs, implement scooter parking areas, enforce riding/parking behavior, and further evaluate the program. Trying to shoehorn these responsibilities into current full-time staff workload has taken away from other daily responsibilities, including the development of safe infrastructure.

A large percentage of scooter trips start or end in the vicinity of UVA and a growing number of trips start/end in the urban areas of the County. City staff has worked closely with UVA to develop and monitor the program and worked with the County to establish no ride zones. However, each jurisdiction separately has spent considerable time adapting to this new form of technology and working individually with the operators to manage the program. This is a drain on staff time collectively. Recent conversations with the County have indicated that they will not be adopting an ordinance to regulate a program at this time. However, in order for dockless mobility to achieve shared goals of reducing single occupancy vehicle use and promoting more sustainable transportation options, the program should operate on a regional level and program staff could be used for this purpose.

Program Recommendations: Staff recommends hiring a full time employee that can work across jurisdictional boundaries to oversee this initiative (using the funds collected from permit fees). A dedicated staff person would help achieve the following:

1. Hold the providers accountable for their operational agreements, making the most of the providers’ reporting capabilities, and analyzing data to identify infrastructure, communication, and enforcement initiatives that could move the program toward the program goals.
2. Spend more time in the field, identifying and addressing improperly parked devices.
3. Focus the time invested by City and UVA staff to a single person dedicated to moving the program toward the program goals.

Lessons Learned

Technology

At the start of the pilot program, scooter companies assured staff that they had technology that could address some of the problems identified by local governments – such as “no go” geo-fencing (a virtual “fence” created around designated areas) that prohibits riding and parking in designated areas, ‘slow-go’ zones that can lower the speed of the scooter, and other technology. Staff quickly realized that these these technologies were evolving, but they are not guarantees and have required other interventions – such as signage and in-app messaging to communicate riding and parking areas. Additional encouragement and enforcement in key areas is needed if micro-mobility devices are to be excluded from designated areas.

In addition, staff understands that there are a number of tools under development by fleet operators to address issues such as helmet use, double riding, tip over technology, and driving under the influence. Staff supports the development and use of these innovative ways to address some of the concerns with scooter riding.
Program Recommendations: Staff recommends that geofences are created for “slow-go zones” in areas designated by the City and UVA with restricted speeds less than 5 mph. In addition, staff recommends creating “no parking” geofences. Staff also suggests that the operators maintain records of repeat offenders and ultimately deactivate accounts for such users.

Outreach
A successful program relies on the coordination between City staff, regional partners and individual companies to promote safe riding and encourage an equitable distribution of the fleet as well as a diverse user base. While regulations required that the companies undertake these initiatives, without the City leading the charge, companies do not appear to take the initiative to engage with local stakeholders to promote safety or their programs that promote diverse ridership.

Program Recommendations: Staff recommends hiring a full time employee that can work across jurisdictional boundaries to oversee this initiative (using the funds collected from permit fees).

Fleet Size
While the providers were approved for 250 devices in the City as part of the pilot extension, on any given day the fleet operates on average at about half that capacity. Limiting the fleet size has allowed staff to better understand the pros and cons of this new form of mobility, while trying to respond to the demands on the City’s limited right of ways. However, the limited fleet size has limited the level of service the City receives from providers and does not meet the current demand and equity goals of the program. Having a larger fleet would allow the City more flexibility to require that the companies have a certain percentage within designated areas without affecting the fleet resources needed to serve the areas with greatest demand.

In addition, the University of Virginia will be phasing out the U-bike Bike Share Program in May 2020, which will provide an opportunity for the region to think more holistically about micro-mobility transportation options. Increasing fleet size with a requirement to include electric bikes, will provide an opportunity for a more robust regional transportation system.

Program Recommendations: Staff understands that the right of way resources are limited and recommends that the City Manager have the authority to establish a maximum fleet size so as not to overwhelm City streets and sidewalks, but provide the opportunity to increase the fleet if performance standards are met. Staff also recommends continuing current incentives, such as providing a scooter “bonus” and waiving the per device permit fee, to encourage the operators to provide electric bikes.

Infrastructure
An overwhelming majority of survey respondents, 77%, indicated that their preferred riding location would be bike lanes in the street. Only 13% indicated they preferred riding on the
sidewalks. These findings suggest that, if there was better bicycle infrastructure, such as protected/separated bike lanes or shared use paths, e-scooter users would use it appropriately.

**Program Recommendations:** Staff recommends on-going data collection and analysis to help inform the infrastructure investments needed to create a safe system, while continuing to implement the recommendations contained in Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2015) and Streets that Work (2016).

**Data**
While both companies provide user dashboards that allow staff to monitor program trends consistent with the permit requirements, it took considerable effort for staff to access to the level of detail from both companies that would allow staff to conduct our own analysis of transportation trends for the program as a whole. This is due, in part, to concerns from the companies about providing staff with data that could divulge proprietary information. Finding a balance between the City’s commitment to providing open data that does not jeopardize proprietary information has proven challenging.

**Program Recommendations:** In the interest of monitoring and compliance, Staff proposes that an element of the Permit program specifically address the provision of data by Permit-holders to the City.

**Additional Concerns Not Previously Addressed**
- The life cycle and disposal of the devices
- As micro-mobility has evolved, there have been many questions about the environmental impact of the devices. Micro-mobility providers tout the reduction in carbon emissions. However, it’s clear that the process of making, charging, and transporting them is not emission-free. One study by NC State found that most scooters last only a month or two on the street. As part of the pilot extension, applicants were required to submit a description of the vehicle end of life process and sustainability plan (including battery disposal and recycling.” Current operators in Charlottesville reuse any salvageable parts and dispose of the batteries according to best practices.
  - Affordability and comparison to parking/transit prices
  - At current prices (which range between .15-.25/minute), the cost of the average micro mobility trip (5 minutes) is $2. This more expensive than a transit fare ($.75), but less than the cost of 2 hours of parking ($3.00) or an Uber for the same distance (approx. $8.00). Reliability appears to play an important role in the choice to use e-scooters with nearly 30% of survey respondents noting the primary reason for using an e-scooter was because it was the “fastest and most reliable.” About 15% of respondents claimed it was “less expensive” than other modes.

**Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:**
This program supports City Council’s Vision to be “A leader in innovation, environmental sustainability, and social and economic justice, and healthy race relations” through the following
vision statements “Economic Sustainability,” “Green City,” “America’s Healthiest City” and “Connected Community.” It can contribute to Goal 3 of the Strategic Plan, to be a beautiful and sustainable natural and built environment, and objective 3.3 to provide a variety of transportation and mobility options. The program also aligns with the goals of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (to explore bike share) as well as on-going discussions with the 2018 Comprehensive Plan to evaluate emerging technologies in transportation.

Community Engagement:

Staff has met with representatives from a variety of City departments, City schools, as well as with representatives from UVA Parking and Transportation and Office of the Architect to coordinate an approach that would effectively manage this new technology. In addition, staff has sought input from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee throughout the pilot program.

City staff created a website with program and safety information, an email address to collect feedback on the program, and worked to integrate scooters in the myCville reporting tool. To date we have received nearly 220 comments (via phone, email and myCville) and more than 4,500 visits to the website. Staff has also worked with the companies to coordinate opportunities to table at a variety of popular events.

In addition, as part of the outreach during the first phase of the pilot program, staff, in collaboration with a representatives from Lime and Bird, and a University of Virginia Master’s Planning Practicum (UVA DMG), developed and distributed an online survey targeted at users and non-users alike. The survey collection period ran from March 20 to May 1, 2019, and generated more than 3,100 responses.

The survey was distributed through the City of Charlottesville’s website, social media, and email lists, Bird and Lime’s mobile apps, the UVA DMG’s personal, professional, and academic networks, and through various tabling events in collaboration with Bird, Lime, and UVA Parking and Transportation.

Budgetary Impact:

One benefit of this program is that all capital equipment costs are covered by private vendors, with no public funds required, and the program provides a revenue stream via vendor permit fees to administer the program and improve infrastructure. During the first phase of the Pilot, permit fees generated $50,575. By the time the program ends in December, staff anticipates collecting a total of $72,750 in permit fees. Staff estimates that the 2019 Scooter Pilot Program Cost the City approximately $68,000 which includes over 2,000 staff hours to set up and administer the program, evaluation and data management costs, installation of scooter corrals and “Walk Your Wheels Signs,” and encouragement activities. This figure does not include staff time to administer or enforce this pilot program at UVA.

Staff recommends creating a position (using the funds collected from the permit fees) to administer the program for the region. This is needed to maintain lines of communication with the operators, implement a region-wide safety and outreach campaign (including outreach to
underserved neighborhoods), and on-going evaluation of the program. It is anticipated that this staff member would work with both the City and UVA to better manage the program across jurisdictions. Staff recommends establishing a permit fee that covers the costs to fully administer the program.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends that Council enact both of the proposed ordinances included as attachments. Attachment A would revise existing City Code provisions to address safe riding and parking of vehicles, including motorized scooters. Attachment B would establish a permit program for dockless mobility devices for hire and authorize the City Manager to administer the permit program.

**Alternatives:**
Council could refuse to adopt an ordinance, thereby allowing companies to operate in a largely unregulated manner within Charlottesville and in accordance with state code.

**Attachments:**
Attachment A. Proposed Ordinance Amending, Reenacting, and Recodifying Article VI of Chapter 15 (Motor Vehicles and Traffic) of the Code of the City of Charlottesville With Respect to the Use of Bicycles, Electric Power-Assisted Bicycles, and Motorized Skateboards or Scooters

Attachment B. Proposed Ordinance Amending Chapter 15 (Motor Vehicles and Traffic) of the Code of the City of Charlottesville to add Article X regarding a permit program for dockless mobility Devices for hire

Attachment C. June 17, 2019 Council Presentation – Update on Dockless Mobility
ATTACHMENT A.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING, REENACTING, AND RECODIFYING SECTIONS OF ARTICLE VI OF CHAPTER 15 (MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC) OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE WITH RESPECT TO THE USE OF BICYCLES, ELECTRIC POWER-ASSISTED BICYCLES, AND MOTORIZED SKATEBOARDS OR SCOOTERS

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that Article VI of Chapter 15 (Motor Vehicles and Traffic) of the Code of the City of Charlottesville is hereby amended and reordained as follows:

ARTICLE VI. — BICYCLES, ELECTRIC POWER-ASSISTED BICYCLES, MOTORIZED SKATEBOARDS OR SCOOTERS, AND MOPEDS

Sec. 15-240. - Riders subject to traffic laws, etc.

Every person riding a bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, motorized skateboard or scooter, or moped upon a street, roadway or other public vehicular area shall be subject to the provisions of this Code and the provisions of Code of Virginia, Chapter 8 (Section 46.2-800 et seq.) of Title 46.2, applicable to drivers of motor vehicles, unless the context of any such provision clearly indicates otherwise.

Sec. 15-241. - Required equipment for bicycles, electric power-assisted bicycles, and motorized skateboards or scooters.

(a) Every bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, and motorized skateboard or scooter, when in use between sunset and sunrise, shall be equipped with a lamp on the front which shall emit a white light visible in clear weather from a distance of at least five hundred (500) feet to the front and with a red reflector on the rear of a type approved for use on the highways of this state by the superintendent of state police, which shall be visible in clear weather from all distances from fifty (50) feet to three thousand (3,000) feet to the rear, when directly in front of lawful upper beams of headlights on a motor vehicle. A lamp emitting a red light visible in clear weather from a distance of five hundred (500) feet to the rear may be used in lieu of or in addition to the red reflector.

(b) Every bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, and motorized skateboard or scooter, when in use between sunset and sunrise, must be equipped with a taillight on the rear emitting a red light plainly visible in clear weather from a distance of at least 500 feet to the rear. Any such taillight must be of a type approved by the superintendent of state police.
(c) Every bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, and motorized skateboard or scooter, when operated upon a street or highway, shall be equipped with a brake which will enable the operator to make the braked wheels skid on dry, level, clean pavement.

Sec. 15-243. - Riding on roadways generally.

(a) Any person operating a bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, motorized skateboard or scooter, or moped on a roadway shall ride as close as practicable to the right curb or edge of the roadway, except under any of the following circumstances:

1. When overtaking and passing another vehicle proceeding in the same direction;
2. When preparing for a left turn at an intersection or into a private road or driveway; and
3. When reasonably necessary to avoid conditions including, but not limited to, fixed or moving objects, parked or moving vehicles, pedestrians, animals, surface hazards, or substandard width lanes that make it unsafe to continue along the right curb or edge.

(b) For the purposes of this section, a "substandard width lane" is a lane too narrow for a bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, motorized skateboard or scooter, or moped and another vehicle to pass safely side by side within the lane.

(c) Bicycles, electric power-assisted bicycles, and motorized skateboards or scooters may use bicycle lanes when operating in the intended direction of travel, and may use any shared use path in the City.

Sec. 15-246. - Riding and skating on sidewalks and the downtown mall.

(a) No person may ride a bicycle, an electric power-assisted bicycle, a motorized skateboard or scooter, or a moped on any sidewalk or other area designated exclusively for pedestrian traffic including, without limitation, the pedestrian mall area on Main Street between the Ninth Street bridge and Ridge-McIntire Road; provided however, that this prohibition does not apply to on-duty police officers and other uniformed emergency services personnel using the pedestrian mall. For the purposes of this section the terms electric power-assisted bicycle and moped shall have the meanings set forth within § 46.2-100 of the Virginia Code.

(b) No person shall ride or use rollerskates, rollerblades, skateboards, scooters, or similar devices on wheels or runners on the above-described pedestrian mall area on Main Street.

(c) Violations of this section will be subject to a civil penalty of not more than fifty dollars ($50.00).

Sec. 15-246.1 – Parking for bicycles, electric-power assisted bicycles, and motorized skateboards or scooters.
(a) No person may stand or park a bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, or motorized skateboard or scooter:

1. upon the street, other than upon the roadway against the curb, or in a corral marked and designated for the purpose;

2. upon the sidewalk, other than in a rack to support the vehicle, or attached to a street sign or light post, or at the curb or the back edge of the sidewalk;

3. where they would obstruct curb ramps, pedestrian access within bus stops, or fire access;

4. in, or upon, any public right-of-way, other than a street or sidewalk, except in a location specifically designated through signage or provision of racks.

(b) Bicycles, electric power-assisted bicycles, and motorized skateboards or scooters must be parked upright, in such a manner as to afford the least obstruction to pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

(c) Violations of this section will be subject to a civil penalty of not more than fifty dollars ($50.00).

Sec. 15-248. - Rider not to attach vehicle or himself to another vehicle.

No person riding upon any bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, motorized skateboard or scooter, or moped shall attach the same or himself to any other vehicle on the roadway.

Sec. 15-249. - Riding on handlebars.

No person riding a bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, motorized skateboard or scooter, or moped shall permit any person to ride on the handlebars.

Sec. 15-249.1 – Riding with more than one person on a motorized skateboard or scooter.

Motorized skateboards or scooters may not be used on a street, highway, or other public vehicular area by more than one person at a time.

Sec. 15-250. - Report of bicycle certain vehicle accidents.

It shall will be the responsibility of the rider to report any bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, and motorized skateboard or scooter accident involving bodily injury or damage of fifty dollars ($50.00) or more to the chief of police within forty-eight (48) hours of such accident. The chief of police shall must keep complete and retrievable records of all such accidents involving these vehicles bicycles. Such records shall must include the location and nature of the accident.

Sec. 15-251. - Disposition of unclaimed bicycles, mopeds, etc.
Where any bicycle, electric personal assistive mobility device, electric power-assisted bicycle, motorized skateboard or scooter, or moped has been found or delivered to the police department, and has thereafter remained in the possession of the police department, unclaimed, for more than thirty (30) days, and the property is not owned by a Dockless Mobility Business operating under a permit issued pursuant to Article X of this Chapter, such property may be disposed of as follows:

(a) In cases where a private person found and delivered the property to the police department, and requested to receive the property if it should remain unclaimed: if the location and a description of the property has been published at least once a week for two (2) successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation within the city (and, in the case of an electric personal assistive mobility device, electric power-assisted bicycle, motorized skateboard or scooter, or moped for which a license plate, tag or decal has been issued pursuant to section 15-39 of the City Code, if the record owner has been notified by mail at the address provided in the license application) then the property may be released to the finder;

(b) In all other cases the property shall be sold pursuant to section 20-59 of the City Code, or, at the option of the city, donated to a charitable organization.

For the purposes of this section the terms moped, electric personal assistive mobility device, and electric power-assisted bicycle shall mean and refer to the vehicles defined by those terms within § 46.2-100 of the Virginia Code.

Sec. 15-253. Unlawful to ride motorized skateboard or scooter while using earphones. — 15-270. Reserved.

No person may ride a motorized skateboard or scooter while using earphones on or in both ears. For the purposes of this section, “earphones” will have the meaning set forth in Va. Code § 46.2-1078.
ATTACHMENT B.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING AND REORDAINING CHAPTER 15 (MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC) OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE BY ADDING A NEW ARTICLE X ESTABLISHING A PERMIT PROGRAM FOR DOCKLESS MOBILITY DEVICES FOR HIRE

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that Chapter 15 (Motor Vehicles and Traffic) of the Code of the City of Charlottesville is hereby amended and reordained by adding a new Article X entitled “Permit Program for Dockless Mobility Devices for Hire,” which article will read as follows:

ARTICLE X. PERMIT PROGRAM FOR DOCKLESS MOBILITY DEVICES FOR HIRE

Sec. 15-445. Purpose and Persons Covered.

(a) Purpose. The purpose of this section is to establish a permit program to regulate the operation of Dockless Mobility Services for-hire within the City of Charlottesville, as defined below. The aims of the permit program shall be:
(1) to ensure that Dockless Mobility Services for-hire are carried on in a manner that is consistent with the health, safety, and welfare of the public, as well as consistent with the accessibility of public right-of-way for bicyclists, pedestrians, and people with disabilities;
(2) to reduce single occupancy vehicle use; and,
(3) to improve the overall mobility, safety, and equity of the City’s transportation network.

(b) Persons Covered. Any person who provides, or applies to provide, Dockless Mobility Service for-hire, as defined below, within the City of Charlottesville will be governed by the provisions of this Article.

Sec. 15-446. Definitions.

The following words and terms, when used in this section, will have the following meaning, unless context clearly indicates otherwise:

“Dockless Mobility Device” means a bicycle, electric power-assisted bicycle, or motorized skateboard or scooter, as those terms are defined in the Code of Virginia.

“Dockless Mobility Business” means any person that offers, or applies to offer, Dockless Mobility Devices for-hire by relying on the public right-of-way to store the Dockless Mobility Devices for customer access and use. Dockless Mobility Business does not include any transportation service operated by the City or any other political subdivision or agency of the Commonwealth of Virginia.
“Dockless Mobility Service” means the service provided by a Dockless Mobility Business.

Sec. 15-447. Permit Requirement.

No person may provide Dockless Mobility Services for public hire within the City of Charlottesville without obtaining a permit from the City Manager pursuant to this Article.

Sec. 15-448. City Manager Authorized to Promulgate Regulations.

The City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, will administer the permit program and will have the authority to promulgate regulations setting forth the requirements applicable to all persons applying for, or operating under, a permit issued pursuant to this Article. The City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, may establish reasonable fees, charges, and penalties in connection with the permit program, including, but not limited to, requirements for insurance coverage, bond payment, and indemnification.

Sec. 15-449. Maximum Fleet Size.

The City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, will have the authority to establish, modify, or eliminate a cap on the total number of Dockless Mobility Devices allowed to operate under this permit program.

Sec. 15-450. Review of Permit Applications.

(a) The City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, must evaluate each application for a permit under this program and notify the applicant in writing regarding the decision to approve or deny the application. In making such an approval or denial, the City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, may consider any established cap on the total number of Dockless Mobility Devices, aggregate demand for services, and any goal articulated in the City’s Comprehensive Plan or Strategic Plan.

(b) An applicant for a permit must request an initial allocation of Dockless Mobility Devices. The City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, may determine the initial number of Dockless Mobility Devices approved under the permit. The City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, may subsequently increase or decrease the number of approved devices under a permit for any of the reasons mentioned in Sec. 15-450(a) or in connection with the enforcement of any regulations promulgated pursuant to this Article.

15-451. Suspension or Revocation of Permits.

The City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, may revoke or suspend a permit for any violation of this Article or regulations promulgated pursuant to this Article.
15-452. Appeals.

The City Manager, or the City Manager’s designee, must establish an administrative process for any Dockless Mobility Business to appeal the denial of a permit application, the suspension or revocation of a permit, or any change in the number of approved devices under a permit.
In November 2018, Council approved temporary pilot program to evaluate dockless devices in Charlottesville.

Pilot is scheduled end on July 31st, 2019.

2 companies applied and were granted permits: Lime and Bird.

Lime began operations on December 10th, Bird began on January 10th.

Both companies are allowed 100 scooters (Lime + 40 bikes - no longer deployed).

Program Regulations

• 200 maximum dockless scooters
• Public Data Access
• Partnership with UVa
• No Go and Slow Go zones for the Mall and UVA
• Fee Structure - $500/permit, $1/day per device
• Low Income Program and Outreach
Key Findings

• People are engaged regarding the public right of way
• Pilot allowed for administrative changes and improvements
• Ridership is high and these devices seem to be filling a gap in short distance trips
• Bird and Lime are two distinct companies in many ways
### Key Statistics

**City & UVa**
- >115,000 rides
- ≈ 700 rides per day
- ≈ 20,000 unique riders
- 1M+ minutes of riding

**Rides & Parking**
- 17% of rides ended on corners
- 20% of rides ended in commercial corridor
- 5% of rides through DTM No-Go Zone
- 50% of rides ended in near UVa

**Travel & Safety**
- 5pm busiest time of day
- 8am slowest time of day
- ½ mile is trip avg.
- 32 ER visits reported
Complaints

- DT Mall, 11%
- Sidewalk Riding, 8%
- Helmet Use, 9%
- Private Property, 13%
- Vandalism, 1%
- Tipped Over, 4%
- Other, 17%
- Blocking Access, 37%

DT Mall, 11%
Sidewalk Riding, 8%
Helmet Use, 9%
Private Property, 13%
Vandalism, 1%
Tipped Over, 4%
Other, 17%
Blocking Access, 37%
Challenges

Initial Deployments

Technology

Others:

• Small Market
• Rider Education
• Equitable Deployment
City Efforts

• Permit Regulations
• Increased Signage
• Social Media/Communications
• In-app messaging
• Strong Collaboration with UVa
• User/Non-User survey
Survey Results

- Joint effort with UVA's School of Architecture - Planning Practicum
- Nearly 3,000 responses (3/19-5/19)

Have you ridden an e-scooter?

- Yes: 43%
- No: 56%
Survey Results

**Why e-scooters?**

- It was just for fun
- I don’t have a car
- Parking was difficult at that time or destination
- I didn’t want to get sweaty
- It was less expensive than other ways to get there
- It was the fastest and most reliable
- Other (please specify):
Survey Results

Primary Trip Purpose

- To commute to or from work
- To access public transportation (CAT, UTS, or JAUNT)
- To commute to or from classes or school
- To go shopping or perform errands
- To travel to or from a work-related meeting/appointment
- For fun/recreation
- To go to or from social/entertainment outings (restaurant, bar, movie theatre, etc.)
- Other (please specify):
Survey Results

Mode If Scooter Not Available?

- Walked, 55.74%
- Personal vehicle, carpool, or other motor vehicle, 16.15%
- Taxi or ridehailing (e.g. Uber, Lyft), 11.77%
- Public transportation (CAT/UTS/JAUNT/Park Connect), 6.61%
- Personal bike, 2.82%
- Uber, 0.29%
- I would not have made this trip, 6.32%
Survey Results

Comparing Non User vs User Perceptions

- Extremely positive, I see many benefits
- Somewhat positive, it could be a plus for the city
- Neutral, I am unsure about ridesharing bicycles and scooters
- Somewhat negative, I have some concerns about the situation
- Extremely negative, I feel that the situation is a failure
- Not sure

Non User vs User Perceptions
Survey Results

Do you want the program to continue?

- Yes, 47.57%
- Yes, BUT... 24.36%
- No, 28.07%

\( \frac{3}{4} \) of respondents want the dockless program to continue
Observational Studies

- **21%** Rode on Sidewalks
- **15%** Wore headphones
- **ZERO** Wore Helmets

Device Provider:
- Bird
- Lime

Observed Gender:
- Male
- Female

Device Provider:
- Bird
- Lime

Observed Gender:
- Male
- Female
Opportunities + Lessons Learned

• Active Program Management is needed
  • Increase data access
  • Outreach to UVA/users/community groups
  • Reduce barriers for low-income riders
  • Distribute fleet more equitably throughout the city
  • Technology + Infrastructure
Recommendations

- **Extend Pilot** through December 18, 2019 to plan for newly enabled state legislation
- **Increase fleet** (no more than 300 total scooters) to help with equity and distribution goals
- **Hire P/T staff** to...
  - Implement outreach campaign
  - On-going coordination with UVA
  - Refine regulations based on lessons learned
  - Evaluate program based on Comprehensive Plan goals
Questions? More Info?

www.charlottesville.org/dockless

Jason Ness
nessj@charlottesville.org
434.970.3717

Amanda Poncy
poncy@Charlottesville.org
434.970.3720
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Action Requested: Consideration of a Rezoning Application

Presenter: Matt Alfele, AICP, City Planner

Staff Contacts: Matt Alfele, AICP, City Planner

Title: ZM—19-00002 209 Maury Avenue

Background:

Landowner Southern Property, LLC has submitted an application seeking a rezoning of approximately (1.6) acres of land identified within City tax records as Tax Map and Parcel (TMP) 17-18, TMP 17-18.1, TMP 17-18.2, TMP 17-184, TMP 17-185, and TMP 17-186 (collectively, “Subject Property”). The Subject Property has frontage on Maury Avenue and Stadium Road. The application is proposing to change the current zoning of the Subject Property from R-2U (Two-family University) to R-3 (Multifamily) with Proffered Conditions (see below for proffered conditions). The Comprehensive Land Use Map for this area calls for Low Density Residential (15 Dwelling Units per Acres).

- On June 11, 2019 the Planning Commission provided a recommendation to City Council to rezone the Subject Property from R-2U (Residential two-family University) to R-3 (Multifamily) with a vote of 4 - 2.

- On July 9, 2019 the Planning Commission provided a recommendation to City Council to amend the 2013 Comprehensive General Land Use Map for the Subject Property from Low Density Residential to High Density Residential (application CP-19-00001) with a vote of 5 - 2.

- At the August 5, 2019 City Council meeting, the applicant presented new documentation (proffered conditions and a conceptual layout) effecting the rezoning application. City Council moved to send the rezoning request and comprehensive plan amendment back to Planning Commission to review the updated materials.

Below is a summary of the updated materials submitted by the applicant after the Planning
Commission made recommendations to City Council on **June 11th and July 9th**.

**June 11th and July 9th Submittal:** The applicant proposed a straight rezoning with no proffers or development plan. Planning Commission initiated a comprehensive plan amendment to insure the City’s Land Use Map would correspond with R-3 zoning.

**October 8th Submittal:** The applicant updated the rezoning request to include proffered conditions and a conceptual drawing, referenced in the proffer statement. The signed proffer statement can be found as **Attachment A**.

**Discussion:**

The Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on October 8, 2019 on this matter. During the discussion, Planning Commission raised the following:

- Concern about the preservation of the existing Eugene Bradbury designed home.
- Rezoning the subject properties to R-3 density could be increased providing more student housing closer to grounds. This could pull some students out of other areas of the City and open up more housing stock.
- The Planning Commission also initiated a Comprehensive plan land use map amendment to change the subject properties to “High Density Residential”. This would insure the land use map designation would match the corresponding zoning.
- Concern with some of the R-3 by-right uses that are not allowed in R-2U, such as Bed-and-breakfast and Public Health Clinic.

During the meeting the applicant presented an updated proffer statement that added an affordable housing requirement. After hearing the Commission concerns, the applicant orally amended his proffer statement per Section 34-64(b). The updated proffer statement (**Attachment A**) removed the words “to be constructed” from #5(a)(iii) and a #6 was added to remove some by-right uses.

**Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:**

If City Council approves the rezoning request, the project could contribute to **Goal 3: A Beautiful and Sustainable Natural and Built Environment, 3.1 Engage in robust and context sensitive urban planning and implementation**, and the City Council Vision of **Quality Housing Opportunities for All**.

**Community Engagement:**

On May 29, 2019 the applicant held a community meeting in the NDS Conference Room at City hall from 6:30pm to 8pm. No members of the public attended the meeting.

On June 11, 2019 the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on the rezoning request. No members of the public spoke.

On July 1, 2019 City Council held a Public Hearing on the rezoning request and two members of the public spoke against the rezoning.
On July 9, 209 the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on amending the comprehensive plan and six members of the community spoke and raised the following:
- Concern about the preservation of the existing Eugene Bradbury designed home.
- Rezoning the subject properties to R-3 density could be increased providing more student housing closer to grounds. This could pull some students out of other areas of the City and open up more housing stock.
- Concern about rezoning the subject properties without a development plan to review.
- The Planning Commission also initiated a Comprehensive plan land use map amendment to change the subject properties to “High Density Residential”. This would insure the land use map designation would match the corresponding zoning.

On September 18, 2019 the applicant held a Community Engagement meeting at CitySpace to review the new materials connected to the rezoning request. About eight members of the community attended and offered feedback to the applicant. Conservation of the home was the biggest concern.

In addition to the required Community Engagement meeting, the applicant also presented the rezoning request to the Fry’s Spring Neighborhood Association meeting on August 14, 2019.

On October 8, 2019 the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on this matter. Six members of the public spoke and voiced the following:
- Frustration that the applicant submitted an updated proffer statement during the meeting the public did not have an opportunity to review. The City should not be making piecemeal changes to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map. The City needs to finish work on the Comprehensive Plan and create a Housing Strategy.
- The neighborhood is stable and any change to the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Map could be detrimental to the stability of the neighborhood.
- The project be proposed is too large for the location and the proffers are not strong enough. The drawing presented is only a concept and not a site plan.
- The proffer protecting the existing manor house is not strong enough.

**Budgetary Impact:**

This has no impact on the General Fund.

**Recommendations:**

The Planning Commission took the following action:

Commissioner Stolzenberg moves to recommend approval of this application to rezone the subject properties from R-2U, to R-3 with amended proffers, on the basis that the proposal would service the interests of the general public and good zoning practice.
Mr. Solla-Yates seconded the motion

Mr. Lahendro, No
Mr. Solla-Yates, Yes
Mr. Stolzenberg, Yes
Mr. Heaton, Yes
Mr. Mitchell, Yes
Mrs. Green, Yes

The motion passed 5 – 1 to recommend approval of the rezoning application with proffers.

**Alternatives:**

City Council has several alternatives:

(1) by motion, approve the requested Rezoning with proffers as recommended by the Planning Commission using the following suggested motion:

   I move the adoption of the Ordinance included in our agenda materials, rezoning land as requested within ZM19-00002, based on a finding that the proposed rezoning is required by public necessity, convenience, general welfare, or good zoning practice;

(2) by motion, take action to deny the attached ordinance granting the Rezoning;

(3) by motion, request changes to the attached ordinance, and then approve the Rezoning; or

(4) by motion, defer action on the Rezoning.

**Attachments:**

A. Signed Proffer Statement Dated October 25, 2019
B. Rezoning Ordinance (starting on page 5 of this memo)
C. Link to the Staff Report and background information from the October 8, 2019 Planning Commission meetings:
   https://www.charlottesville.org/home/showdocument?id=66862
   (Staff report starts on page 31)
AN ORDINANCE
APPROVING REZONING APPLICATION ZM19-00002
A REQUEST TO REZONE LAND FRONTING ON MAURY AVENUE AND STADIUM ROAD FROM R-2U (TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, UNIVERSITY) TO R-3 (MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL) SUBJECT TO PROFFERED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

WHEREAS, in order to facilitate a specific development project, Southern Property, LLC (“Landowner”), by its member Charlie Armstrong, has submitted rezoning application ZM19-00002, proposing a change in the zoning classification (“rezoning”) of certain land fronting on Maury Avenue and Stadium Road, designated on 2019 City Tax Map 17 as Parcels 180, 180.1, 180.2, 184, 185, and 186 (collectively, the “Subject Property”), from “R-2U” to “R-3”, with said rezoning to be subject to several development conditions proffered by Landowner; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the rezoning application is to allow a specific development project identified within the proffered development conditions (“Project”) which will provide multifamily residential dwellings within the Subject Property and will preserve an existing structure of historic significance located within the Subject Property; and

WHEREAS, a joint public hearing on the proposed rezoning was conducted by the Planning Commission and City Council on October 8, 2019, following notice to the public and to adjacent property owners, as required by law, and following the joint public hearing, the Planning Commission voted on October 8, 2019 to recommend that City Council should approve the Proposed Rezoning for the Project; and

WHEREAS, this City Council has considered the details of the specific Project represented within the Landowner’s application materials for ZM19-00002; has reviewed the NDS Staff Report, public comments, the Planning Commission’s recommendation, and the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, this Council finds and determines that the public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice require the proposed rezoning; that both the existing zoning classification and the proposed zoning
classification are reasonable; and that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; now, therefore,

**BE IT ORDAINED** by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the Zoning District Map Incorporated in Section 34-1 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Code of the City of Charlottesville, 1990, as amended, be and hereby is amended and reenacted as follows:

*Section 34-1. Zoning District Map.* Rezoning all of the land designated on 2019 City Tax Map 17 as Parcels 180, 180.1, 180.2, 184, 185, and 186 (“Subject Property”), containing, in the aggregate approximately 1.6 acres (approximately 69,696 square feet), from R-2U (Two Family Residential, University) to R-3 (Multifamily Residential), subject to the following proffered development conditions (“Proffers”), which were tendered by the Landowner in accordance with law and are hereby accepted by this City Council:

**Approved Proffers**

The use and development of the Subject Property shall be subject to the following development conditions voluntarily proffered by the Landowner, which conditions shall apply in addition to the regulations otherwise provided within the City’s zoning ordinance:

1. The number and location of buildings and structures relative to Maury Avenue and Stadium Road, and points of ingress and egress to the Subject Property, may not be varied from the general or approximate location(s) depicted within the following drawing, titled “209 Maury Avenue Application Plan” by Mitchell Matthews Architects (the “Application Plan”):
Document referenced in proffer 1 “209 Maury Avenue Application Plan”
2. The majority of the area between Maury Avenue and the façade of the historic Manor House located on the Subject Property, currently having an address of 209 Maury Avenue, shall be maintained as open green space (grass lawn), landscaping with plantings, or a combination thereof, as generally depicted within the Application Plan. Stormwater management practices or treatments may be located within this area only if the appearance of this area is that of a grass yard with trees and shrubbery, as generally depicted within the Application Plan.

3. Prior to seeking a building permit for construction of any new building, structure or addition to the Manor House, the Landowner shall submit and obtain final approval of a site development plan covering the entire area of the Subject Property. The Landowner shall, as part of the final site development plan, include a landscape plan for the entire Subject Property which shall be prepared by a landscape architect. The landscape plan shall provide green space (grass lawn), trees and shrubbery in an amount, and in locations, generally consistent with the Application Plan.

4. The historic Manor House building located on the Subject Property, currently having an address of 209 Maury Avenue, shall, in perpetuity, (but excluding destruction by natural disasters, fires, or other unforeseen calamities) be maintained in good repair. Nothing herein shall restrict the owner of the Subject Property and/or its assigns from making reasonable and architecturally consistent additions or modification to the historic Manor House building located on the Subject Property.

5. Prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of any new buildings within the Subject Property, the Landowner will demonstrate that it has provided for construction of affordable dwelling units (“ADUs”), by one of the following means:

   a. For-rent ADUs will be constructed by Landowner on the Subject Property, as part of the Landowner’s development of the Subject Property. The gross square footage of the affordable units, in the aggregate, shall be at least fifteen percent (15%) of the aggregate habitable floor area of the buildings on the Subject Property. For-rent ADUs shall meet the definition of “affordable dwelling unit” in City Code 34-12(c), and the period of affordability shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of City Code 34-12(g); or
b. For-sale ADUs are under construction by Landowner at a site outside the Subject Property, at a location within the City of Charlottesville. If the Landowner constructs the ADUs, then the for-sale ADUs shall meet the definition of “affordable dwelling unit” in City Code 34-12(c), and the period of affordability shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of City Code 34-12(g). The number of off-site ADUs shall be fifteen percent (15%) of the total number of dwelling units within the Subject Property. At the Landowner’s option, if the Landowner conveys to Habitat for Humanity, by recorded deed, any off-site lot(s) for construction of the off-site ADUs pursuant to this proffer, then if any ADU lot(s) are so conveyed to Habitat then:

1. The ADUs on such off-site location(s) shall be deemed to be “under construction” as of the date of recordation of the deed of conveyance from Landowner to Habitat, containing the required ADU restriction; and

2. The Landowner shall provide the City with a binding commitment from Habitat for Humanity promising that, if any of the initial owners of the ADUs on the off-site location(s) sells or otherwise transfers ownership of the affordable dwelling unit to a person other than the Habitat for Humanity organization or a qualifying heir, within the first twenty (20) years following issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the unit sold or transferred, then Habitat will use any profit-sharing proceeds from the sale or transfer for construction of a replacement affordable dwelling unit within the City of Charlottesville;

Or,

c. Landowner shall make a cash contribution to the City’s affordable housing fund, which contribution shall be calculated as follows: (i) two dollars ($2.00) per square foot of the habitable residential floor area within the Subject Property.

6. The following land uses, currently generally allowed within the R-3 zoning district, shall be prohibited on the lot(s) within the Subject Property: Bed and Breakfasts (including both “Homestay” and “Bed-and-breakfast”);
Health clinic (up to 4,000 SF, GFA); Public health clinic; and Educational Facilities (elementary, high schools, and colleges and universities).

**BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED THAT** the City’s Zoning Administrator shall update the Zoning District Map to reflect this rezoning of the Subject Property subject to the proffered development conditions.
BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
IN RE: PETITION FOR REZONING (City Application No. ZM-19-00002)
STATEMENT OF FINAL PROFFER CONDITIONS FOR
TAX MAP 17, PARCELS 180, 180.1, 180.2, 184, 185, & 186.
Dated as of October 25, 2019

TO THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE:

The undersigned limited liability company ("Landowner") is the owner of land subject to the above-referenced rezoning petition ("Subject Property"). Through this rezoning request the Landowner seeks approval of a specific use described within an Application Plan accompanying the rezoning petition.

Pursuant to City Code §34-61 et seq., the Landowner seeks to amend the current zoning of the property subject to certain proffered development conditions set forth below. The Landowner proffers these conditions as part of the requested rezoning, and Landowner agrees that (i) the rezoning itself gives rise to the conditions, and (ii) the conditions have a reasonable relationship to the rezoning request. The Landowner agrees that if the Subject Property is rezoned as requested, the use and development of the Subject Property will be subject to the following voluntarily proffered development conditions:

The use and development of the Subject Property shall be subject to the following development conditions voluntarily proffered by the Landowner, which conditions shall apply in addition to the regulations otherwise provided within the City’s zoning ordinance:

1. The number and location of buildings and structures relative to Maury Avenue and Stadium Road, and points of ingress and egress to the Subject Property, may not be varied from the general or approximate location(s) depicted within the following drawing, titled “209 Maury Avenue Application Plan” by Mitchell Matthews Architects (the “Application Plan”):
2. The majority of the area between Maury Avenue and the façade of the historic Manor House located on the Subject Property, currently having an address of 209 Maury Avenue, shall be maintained as open green space (grass lawn), landscaping with plantings, or a combination thereof, as generally depicted within the Application Plan. Stormwater management practices or treatments may be located within this area only if the appearance of this area is that of a grass yard with trees and shrubbery, as generally depicted within the Application Plan.

3. Prior to seeking a building permit for construction of any new building, structure or addition to the Manor House, the Landowner shall submit and obtain final approval of a site development plan covering the entire area of the Subject Property. The Landowner shall, as part of the final site development plan, include a landscape plan for the entire Subject Property which shall be prepared by a landscape architect. The landscape plan shall provide green space (grass lawn), trees and shrubbery in an amount, and in locations, generally consistent with the Application Plan.

4. The historic Manor House building located on the Subject Property, currently having an address of 209 Maury Avenue, shall, in perpetuity, (but excluding destruction by natural disasters, fires, or other unforeseen calamities) be maintained in good repair. Nothing herein shall restrict the owner of the Subject Property and/or its assigns from making reasonable and architecturally consistent additions or modification to the historic Manor House building located on the Subject Property.

5. Prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of any new buildings within the Subject Property, the Landowner will demonstrate that it has provided for construction of affordable dwelling units ("ADUs"), by one of the following means:

   a. For-rent ADUs will be constructed by Landowner on the Subject Property, as part of the Landowner’s development of the Subject Property. The gross square footage of the affordable units, in the aggregate, shall be at least fifteen percent (15%) of the aggregate habitable floor area of the buildings on the Subject Property. For-rent ADUs shall meet the definition of “affordable dwelling unit” in City Code 34-12(c), and the period of affordability shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of City Code 34-12(g); or

   b. For-sale ADUs are under construction by Landowner at a site outside the Subject Property, at a location within the City of Charlottesville. If the Landowner constructs the ADUs, then the for-sale ADUs shall meet the definition of “affordable dwelling unit” in City Code 34-12(c), and the period of affordability shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of City Code 34-12(g). The number of off-site ADUs shall be fifteen percent (15%) of the total number of dwelling units within the Subject Property. At the Landowner’s option, if the Landowner conveys to Habitat for Humanity, by recorded deed, any off-site lot(s) for construction of the off-site ADUs pursuant to this proffer, then if any ADU lot(s) are so conveyed to Habitat then:
1. The ADUs on such off-site location(s) shall be deemed to be “under construction” as of the date of recordation of the deed of conveyance from Landowner to Habitat, containing the required ADU restriction; and

2. The Landowner shall provide the City with a binding commitment from Habitat for Humanity promising that, if any of the initial owners of the ADUs on the off-site location(s) sells or otherwise transfers ownership of the affordable dwelling unit to a person other than the Habitat for Humanity organization or a qualifying heir, within the first twenty (20) years following issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the unit sold or transferred, then Habitat will use any profit-sharing proceeds from the sale or transfer for construction of a replacement affordable dwelling unit within the City of Charlottesville;

Or,

c. Landowner shall make a cash contribution to the City’s affordable housing fund, which contribution shall be calculated as follows: (i) two dollars ($2.00) per square foot of the habitable residential floor area within the Subject Property.

6. The following land uses, currently generally allowed within the R-3 zoning district, shall be prohibited on the lot(s) within the Subject Property: Bed and Breakfasts (including both “Homestay” and “Bed-and-breakfast”); Health clinic (up to 4,000 SF, GFA); Public health clinic; and Educational Facilities (elementary, high schools, and colleges and universities).

WHEREFORE, the undersigned Owner(s) stipulate and agree that the use and development of the Subject Property shall be in conformity with the conditions hereinabove stated, and requests that the Subject Property be rezoned as requested, in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Charlottesville.

Respectfully submitted this 25th day of October 2019.

Owner: FMC, INVESTMENTS LLC
Owner’s Address: 142 S Pantops Dr
Charlottesville, VA 22911

By: [Signature]
Charles Armstrong, Member
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**Background:**
Pursuant to Virginia Code §15.2-2265, when a locality approves a subdivision plat and the plat is recorded within the Circuit Court’s land records, recordation of the plat operates to transfer legal title to all rights-of-way, easements or other interest of the City in the land identified on the plat as being dedicated for public use. However, the City is not required to accept ownership or maintenance responsibility for any improvements within the dedicated areas, for example: water, sewer or storm sewer mains, unless and until the City verifies that the improvements have been constructed within the public easements AND have been constructed in accordance with City standards.

Once a Developer records a plat and legal title passes to the City, a Developer may not subsequently “take back” [abandon, vacate, etc.] that easement except in accordance with applicable state statutes. As a general rule, City Council is required to take public action in order to dispose of any public interest in real property. Thus, in most instances—particularly after a developer begins to sell off lots within a subdivision—a developer cannot simply record new subdivision plats to “erase” public easements created by a prior subdivision plat. If a developer tries to do this, it can create problems in the chain of title to the City’s interests in real estate.

**Discussion:**
The Developer of the Lochlyn Hill Subdivision has had difficulty constructing utilities within the boundaries of recorded easements. Boundaries of easements have been platted and re-platted several times; in some of the re-plats, the Developer has referenced an easement as being “vacated” without first having obtained the approval of City Council. The Developer has been made aware of the problems this can create, but has pressed forward not wishing to be slowed down in the development process.

At this time two primary issues related to utilities remain outstanding:

1. for utility mains (water, sewer and storm sewer lines) that have been constructed, the Developer has not yet provided the City with accurate and complete as-built survey documents, to confirm that the constructed utilities are, in fact, located within the boundaries of easements that are of record within the City Circuit Court, and
(2) Developer has not yet recorded any deed(s) of easement establishing the terms and conditions applicable to the dedicated easement areas.

Within each of its subdivision plats, the Developer has consistently included a note putting individuals who purchase lots on notice that the Developer has reserved all easements shown on the plats that will be required by the City in order [for the City] to assume the maintenance responsibility for utilities constructed within the easements, and that the Developer has also reserved the right to vacate or revise any such easement provided the proper authority (City Council; Director of Utilities) agrees.

The City Attorney’s office is of the opinion that resolution of these two outstanding issues should be made conditions of any proposed vacation of public utility easements as requested by the Developer. These conditions are incorporated into the Proposed Ordinance attached to this Agenda Memo.

**Alignment with Council Vision Areas and Strategic Plan:**
N/A

**Community Engagement:**
A public hearing is required to be held by City Council on this request, pursuant to Va. Code §15.2-2272.

**Budgetary Impact:**
N/A

**Recommendation:**
Staff and the City Attorney’s Office recommend approval of the attached Ordinance. *(Note: on the last page of the Ordinance, there is a provision that waives the requirement for a second reading of the Ordinance).*

**Alternatives:**
City Council may decline to approve the Ordinance, or may edit the terms of the proposed Ordinance prior to adopting it.

**Attachments:**
Proposed Ordinance
ORDINANCE
CLOSING, VACATING AND DISCONTINUING
CERTAIN UTILITY EASEMENTS
WITHIN THE LOCHLYN HILL SUBDIVISION

WHEREAS, the developers of the Lochlyn Hill subdivision (“Developers”) have recorded one or more subdivision plat(s) within the land records of the Charlottesville Circuit Court for the Lochlyn Hill Subdivision (“Subdivision”); and

WHEREAS, within the various subdivision plat(s) the Developers have created certain easements for public utilities, and have dedicated the areas of land within those easements for public use (“Subject Rights-of-Way”), but the Developers have also attempted to vacate certain of those easements by recordation, or re-recordation of the various subdivision plat(s); and

WHEREAS, once the Developers began selling lots within the Subdivision, the City of Charlottesville’s right, title and interest in and to utility easements created by recordation of subdivision plat(s), and the boundary(ies) of those easements, may be extinguished or altered only in accordance with the provisions of Virginia Code §15.2-2265 and §15.2-2272; and

WHEREAS, the Developers have now made application to the City Council, requesting Council to vacate or relocate the boundaries of certain easements within Phases II and III of the Subdivision; and,

WHEREAS, landowners who own property adjacent to the Subject Rights-of-Way have been duly notified of the Petition, in accordance with Virginia Code §15.2-2272, and within each of the subdivision plats recorded by the Developers, the Developers, by notes on such plats, reserved the right to vacate or revise any easement depicted on the plats, and by such notes the lot owners purchasing from the Developers have also been put on notice that the easements may be vacated or revised; and,

WHEREAS, following notice to the public given in accordance with Virginia Code §15.2-2272 and 15.2-2204, and a public hearing by the City Council was held on December 2, 2019; and,

WHEREAS, this Council finds and determines that the Developer’s application should be conditionally granted;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia as follows:

(1) Within the Subdivision Plat titled “SUBDIVISION PLAT LOCHLYN HILL, PHASE II AND FUTURE PHASE III, BEING A BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT OF TMP48A-39 AND 48A-40 AND VACATING A PORTION OF AN EXISTING CITY 20’ SANITARY EASEMENT AND A STORMWATER MAINTENANCE AND ACCESS EASEMENT AS SHOWN HEREON CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA DECEMBER 20, 2015, MARCH 16, 2016 (REVISED) JULY 6, 2016 (REVISED) AUGUST 31, 2016 (REVISED)”, recorded within the land records of the Charlottesville
Circuit Court as Instrument Number 2016-00003811, City Council hereby vacates the following easements:


(2) Within the Subdivision Plat titled “PLAT SHOWING REVISED 20’ SANITARY SEWER EASEMENTS AND NEW 20’ STORM DRAINAGE EASEMENTS AND EXISTING STORM DRAINAGE EASEMENTS TO BE VACATED ACROSS LOCHLYN HILL, PHASE II, CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA, FEBRUARY 1, 2019, JUNE 21, 2019 (REVISED), NOVEMBER 6, 2019 (REVISED)” recorded within the land records of the Charlottesville Circuit Court as Instrument Number 2019-00004144, City Council hereby vacates the following easements:

Sheet 3 of 13: Drainage Easements (or portions thereof) labeled as “A” on Sheet 3 of 13 on the above-referenced Plat, such easements having been dedicated to the public on the 2016 subdivision plat recorded as Instrument 2016-00003811; and Drainage Easements (or portions thereof) labeled as “D” on Sheet 3 of 13 on the above-referenced Plat, such easements having been dedicated to the public on the 2016 subdivision plat recorded as Instrument 2016-00003811;

(3) And within the Subdivision Plat titled “LOCHLYN HILL, PHASE III, CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA JANUARY 11, 2019, APRIL 19, 2019 (REVISED), JUNE 3, 2019 (REVISED)” recorded within the land records of the Charlottesville Circuit Court as Instrument Number 2019-00002201, City Council hereby vacates the following easements:

Sheet 4 of 14: Drainage Easements (or portions thereof) labeled as “A, B, C, and D” on Sheet 4 of 13 on the above-referenced Plat; and a Waterline Easement (or portion thereof) labeled as “G” on Sheet 4 of 13 of the above-referenced Plat; and a Sanitary Sewer Easement (or portion thereof) labeled as “H” on the above-referenced Plat, such easements having been dedicated to the public on the 2016 subdivision plat recorded as Instrument 2016-00003811;

PROVIDED, HOWEVER, that the vacation of the foregoing easements is hereby made conditionally, and neither this Ordinance nor any related deed shall be recorded within the land records of the City, until the following conditions precedent have been satisfied:

1. Receipt by the City’s Director of Utilities of plans demonstrating the actual as-built locations, within the boundaries of non-vacated easements dedicated for public use, of all water, sewer and storm sewer mains to be operated and maintained by the City of Charlottesville;

2. Pursuant to the express language within each of the recorded subdivision plats for the Lochlyn
Hill Subdivision, reserving to the Developer all water, sanitary sewer and drainage easements that will be required by the City of Charlottesville to assume the maintenance responsibility for these utilities, and also reserving to the Developer the right to revise any easement on the plats provided the proper authority agrees: the Developer shall record one or more deeds of easement in favor of the City, setting forth the specific terms and conditions to which each easement is to be used and maintained by the City and by the individual lot owners whose lots are burdened by said easements. These Deeds of Easement shall be prepared by the City Attorney’s Office, subject to review by the Developer prior to recordation. The Developer shall cooperate with the City in reviewing and signing any such Deed(s) of Easement promptly upon request by the City Attorney’s Office; and

3. A period of 30 calendar days from December 2, 2019 has expired, and no appeal has been taken by any person from Council’s adoption of this Ordinance pursuant to Virginia Code §15.2-2272(2).

When the City Attorney has received evidence confirming that the foregoing conditions have been satisfied (a receipt giving the recorded instrument number(s) for the deeds of easement referenced in condition #2 shall constitute the required evidence that such condition has been satisfied), then the City Attorney shall prepare a Deed of Vacation referencing the easements to be vacated by this Ordinance, and will cause the Deed of Vacation and this Ordinance to be recorded within the land records of the Circuit Court of the City of Charlottesville.

In the event that this Ordinance and the related Deed of Vacation have not been recorded in the City’s land records within one (1) year after the date of approval of this Ordinance by City Council, then this Ordinance shall be void.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED BY CITY COUNCIL THAT the requirement within City Code Section 2-97 (for a two readings of an ordinance) is hereby WAIVED and this Ordinance shall be effective upon its adoption by Council without any requirement for a second reading.

Approved by Council
December 2, 2019

__________________________________
Clerk of Council
Background:

The City Manager’s Advisory Committee on Organizational Equity was charged to consider methods and models of assessing organizational equity, review internal and external profiles, and make policy, practice, process and investment recommendations to the city manager so that the city’s operations and impact match its stated values. The advisory was formed because the city seeks to adopt an intentional equity lens to understand how both internal and external operations contribute to inequity. The advisory’s report and recommendations were presented to council on August 19, 2019, at which time council requested cost estimates for implementation.

Discussion:

The committee concluded its work and presented recommendations on August 19, 2019. The results were two broad recommendations – Create an Office of Equity, Inclusion and Diversity, and prepare city staff and organizational context for culture change. A new Human Resources Director was hired in October 2019 and supports the committee recommendations within the following scope:

Recommendation #1: The hiring of an Equity & Inclusion leader this fiscal year and funding the operational budget for this office. The selected Equity & Inclusion leader will conduct an organizational assessment and determine a comprehensive strategy. The success of this initiative will be measured not by the number of activities performed, but by results and achievements championed by the organization over time.

Tactical Plan for Implementation:

1. Create the position of Equity & Inclusion Manager. The incumbent will provide expert level consultation and technical assistance to the City Manager, Deputy City Manager and Leadership Team with day to day supervision by the HR Director. This position will be responsible for executing the following:
a. Conduct a climate analysis survey and assess the organization’s readiness using the Diversity Development Continuum.

b. Charlottesville will want to maintain the public’s confidence that our services meet the diverse needs of our citizenry. The Equity & Inclusion leader will work with departments to develop comprehensive equity and inclusion plans with specific goals and timetables. These plans will be linked to the organization’s strategic plan, thus validating our efforts.
   i. These assessments will identify barriers and challenges that exist in our current processes which unintentionally exclude individuals, both internally and externally.
   ii. Policies and processes will be reviewed to guarantee services which provide equal access to meet diverse needs.

c. Design a robust learning program for the organization (based on the climate analysis results) centered around equity and inclusion. Identify external resources as experts in this field and establish those essential relationships.

d. Support a culture shift toward intentionally and actively welcoming and celebrating inclusion. The culture change is to be initiated by leadership and woven into the inclusion programs.

e. Initiate an Advisory Council that will report directly back to the City Manager. This team will be sponsored and supported, but not directed by HR. Members will apply for selection.

Recommendation #2: Building capacity among the leadership team to accept accountability for this initiative. As change is most effective when implemented top-down, leadership will demonstrate the desired behaviors and carry out the commitment for all employees to observe.

Tactical Plan for Implementation:

1. The Leadership Team will demonstrate the importance of equity and inclusion not only in the workplace but also service delivery. Describe diversity as an asset with value and worth, something to celebrate, not an issue to be dealt with.
   a. Support and participate in equity, diversity and inclusion programs.
   b. Be deliberate and intentional in recruiting and retaining diverse talent in our workforce.
   c. Evaluate personal biases through professional assessments and/or coaching.
   d. Recognize and make changes where our service delivery excludes individuals.
   e. Determine how this organization will measure equity and inclusion efforts and create a sustainable business case beyond the moral imperative and how it will be tied to organizational success.

The following chart illustrates the cost of these recommendations for the remainder of the current fiscal year as $113,596. The second part of the chart shows these costs annualized over an entire fiscal year with additional activity costs, totaling $210,192 for FY 21. Funding to continue in FY21 and beyond would need to be added to the City’s FY21 proposed budget for consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation #1</th>
<th>Associated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity &amp; Inclusion Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Jun 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 FTE (Est. salary $97,091)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (31%)</td>
<td>$48,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td>$15,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office needs, staff development, certification, training, etc.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL for FY20 (Jan – Jun 2020)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$113,596</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation #2</th>
<th>Potential Associated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff (based on above)</td>
<td>$127,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21 Operating budget</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Activity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Training for Leadership Team to evaluate personal biases through professional assessments, books, Lunch and Learn activities, books, discussion groups and other activities</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advisory Councils and Employee Resource Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FY21 Operating budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$210,192</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:**

These recommendations are strongly aligned with City Council’s Strategic Plan Goal #1: An Inclusive City of Self-Sufficient Residents, Objective 1.5: Intentionally address issues of race and equity.

**Community Engagement:**

Five members of the community participated on the City Manager’s Advisory Committee on Organizational Equity.

**Budgetary Impact:**

If the City Council agrees with and approves the recommendations, funding for the remainders of the FY20 is recommended to come from the Council Strategic Initiatives account. Currently there is $276,693.63 in funding remaining in that account. Approval of these recommendations would result in a remaining balance of $163,097.63.

Funding to continue these efforts in FY21 and beyond would need to be added to the City’s FY21 proposed budget for consideration.
**Recommendation:**

The City Manager and Human Resources Director recommend the adoption of these recommendations as written.

**Alternatives:**
N/A

**Attachments:**

Resolution
May 6, 2019 Report/Update on Committee’s Activities
August 19, 2019 Report and Recommendations
RESOLUTION
Implementing Recommendations from the City Manager to Address Organizational Equity
$113,596

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the sum of $113,596 is hereby allocated from currently appropriated funds in the Council Strategic Initiatives account in the General Fund to implement the recommendations from the City Manager on Organizational Equity.

$113,596 Fund: 105 Cost Center: 1011001000
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Background:

The City Manager’s Advisory on Organizational Equity was charged to consider methods and models of assessing organizational equity, review internal and external equity profiles, and make policy, practice, process and investment recommendations to the city manager so that the city’s operations and impact match its stated values. The advisory was formed because the city seeks to adopt an intentional equity lens to understand how both internal and external operations contribute to inequity. As an organization, we must create effective internal operations to ensure that:

- Our role as public servants is solution oriented and customer focused
- We become a community where black and brown babies are just as likely to be born safe and healthy as white babies
- All children are equally likely to be ready for school
- School is a place where all students can be successful
- We improve economic mobility and opportunity for families in poverty
- The systems that are meant to keep children safe do so in a culturally responsive way that keeps families together whenever possible
- Our justice systems are fair and equitable regardless of the color of your skin or the country in which you were born
- People enjoy many modes of safe accessible transportation to get out and about
- Everyone can enjoy clean air and water, green spaces and a healthy environment
- We work together to create safe and affordable housing for all
- People have access to the medical and behavioral health services they need

Membership

Cass Bailey  Lance Blakey  Andrea Douglas
Charlene Green  Paul Martin  Matthew Murphy
Kelli Palmer  David Saunier  Jordy Yager
Kaki Dimock, staff
**Discussion:**

**Process**

Prior to convening the committee, staff reviewed steps taken by other communities to evaluate internal, organizational equity including Multnomah County, Oregon; Portland, Oregon; Seattle, Washington; Austin, Texas; Asheville, North Carolina; Baltimore, Maryland; St. Louis Park, Minnesota, and Toronto, Canada and studied additional tools and processes recommended by the Racial Equity Institute, the Racial Justice Network, Annie E. Casey Foundation, The Kellogg Foundation, and the Government Alliance for Racial Equity. Internally, department directors were asked to complete an organizational equity assessment tool by January 2019.

The committee analyzed data on city employees by race, job category band, salary, and FTE status; reviewed equity tools used in other communities; reviewed the results of the internal organizational equity assessment; and considered recommendations for improving the city’s internal equity.

**City salary analysis & demographics data**

Salary data was obtained from the Department of Human Resources. The original data set contained information about 1,414 individuals. This data was “cleaned” to eliminate returning retirees, seasonal temporary workers, and employees who work less than 20 hours per week. This resulted in a dataset of 953 employees, upon which the following analysis is based.

The dataset included hourly salary, employment band, gender, and race, along with other information such as employment date, department, and pay scale level group and level. The following analysis is based on salary, band, race, and gender. Future analyses could include age and ethnicity.

**Racial Distribution of City Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees in Racial Groups By Human Resources ‘Band’</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50/83.3%</td>
<td>6/10%</td>
<td>4/6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>223/73.6%</td>
<td>58/19.1%</td>
<td>3/1%</td>
<td>2/0.7%</td>
<td>15/5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>176/83.8%</td>
<td>28/13.3%</td>
<td>4/1.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>211/58.2%</td>
<td>128/35.3%</td>
<td>13/3.6%</td>
<td>3/0.8%</td>
<td>7/1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>660/70.6%</td>
<td>220/23.5%</td>
<td>24/2.6%</td>
<td>5/0.5%</td>
<td>24/2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage and Distribution of Employees by Race by Human Resources ‘Band’</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Employee Demographics Compared to City Populations

Table 3 shows the overall 2017 population of the City of Charlottesville.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charlottesville Population</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48,019</td>
<td>33,561</td>
<td>8,984</td>
<td>3,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Source: US Census American Factfinder

Table 4 shows the demographic make-up the City’s employees, which is similar to the City population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Make-Up of City Employees</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of City workforce</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Salary Differences by Race

Table 5 shows the average hourly salary rate for all City employees by race and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Charlottesville Employees Average Salary</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>$24.50</td>
<td>$25.60</td>
<td>$21.31</td>
<td>$26.30</td>
<td>$22.49</td>
<td>$21.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$24.52</td>
<td>$25.79</td>
<td>$21.52</td>
<td>$33.87</td>
<td>$24.40</td>
<td>$19.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$24.48</td>
<td>$25.50</td>
<td>$21.14</td>
<td>$22.93</td>
<td>$19.64</td>
<td>$25.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Table 6 shows deviation from the average hourly salary rate for all employees by race and gender. Negative differences are shown in red.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviation from Average</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$1.29</td>
<td>-2.98</td>
<td>$9.37</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>-12.2%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>-4.29</td>
<td>$4.99</td>
<td>-3.81</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>-15.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Table 7 shows the average pay in each band by race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Pay by Band</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>$52.77</td>
<td>$52.06</td>
<td>$57.86</td>
<td>$54.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>$26.75</td>
<td>$27.33</td>
<td>$24.67</td>
<td>$32.31</td>
<td>$23.59</td>
<td>$23.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>$22.23</td>
<td>$22.29</td>
<td>$22.48</td>
<td>$19.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>$19.24</td>
<td>$20.26</td>
<td>$17.82</td>
<td>$17.64</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$18.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 shows deviation from average pay in each band. Negative differences are shown in red.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviation from Band Average</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-$0.71</td>
<td>$5.09</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1.02</td>
<td>-$2.08</td>
<td>$5.56</td>
<td>-$3.16</td>
<td>-$2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>-14.2%</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>-$3.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1.02</td>
<td>-$1.42</td>
<td>-$1.60</td>
<td>-$1.35</td>
<td>-$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

**Temporary Employees**

The City employs 471 temporary, seasonal, and substitute employees. These individuals work between 5 and 40 hours per week, with an average of 11.1 hours per week. Their average salary is $16.75 per hour. White temporary employees receive the highest average wage (17.29), 3.2% above the average wage for all temporary employees, while employees identifying as multiracial receive the lowest wage (14.76), 11.8% below the average wage for all temporary employees.

**Average Salary by Race for Temporary Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Multi-racial</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hours</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average wage</td>
<td>$16.75</td>
<td>$17.29</td>
<td>$15.72</td>
<td>$16.10</td>
<td>$16.40</td>
<td>$14.76</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

**Internal/Organizational Equity Assessment Tool**

Department directors were asked to complete an organizational equity assessment tool by January 2019. The committee reviewed responses to evaluate potential opportunities to expand promising practices across the organization and to assess the culture and context of departments. The following 14 questions were developed through review of tools engaged in other communities, drawing most heavily on those questions asked of departments in Austin, Texas:

1) Does the department have written equity goals and priorities? If yes, what are they?

2) Does the racial demography of the departmental staff reflect that of the community?

3) Does the racial demography of the departmental staff reflect that of the department’s primary customers or consumers?

4) Does your department routinely disaggregate data by race?
5) Are staff supported and evaluated in deepening knowledge and building skills around issues of white privilege, equity, inclusion, and developing culturally responsive services? If yes, how?

6) Do department staff routinely exhibit cultural competence in interactions with diverse groups? If yes, how do you know?

7) Is the department’s general environment and culture (food, art, holiday activities, etc) intentionally multicultural? If yes, provide examples.

8) Are people of color on staff specifically supported in identifying and participating in leadership development opportunities? How?

9) What strategies does the department employ to ensure departmental policies, practices, programs and investments do not adversely impact communities of color?

10) Describe any training your department has had or made available to staff in the last 18 months related to diversity, equity and inclusion.

11) Describe all opportunities your department offers consumers and customers to provide recommendations on policies, practices, programs and investments.

12) Does your department translate public documents for people with limited English proficiency and/or visual/hearing impairments?

13) What does your department do to understand the lived experience of members of marginalized communities?

14) Describe two new or additional things your department could do now to impact diversity, equity and inclusion goals.

**Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:**

The City Manager’s Advisory Committee on Organizational Equity’s work and recommendations are strongly aligned with City Council’s Strategic Plan Goal #1: An Inclusive City of Self-Sufficient Residents, Objective 1.5: Intentionally address issues of race and equity.

**Community Engagement:**

Five members of the committee are community members who have agreed to assist the city in its review of internal operations. Improving community engagement across the organization is a fundamental part of most municipal plans for improving equity.

**Budgetary Impact:**

This report is intended to serve as an update and therefore, has no immediate impact on the General Fund.
**Recommendation:**

Though the committee’s discussion continues, four broad categories of recommendations have emerged and include:

- **Implement** diversity, equity and inclusion best practices throughout organization with emphasis on Human Resources functions related to recruitment, hiring, and staff development activities

- **Create Office of Equity & Inclusion** to sustain the effort
  - Invest in staff to support these activities to include training and data evaluation
  - Support with staff and community advisory board

- **Consider using a formal equity impact assessment tool** to evaluate new programs, investments, practice changes, and policies based on equity and impact; incorporate as part of the council memo process

- **Establish meaningful and sustained community engagement strategies** at every level of the organization

The committee strongly advises that the city take steps to prepare city staff and leadership for future actions aimed at improving equity. These steps will help ensure that this effort has staying power, is meaningful, and engages all staff in the change process. Initial steps for this preparation include:

- **Identify and engage in training** so that all employees understand and can articulate why an equity-focus is necessary for this community
  - Groundwater Training by the Racial Equity Institute
  - Racial Sensitivity & Cultural Awareness by Dr. Ken Hardy
  - Undoing Institutional Racism

- **Identify internal policy changes** that support an emphasis on equity
  - Integrate departmental equity goals into strategic performance goals
  - Consider adding an equity component to performance appraisal tool

- **Create opportunities for safe and supported growth** among employees
  - Informal group discussion forums
  - Incentivized participation
  - Engage external facilitators

**Alternatives:**

N/A

**Attachments:**

Sample of Equity Impact Assessment Tools used in other communities.
Racial Equity Impact Assessment

What are Racial Equity Impact Assessments?
A Racial Equity Impact Assessment (REIA) is a systematic examination of how different racial and ethnic groups will likely be affected by a proposed action or decision. REIAs are used to minimize unanticipated adverse consequences in a variety of contexts, including the analysis of proposed policies, institutional practices, programs, plans and budgetary decisions. The REIA can be a vital tool for preventing institutional racism and for identifying new options to remedy long-standing inequities.

Why are they needed?
REIAs are used to reduce, eliminate and prevent racial discrimination and inequities. The persistence of deep racial disparities and divisions across society is evidence of institutional racism –– the routine, often invisible and unintentional, production of inequitable social opportunities and outcomes. When racial equity is not consciously addressed, racial inequality is often unconsciously replicated.

When should it be conducted?
REIAs are best conducted during the decision-making process, prior to enacting new proposals. They are used to inform decisions, much like environmental impact statements, fiscal impact reports and workplace risk assessments.

Where are they in use?
The use of REIAs in the U.S. is relatively new and still somewhat limited, but new interest and initiatives are on the rise. The United Kingdom has been using them with success for nearly a decade.

EXAMPLES OF RACIAL JUSTICE EQUITY IMPACTS

Equity and Social Justice Initiative
King County, WA
The county government is using an Equity Impact Review Tool to intentionally consider the promotion of equity in the development and implementation of key policies, programs and funding decisions.

Race and Social Justice Initiative
Seattle, WA
City Departments are using a set of Racial Equity Analysis questions as filters for policy development and budget making.

Minority Impact Statements
Iowa and Connecticut
Both states have passed legislation which requires the examination of the racial and ethnic impacts of all new sentencing laws prior to passage. Commissions have been created in Illinois and Wisconsin to consider adopting a similar review process. Related measures are being proposed in other states, based on a model developed by the Sentencing Project.

Proposed Racial Equity Impact Policy
St. Paul, MN
If approved by the city council, a Racial Equity Impact Policy would require city staff and developers to compile a “Racial Equity Impact Report” for all development projects that receive a public subsidy of $100,000 or more.

Race Equality Impact Assessments
United Kingdom
Since 2000, all public authorities required to develop and publish race equity plans must assess proposed policies using a Race Equality Impact Assessment, a systematic process for analysis.
Below are sample questions to use to anticipate, assess and prevent potential adverse consequences of proposed actions on different racial groups.

1. IDENTIFYING STAKEHOLDERS
Which racial/ethnic groups may be most affected by and concerned with the issues related to this proposal?

2. ENGAGING STAKEHOLDERS
Have stakeholders from different racial/ethnic groups—especially those most adversely affected—been informed, meaningfully involved and authentically represented in the development of this proposal? Who’s missing and how can they be engaged?

3. IDENTIFYING AND DOCUMENTING RACIAL INEQUITIES
Which racial/ethnic groups are currently most advantaged and most disadvantaged by the issues this proposal seeks to address? How are they affected differently? What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists? What evidence is missing or needed?

4. EXAMINING THE CAUSES
What factors may be producing and perpetuating racial inequities associated with this issue? How did the inequities arise? Are they expanding or narrowing? Does the proposal address root causes? If not, how could it?

5. CLARIFYING THE PURPOSE
What does the proposal seek to accomplish? Will it reduce disparities or discrimination?

6. CONSIDERING ADVERSE IMPACTS
What adverse impacts or unintended consequences could result from this policy? Which racial/ethnic groups could be negatively affected? How could adverse impacts be prevented or minimized?

7. ADVANCING EQUITABLE IMPACTS
What positive impacts on equality and inclusion, if any, could result from this proposal? Which racial/ethnic groups could benefit? Are there further ways to maximize equitable opportunities and impacts?

8. EXAMINING ALTERNATIVES OR IMPROVEMENTS
Are there better ways to reduce racial disparities and advance racial equity? What provisions could be changed or added to ensure positive impacts on racial equity and inclusion?

9. ENSURING VIABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY
Is the proposal realistic, adequately funded, with mechanisms to ensure successful implementation and enforcement. Are there provisions to ensure ongoing data collection, public reporting, stakeholder participation and public accountability?

10. IDENTIFYING SUCCESS INDICATORS
What are the success indicators and progress benchmarks? How will impacts be documented and evaluated? How will the level, diversity and quality of ongoing stakeholder engagement be assessed?
Background:

The City Manager’s Advisory on Organizational Equity was charged to consider methods and models of assessing organizational equity, review internal and external equity profiles, and make policy, practice, process and investment recommendations to the city manager so that the city’s operations and impact match its stated values. The advisory was formed because the city seeks to adopt an intentional equity lens to understand how both internal and external operations contribute to inequity.

Discussion:

The committee has concluded its work and has attached its final report and recommendations. There are two broad recommendations – prepare city staff and organizational context for culture change and create Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. The committee recommends that these efforts be concurrent.

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:

The City Manager’s Advisory Committee on Organizational Equity’s work and recommendations are strongly aligned with City Council’s Strategic Plan Goal #1: An Inclusive City of Self-Sufficient Residents, Objective 1.5: Intentionally address issues of race and equity.

Community Engagement:

Five members of the committee are community members who have agreed to assist the city in its review of internal operations. Improving community engagement across the organization is a fundamental part of most municipal plans for improving equity.

Budgetary Impact:

This final report includes recommendations which, if adopted, would have a financial impact on
the city. Staff will respond to direction to prepare an appropriation request.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommend adoption of recommendations as written.

**Alternatives:**

N/A

**Attachments:**

Final Report and Recommendations of the City’s Advisory Committee on Organizational Equity
City Manager’s Advisory Committee on Equity
Final Report & Recommendations

Introduction

The City Manager’s Advisory on Organizational Equity was charged to consider methods and models of assessing organizational equity, review internal and external equity profiles, and make policy, practice, process and investment recommendations to the city manager so that the city’s operations and impact match its stated values. The advisory was formed because the city seeks to adopt an intentional equity lens to understand how both internal and external operations contribute to inequity. As an organization, we must create effective internal operations to ensure that:

- Our role as public servants is solution oriented and customer focused
- We become a community where black and brown babies are just as likely to be born safe and healthy as white babies
- All children are equally likely to be ready for school
- School is a place where all students can be successful
- We improve economic mobility and opportunity for families in poverty
- The systems that are meant to keep children safe do so in a culturally responsive way that keeps families together whenever possible
- Our justice systems are fair and equitable regardless of your race or ethnicity
- People enjoy many modes of safe accessible transportation to get out and about
- Everyone can enjoy clean air and water, green spaces and a healthy environment
- We work together to create safe and affordable housing for all
- People have access to the medical and behavioral health services they need

The Advisory Committee embarked on an internal organizational equity assessment to understand the strengths of the city as an organization and identify opportunities for improvement. Using multiple methods to gather information, the committee developed a set of recommendations for city leadership to consider. These internally-focused recommendations were selected for their capacity to improve staff experience, knowledge and practice so that city services for the public are as equitable as possible. The committee acknowledges the need to understand equity through an intersectional lens and encourages the city to take steps to ensure that all voices and experiences contribute to the development of long-term strategies for inclusion. This committee focused its efforts primary on racial equality and equity. This perspective reflects an authentic understanding of this community’s recent traumatic history and its long and devastating legacy of slavery, racism and systems that support white advantage.

The City of Charlottesville has engaged in several projects that seek to understand and ensure equity including disproportionate minority contact studies of the juvenile justice system, the adult criminal justice system, and the child welfare system; and health disparity studies in the
MAPP process. In addition, the city has invested taxpayer funds to improve the experience and engagement of our community members, particularly the low-wealth African-American community, including the Black Male Achievement Project, the Office of Human Rights, the Dialogue on Race, Home to Hope, among others, and, recently, significant investments in the development and redevelopment of affordable housing. This committee’s focus on internal operations is intended to ensure that city culture matches this external commitment.

The committee analyzed data on city employees by race, job category band, salary, and F.T.E. status; reviewed equity tools used in other communities; reviewed the results of the internal organizational equity assessment; and considered recommendations for improving the city’s internal equity. The committee discussed internal processes for recruiting, developing, promoting and retaining staff; conducting employee performance evaluations; communicating throughout the organization; and engaging the community at large in service provision and decision-making. The committee concluded that a significant culture shift is required to evolve into an organization that intentionally and actively welcomes and celebrates inclusion. The recommendations that follow provide an initial roadmap to make this necessary culture shift.

We believe that an organization that prioritizes diversity, equity and inclusion creates an environment that respects and values individual difference along varying dimensions. In addition, inclusive organizations foster cultures that minimize bias and recognize and address systemic inequities, which, if unaddressed, can create disadvantage for certain individuals. This is not a human resources issue, it is a strategic issue. These efforts should be reflected in organizational mission, vision, and values; incorporated into strategic plans; and cascaded throughout the organization. Leaders must invest time, resources, and courage to make progress on creating an inclusive environment. (Independent Sector)

Membership
Cass Bailey, Trinity Episcopal Church
Lance Blakey, Charlottesville Fire Department
Andrea Douglas, Jefferson School African American Heritage Center
Charlene Green, Charlottesville Office of Human Rights
Paul Martin, UVA Batten School of Public Policy
Matthew Murphy, Charlottesville City Council
Mike Murphy, Convener, Charlottesville City Manager’s Office
Kelli Palmer, CFA Institute
David Saunier, Charlottesville Department of Human Services
Jordy Yager, Journalist
Kaki Dimock, Staff, Charlottesville Department of Human Services
Study of Equity Approaches in Other Communities

Prior to convening the committee, staff reviewed steps taken by other communities to evaluate internal, organizational equity including:

- Portland, Oregon – https://www.portlandoregon.gov/oehr/
- Austin, Texas – http://www.austintexas.gov/department/equity-office
- Baltimore, Maryland – http://www.equitybaltimore.org/
- St. Louis Park, Minnesota – https://www.stlouispark.org/our-city/race-equity
- Racial Equity Institute – https://www.racialequityinstitute.com/
- The Kellogg Foundation – http://www.racialequityresourceguide.org/

Staff found that many communities throughout the nation are engaging in the questions of equity and inclusion. Some approach the work by examining and improving the experience of consumers of city services, most notably, child welfare, policing, and criminal justice work. Others approach the work by examining and improving the experience of city employees as a way to improve the quality and impact of city services more broadly. Some local governments (Seattle, W.A.; Portland, O.R.; Multnomah County, O.R.) have adopted comprehensive equity plans that directly examine and impact all aspects of governing. Many local governments (Asheville, N.C.; Austin, T.X.) started this work by establishing an office of equity to champion local equity goals internally and externally and to signal their commitment to accomplishing these goals. Staff in these newly minted offices spoke consistently of the need to ensure the
appropriate level of staffing and funding in these office in order to conduct the work and meet expectations. In addition, staff learned that these offices should have regular access to executive leadership in order to follow through effectively on recommendations.

---

**A Leader’s Guide: Finding and Keeping Your Next Chief Diversity Officer**

**Resource**
Adequately resource the chief diversity officer

**Position**
Ensure that the chief diversity officer has regular exposure to the highest levels of the organization and there is a structure in place to support this

**Educate**
Arm your chief diversity officer with a deep understanding of your business and the types of challenges that you face.

**Define/Measure**
Define and align on what long term success looks like; improved metrics, better engagement survey results, stronger employer brand, etc. Ensure the chief diversity officer is genuinely empowered to affect change in those areas.

*Russell Reynolds & Associates*

---

Staff and committee members studied several tools in use by communities seeking to understand how potential policies, investments, and programmatic changes might adversely impact marginalized members or neighborhoods. These tools, identified as equity impact assessments, are employed much like an environmental impact assessment – they seek to identify who is impacted and how by any proposed change. For some communities, this constitutes a long, comprehensive evaluative process. For others, it is a series of questions that prompt decision-makers to consider community engagement and impact prior to drawing a conclusion. These organizations and communities have developed tools that may be revised or adopted for local use:

- [https://allincities.org/toolkit/racial-equity-impact-assessments](https://allincities.org/toolkit/racial-equity-impact-assessments)
Internal Organizational Equity Analysis

Department directors were asked to complete an organizational equity assessment tool by January 2019. The committee reviewed responses from transit, treasurer’s office, neighborhood development services, parks and recreation, economic development, human resources, fire, communication, public works, utilities, finance, social services and human services to evaluate potential opportunities to expand promising practices across the organization. The following 14 questions were developed through review of tools engaged in other communities, drawing most heavily on those questions asked of departments in Austin, T.X.:

- Does the department have written equity goals and priorities? If yes, what are they?
- Does the racial demography of the departmental staff reflect that of the community?
- Does the racial demography of the departmental staff reflect that of the department’s primary customers or consumers?
- Does your department routinely disaggregate data by race?
- Are staff supported and evaluated in deepening knowledge and building skills around issues of white privilege, equity, inclusion, and developing culturally responsive services? If yes, how?
- Do department staff routinely exhibit cultural competence in interactions with diverse groups? If yes, how do you know?
- Is the department’s general environment and culture (food, art, holiday activities, etc) intentionally multicultural? If yes, provide examples.
- Are people of color on staff specifically supported in identifying and participating in leadership development opportunities? How?
- What strategies does the department employ to ensure departmental policies, practices, programs and investments do not adversely impact communities of color?
- Describe any training your department has had or made available to staff in the last 18 months related to diversity, equity and inclusion.
- Describe all opportunities your department offers consumers and customers to provide recommendations on policies, practices, programs and investments.
- Does your department translate public documents for people with limited English proficiency and/or visual/hearing impairments?
- What does your department do to understand the lived experience of members of marginalized communities?
- Describe two new or additional things your department could do now to impact diversity, equity and inclusion goals.
The committee reviewed the written responses from department directors to understand what actions departments had already taken to address issues of equity and inclusion, and what resources or needs departments might have to advance these activities. The committee assessed these responses as inconsistent and uneven. Several departments had clearly taken steps to acknowledge the need to address equity and inclusion concerns, but others had failed to engage in any problem solving on the issue. Most departments did not routinely disaggregate data by race to understand service impact. Few actively sought to understand the lived experience of consumers and most maintained traditional feedback or community engagement methods, like suggestion boxes or comment cards, without a more concerted effort to hear authentic feedback. Finally, most departments acknowledged the lack of citywide training on racial awareness and sensitivity, intersectionality, or equity and inclusion best practices. It was clear that departments were in significantly different places and that significant work would be required to engage all departments meaningfully and effectively.

The results of the Mayor’s survey of staff opinions were additionally discussed to test whether the committee’s conclusions could be confirmed by this body of anonymous feedback from staff. Staff responses clearly reflect an interest in improved equity and increasing diversity among city employees.

More diversity among the staff and supervisors.

In my department, black employees are not paid or promoted the same as white employees. As a black supervisor, there are white supervisors with less time on the job are paid more than black supervisors.

Give equal advancement opportunity to all, with focus only on quality and the ability to perform.
Salary Equity Analysis

The committee conducted a preliminary salary equity study to understand whether city employees are compensated differently based on sex and race. Salary data was obtained from the Department of Human Resources. The original data set contained information about 1,414 individuals. This data was “cleaned” to eliminate returning retirees, seasonal temporary workers, and employees who work less than 20 hours per week. This resulted in a dataset of 953 employees, upon which the following analysis is based.

The dataset included hourly salary, employment band, gender, and race, along with other information such as employment date, department, and pay scale level group and level. The following analysis is based on salary, band, race, and gender. Future analyses could include age and ethnicity.

Racial Distribution of City Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees in Racial Groups By Human Resources ‘Band’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage and Distribution of Employees by Race by Human Resources ‘Band’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee Demographics Compared to City Populations

Table 3 below shows the overall 2017 population of the City of Charlottesville.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charlottesville Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: US Census American Factfinder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 shows the demographic make-up of the City’s employees, which is similar to the City population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Make-Up of City Employees</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of City workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary Differences by Race

Table 5 shows the average hourly salary rate for all City employees by race and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Charlottesville Employees Average Salary</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>$24.50</td>
<td>$25.60</td>
<td>$21.31</td>
<td>$26.30</td>
<td>$22.49</td>
<td>$21.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$24.52</td>
<td>$25.79</td>
<td>$21.52</td>
<td>$33.87</td>
<td>$24.40</td>
<td>$19.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$24.48</td>
<td>$25.50</td>
<td>$21.14</td>
<td>$22.93</td>
<td>$19.64</td>
<td>$25.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows deviation from the average hourly salary rate for all employees by race and gender. Negative differences are shown in red.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviation from Average</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>-$3.19</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>-$2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1.29</td>
<td>-$2.98</td>
<td>$9.37</td>
<td>-$0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>-12.2%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>-$4.29</td>
<td>$4.99</td>
<td>-$3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>-15.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows the average pay in each band by race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Pay by Band</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>$52.77</td>
<td>$52.06</td>
<td>$57.86</td>
<td>$54.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>$26.75</td>
<td>$27.33</td>
<td>$24.67</td>
<td>$32.31</td>
<td>$23.59</td>
<td>$23.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>$22.23</td>
<td>$22.29</td>
<td>$22.48</td>
<td>$19.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>$19.24</td>
<td>$20.26</td>
<td>$17.82</td>
<td>$17.64</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$18.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows deviation from average pay in each band. Negative differences are shown in red.

### Deviation from Band Average

**Table 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-$0.71</td>
<td>$5.09</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1.02</td>
<td>-$2.08</td>
<td>$5.56</td>
<td>-$3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>-14.2%</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>-$3.05</td>
<td>-$2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1.02</td>
<td>-$1.42</td>
<td>-$1.60</td>
<td>-$1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Temporary Employees

The City employs 471 temporary, seasonal, and substitute employees. These individuals work between 5 and 40 hours per week, with an average of 11.1 hours per week. Their average salary is $16.75 per hour. White temporary employees receive the highest average wage ($17.29), 3.2% above the average wage for all temporary employees, while employees identifying as multiracial receive the lowest wage ($14.76), 11.8% below the average wage for all temporary employees.

**Average Salary by Race for Temporary Employees**

**Table 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Multi-racial</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hours</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average wage</td>
<td>$16.75</td>
<td>$17.29</td>
<td>$15.72</td>
<td>$16.10</td>
<td>$16.40</td>
<td>$14.76</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee notes that this analysis is preliminary and offers more follow up questions than it does firm conclusions. However, it is clear that black employees generally earn less than their white colleagues in most roles and in most payband categories. City staff, as a whole and in general, represent the racial demography of the larger Charlottesville population except for those individuals identified by the broad designation ‘Asian’. In this case, only 2.8% of city staff are so designated compared to 7.8% of the general population. When the data is divided by the four primary payband designations – management, professional, protective, and technical – the distribution of staff by race changes. There are significantly fewer black employees represented in the management and protective paybands while black employees are disproportionately represented in the technical band. The salary data reveal that white and Asian employees earn above the average salary for city employees, and black employees earn less. Black employees
earn significantly less than the average salary in the professional and technical bands. The committee’s recommendations include additional professional data analysis to understand the extent of salary inequity more completely. The committee acknowledges that, while a salary equity study is a critical component of an organizational equity analysis, it does not illuminate the causes for any inequity found.

**Conclusion:**

After reviewing best practice approaches in other communities, assessing internal engagement around issues of diversity, equity and inclusion; and examining demographic distribution of city employees and salary equity, the committee identified the need for several internal structures to support the city’s growth and development in this area. These structures included a standing office and strategic goals around equity. The committee spent considerable time addressing the concern that these new structures would be insufficient without significant investment in changing the culture internally. As a result, the recommendations to follow include expectations for investment in staff education in the areas of racial awareness and sensitivity, understanding of white advantage and white privilege, and improving staff capacity to engage in challenging and uncomfortable conversations.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Prepare city staff and organizational context for culture change

1) Establish equity advisory team to shepherd the work
   a. Membership of 10-12
      i. City council membership (1 ex officio status)
      ii. City management/leadership
      iii. Staff
          1. Recruited based on level of interest and engagement
          2. Ensure representation from departments with the highest disparities
      iv. External partners & community members
          1. Seek participants with professional experience with equity, diversity, and inclusion
          2. Consider consumer representatives
          3. Consider individuals with deep understanding of Charlottesville’s history
          4. Consider including representatives from U.V.A. and Albemarle County office of diversity, equity and inclusion with ex officio status
   b. Committee hosted and staffed by City Manager’s Office and Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion leadership
   c. Human Resources Council subcommittee
      i. Internal task force to ensure meaningful implementation and accountability
      ii. Representation from every department, including line staff
      iii. Staffed by human resources director
      iv. Focus on problem-solving and guidance-giving
   d. Engage external facilitator for beginning
   e. Create benchmarks to guide city’s work
   f. Address salary study inequities
   g. Establish reporting schedule

2) Create equity goals & incorporate into city’s strategic plan
   a. Set council/senior leadership worksession on equity
      i. Introduction to Government Alliance for Racial Equity framework
      ii. Discussion of equity-based activities to date
          1. Juvenile Disproportionate Minority Contact Study
          2. Adult Disproportionate Minority Contact Study
          3. Child Welfare Disproportionate Minority Contact Study
          4. Citizen Review Board
          5. Affordable housing efforts
6. Home to Hope
7. Youth Opportunity Project
8. Community Connector
9. Minority Business incubator
10. Growing Opportunity Programs
11. Office of Human Rights
12. Implicit Bias training
b. Require departmental equity goals to match strategic plan
c. Join Government Alliance for Racial Equity as associate member
d. Select new human resources director based on knowledge, skills and expertise in diversity, equity and inclusion best practices

3) Engage in robust education for staff on issues of equity
a. External
   i. History of Charlottesville
   ii. Groundwater Training(s) from Racial Equity Institute using local data on metrics of well-being
   iii. Racial Awareness/Talking About Race/Understanding White Privilege, etc.
   iv. Create capacity for challenging dialogue with education on Difficult Conversations, Crucial Conversations, Critical Conversations, etc.

b. Internal
   i. Establish many supports for staff to engage in learning
      1. Cross-departmental learning cohorts
      2. Reading & discussion groups
      3. Train staff as facilitators of Everyday Democracy study groups to serve in other departments

Create Office of Diversity, Equity & Inclusion

1. Staffed to ensure capacity
   a. Director-reports to City Manager’s Office
   b. Data Analyst
   c. Community Engagement Coordinator
2. Authorized to influence policy and practice, authorized to implement goals of equity advisory team, human resources council, and City Manager’s Office
   a. Complete equity study and take steps to remedy
   b. Establish internal & external metrics with which to measure progress and impact
   c. Partner with HR performance expectations to include in performance appraisal
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d. Facilitate selection and implementation of equity impact assessment tool for council and senior leadership decision-making, part of council memo/report

e. Facilitate creation and implementation of best practice community engagement strategies across all departments

f. Lead use of equity auditing tool to ensure sustainability of effort

g. Identify and implement diversity, equity, and inclusion best practices across organization with an initial emphasis on Human Resources activities
Background:

On December 17, 2018, the County of Albemarle and the City of Charlottesville executed an inter-governmental memorandum of agreement (MOA) to redevelop the Levy Opera House and site located at 350 Park Street to serve as a co-located General District Court (GDC). The agreement has a number of provisions and specifically requires the City to provide the County with 90 parking spaces for their exclusive use in a new downtown garage to be constructed nearby and in operation by November 30, 2023.

Updates on both the General District Court project and the Parking Facility are provided below.

Discussion:

General District Court - A series of working groups have been created to ensure adequate input from all stakeholders and help guide the project forward. These include a project coordination team, a stakeholder team, a design team selection committee, a parking facility coordination team and an overall steering team for the project.

The GDC Design Team Selection Committee has drafted and issued an RFP for design services. The following have served on this committee on behalf of the City of Charlottesville: Mathew Quatara (Judge, Charlottesville GDC), Mary Trimble (Clerk of Court, Charlottesville GDC), Scott Hendrix, (Sr. Project Manager, City of Charlottesville). Proposals have been received from 10 firms and an initial short list of firms has been established. Formal interviews and negotiation, selection and contract execution should occur by January 2020. Design is expected to take 18 months after which bidding for construction and actual construction will begin.

7th Street Deck - The aforementioned MOA stipulates that the City will purchase the County’s one-
half interest of parcel #530159000 following the completion of a professional appraisal. An appraisal of the property prepared by the Appraisal Group, Inc. indicates a value of $2,560,000. Based on this appraisal, the purchase price for the parcel is $1,280,000. The parcel will be assembled with an adjoining parcel at 801 East Market Street, which was previously purchased by the City in 2016 for the purposes of increasing parking capacity.

In April 2019, the City engaged Kimley Horn (KH), a nationally recognized transportation-consulting firm, to conduct a Structured Parking Feasibility Study for the assembled property. Based on the dimensions of the site, traffic volumes in the area and current zoning, KH developed a conceptual design for a three-level parking garage wrapped in approximately 12,000 square feet of street front retail. This option is a full lot, single helix design that would provide approximately 300 parking spaces at a cost of $8.5M. The design also requires a small portion of 8th Street between the two parcels to be closed to allow an assemblage of sufficient size to accommodate the planned facility (This item will come to council at a future date for consideration). The design is allowed by-right under the current city zoning ordinance and has a height just below the permitted maximum of height of 45’.

As this project has been anticipated for a number of years, a funding allocation in the City’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) was initiated in FY18. These funds are included in the FY21 CIP and on July 1, 2020, $4.8 million is available to the project followed by $5.2 million in the following year.

The next step involves developing design/build documents and soliciting a firm to complete the work. Design is expected to take approximately 15 months and construction is expected to take 18 months.

In summary, the conceptual design can be constructed within the timeframe required by the agreement and within the allocated CIP funding. The schedule also allows the lease terms for the existing tenants currently occupying the buildings at the 801 Market Street location to conclude.

The enclosed resolution 1) directs the necessary funds for the purchase of the County’s portion of the jointly owned parcel, 2) directs the City Manager to authorize all necessary documents related to the closing and 3) directs staff to commence the project as outlined by Kimley Horn in the conceptual design referenced herein as Option C and dated April 2019.

**Alignment with Council Vision Areas and Strategic Plan:**

This action aligns with the Council’s Vision for a connected community that enables convenient transit supporting mixed-use development. This action aligns with the City Council’s Strategic Plan Goal Four: A Strong Diversified Economy.

**Community Engagement:**

The City and County both had significant engagement from the legal and justice system communities regarding the ultimate decision on where and how to expand the court facilities. The City’s purchase of property in support of this effort was done in accordance with public notice requirements. Moving forward both the General District Court facility and the Parking Structure projects will undergo review by all applicable bodies.

**Budgetary Impact:**
No new funding is being requested. The funds to purchase the County’s portion of the parcel ($1,280,000) would be transferred from funds that were previously appropriated into the CIP Contingency account.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval of the Resolution. The City will then have full ownership of the 0.417 acres of land which can be used to fulfill the obligations of the Memorandum of Agreement with Albemarle County regarding the General District Court Project.

**Attachments:**

Survey Plat (dated October 9, 2019) showing Parcel 530159000 to be Acquired
Conceptual Drawing of Parking Facility (Option C)
Proposed Resolution
RESOLUTION

Transfer CIP Contingency Account for Acquisition of Land at 701 East Market Street
$1,280,000

WHEREAS, on December 17, 2018, Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville
signed a memorandum of agreement to develop a joint court complex located at 350 Park Street
in downtown Charlottesville; and

WHEREAS, the agreement is premised on the City’s stated intention to construct a
parking structure on property owned jointly by the City and the County and adjacent property
owned solely by the City, both on East Market Street; and

WHEREAS, the agreement stipulates that the City will purchase the County’s one-half
interest of the jointly owned property following the completion of a professional appraisal; and

WHEREAS, the appraisal indicates the value of the County’s one-half ownership to be
$1,280,000;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of
Charlottesville, Virginia that funding for purposes of acquiring parcel #530159000 located at
701 East Market is hereby transferred in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer From;</th>
<th>$1,280,000</th>
<th>Fund: 426</th>
<th>WBS: CP-080</th>
<th>G/L Account: 599999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer To</td>
<td>$1,280,000</td>
<td>Fund: 426</td>
<td>WBS: P-01008</td>
<td>G/L Account: 599999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Manager is hereby authorized to execute,
on behalf of the City of Charlottesville, all necessary documents required in conjunction with
the aforementioned purchase of property; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City staff is directed to proceed immediately with
development of a parking structure as presented at this meeting, consisting of approximately 300
spaces and 12,000 square feet of street front commercial space, such that the timelines prescribed
in the memorandum of agreement can be met.

Adopted this _____ day of December 2019.
City of Charlottesville, Virginia

ATTEST:

____________________________  __________________________
CLERK OF COUNCIL                  MAYOR
OPTION C - LEVELS P2-P3

MARKET STREET & 9TH STREET - STRUCTURED PARKING FEASIBILITY STUDY
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA
APRIL, 2019
OPTION C - LEVEL P4
MARKET STREET & 9TH STREET - STRUCTURED PARKING FEASIBILITY STUDY
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA
APRIL, 2019
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Agenda Date: December 2, 2019
Action Required: Consideration of an application for a Special Use Permit
Presenter: Brian Haluska, Principal Planner
Staff Contacts: Brian Haluska, Principal Planner
Title: SP19-00006 – 218 West Market Street Special Use Permit request for a mixed-use building

Background:

L.J. Lopez of Milestone Partners, acting as agent for Market Street Promenade, LLC (owner) has submitted an application seeking approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP) for the property located at 218 West Market Street with approximately 145 feet of road frontage on West Market Street and 165 feet of road frontage on Old Preston Avenue. The proposal requests additional residential density up to 240 dwelling units per acre (DUA), pursuant to City Code Section 34-560 and additional height up to 101 feet, pursuant to City Code Section 34-557.

The applicant’s proposal shows a new mixed-use building on the entire development site (0.562 acres). The property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map 33 Parcel 276 (“Subject Property”). The Subject Property is zoned Downtown Mixed-Use Corridor with Downtown Architectural Design Control District Overlay and Urban Corridor Parking Overlay. The site is approximately 0.562 acres or 24,480 square feet.

Discussion:

The Planning Commission considered this application at their meeting on November 12, 2019. The discussion centered on the how the BAR’s review of the building would impact the overall density of the structure and whether the project would contribute to the City’s housing goals.

The staff report and supporting documentation presented to the Planning Commission can be found starting at page 54 at the following link: https://www.charlottesville.org/home/showdocument?id=67231

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:

The City Council Vision of Economic Sustainability states that, “The City has facilitated significant mixed and infill development within the City.”
The City Council Vision of Quality Housing Opportunities for All states that “Our neighborhoods retain a core historic fabric while offering housing that is affordable and attainable for people of all income levels, racial backgrounds, life stages, and abilities. Our neighborhoods feature a variety of housing types, including higher density, pedestrian and transit-oriented housing at employment and cultural centers.”

**Community Engagement:**

Per Sec. 34-41(c)(2), the applicant held a community meeting on October 3, 2019 (a City Planner attended as a NDS representative). Neighborhood concerns gathered from the community meeting are listed below.

- Parking impact in the surrounding neighborhood.
- The adjacent historic buildings and the need for care in working around this building during the construction of the new building.
- The impact of the additional height on the residential properties to the north.

The Planning Commission held a joint public hearing with City Council on this matter on November 12, 2019. Several members of the public spoke in opposition to the application, and raised concerns regarding:

- The impact of the increased density on parking in the neighborhood.
- The visual impact of the additional height, and the impact of the shade cast by the building.
- The appropriateness of the additional height on the west end of the Downtown Mall.
- The impact of the project on surrounding property values.

**Budgetary Impact:**

No direct budgetary impact is anticipated as a direct result of this special use permit.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the application be approved.

The Planning Commission voted 5-1 to recommend the application be approved. Commissioner Heaton was not present.

**Alternatives:**

City Council has several alternatives:
1. by motion, take action to approve the attached resolution (granting an SUP as recommended by the Planning Commission);
2. by motion, request changes to the attached Resolution, and then approve an SUP in accordance with the amended Resolution;
3. by motion, defer action on the SUP, or
4. by motion, deny the requested SUP.
Attachments:

(1) Proposed Special Use Permit, containing the conditions recommended for the approval of SP19-00006 by the Planning Commission on November 12, 2019.
RESOLUTION
APPROVING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT
FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT
218 WEST MARKET STREET

WHEREAS, landowner Market Street Promenade, LLC is the current owner of a lot identified on 2019 City Tax Map 33 as Parcel 276 (City Parcel Identification No. 330276000), having an area of approximately 0.562 acre (24,480 square feet) (the “Subject Property”), and

WHEREAS, the landowner proposes to redevelop the Subject Property by constructing a mixed use building at a height of up to 101 feet on the Subject Property, with retail space on the ground floor facing West Market Street, residential dwelling units at a density of up to 240 dwelling units per acre, and underground parking (“Project”); and

WHEREAS, the Subject Property is located within the Downtown Architectural Design Control District established by City Code §34-272(1) and contains an existing building that is classified as a “contributing structure”, and the City’s board of architectural review (BAR) has been notified of this special use permit application and the BAR believes that any adverse impacts of the requested additional height, the loss of the existing contributing structure, and the massing of the proposed building to be constructed can be adequately addressed within the process of obtaining a certificate of appropriateness from the BAR;

WHEREAS, the Project is described in more detail within the Applicant’s application materials dated submitted in connection with SP19-00006 and a preliminary site plan dated August 13, 2019, as required by City Code §34-158 (collectively, the “Application Materials”); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission and City Council conducted a joint public hearing, after notice and advertisement as required by law, on November 12, 2019; and

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the comments received during the joint public hearing, the information provided by the landowner within its application materials, and the information provided within the Staff Report, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed special use permit for the Project; and

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the Planning Commission’s recommendation, and the Staff Reports discussing this application, public comments received, as well as the factors set forth within Sec. 34-157 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, this Council finds and determines that granting the proposed Special Use subject to suitable conditions would serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare or good zoning practice; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that, pursuant to City Code §§ 34-557 and 34-560, a special use permit is hereby approved and granted to authorize a building height of up to 101 feet, and residential density of up to 240 dwelling units per acre, for the Project, subject to the following conditions:
1. The specific development being approved by this special use permit ("Project"), as described within the August 13, 2019 site plan exhibit submitted as part of the application materials, as required by City Code §34-158(a)(1), shall have the following minimum attributes/characteristics:

   a. Not more than one building shall be constructed on the Subject Property (the "Building"). The Building shall be a Mixed Use Building, containing residential and commercial uses in the percentages required by the Ordinance adopted by City Council on July 16, 2018 amending Article VI (Mixed Use Corridor Districts) of Chapter 34 (Zoning Ordinance) (relating to bonus height or density within mixed use zoning districts).

   b. The commercial floor area within the Building shall contain space to be occupied and used for retail uses, which shall be located on the ground floor of the Building. The square footage of this retail space shall be at least the minimum required by the City’s zoning ordinance or, if none, equivalent square footage in relation to the gross floor area of the Building as depicted in the August 13, 2019 site plan exhibit submitted as part of the application materials (subject to adjustment of the GFA, as necessary to comply with requirements of any COA approved by the BAR).

   c. Underground parking shall be provided within a parking garage structure constructed underneath the Building.

2. The mass of the Building shall be broken up to provide compatibility with the character-defining features of the Downtown Architectural Design Control District (City Code §34-272(1)), subject to approval by the City’s board of architectural review.

3. There shall be pedestrian engagement with the street with an active, transparent, and permeable façade at street level.

4. The Landowner (including, without limitation, any person who is an agent, assignee, transferee or successor in interest to the Landowner) shall prepare a Protective Plan for the building located on property adjacent to the Subject Property at 110 Old Preston Avenue ("Adjacent Property"). The Protective Plan shall provide for baseline documentation, ongoing monitoring, and specific safeguards to prevent damage to the building, and the Landowner shall implement the Protective Plan during all excavation, demolition and construction activities within the Subject Property ("Development Site"). At minimum, the Protective Plan shall include the following:
a. **Baseline Survey**—Landowner shall document the existing condition of the building at 110 Old Preston Avenue ("Baseline Survey"). The Baseline Survey shall take the form of written descriptions, and visual documentation which may include color photographs and video recordings. The Baseline Survey shall document the existing conditions observable on the interior and exterior of the Adjacent Property, with close-up images of cracks, staining, indications of existing settlement, and other fragile conditions that are observable.

The Landowner shall engage an independent third party structural engineering firm (one who has not participated in the design of the Landowner’s Project or preparation of demolition or construction plans for the Landowner, and who has expertise in the impact of seismic activity on historic structures) and shall bear the cost of the Baseline Survey and preparation of a written report thereof. The Landowner and the Owner of the Adjacent Property ("Adjacent Landowner") may both have representatives present during the process of surveying and documenting the existing conditions. A copy of a completed written Baseline Survey Report shall be provided to the Adjacent Landowner, and the Adjacent Landowner shall be given fourteen (14) days to review the Baseline Survey Report and return any comments to the Landowner.

b. **Protective Plan**—The Landowner shall engage the engineer who performed the Baseline Survey to prepare a Protective Plan to be followed by all persons performing work within the Development Site, that shall include seismic monitoring or other specific monitoring measures of the Adjacent Property as recommended by the engineer preparing the Protective Plan. A copy of the Protective Plan shall be provided to the Adjacent Landowner. The Adjacent Landowner shall be given fourteen (14) days to review the Report and return any comments to the Landowner.

c. **Advance notice of commencement of activity**—The Adjacent Landowner shall be given 14 days’ advance written notice of commencement of demolition at the Development Site, and of commencement of construction at the Development Site. This notice shall include the name, mobile phone number, and email address of the construction supervisor(s) who will be present on the Development Site and who may be contacted by the Adjacent Landowner regarding impacts of demolition or construction on the Adjacent Property.

The Landowner shall also offer the Adjacent Landowner an opportunity to have meetings: (i) prior to commencement of demolition at the Development Site, and (ii) at least fourteen (14) days prior to commencement of construction at the Development Site, on days/ times reasonably agreed to by both parties. During any such preconstruction meeting, the Adjacent Landowner will be provided information as to the nature and duration of the demolition or construction activity
and the Landowner will review the Protective Plan as it will apply to the activities to be commenced.

Permits--No demolition or building permit, and no land disturbing permit, shall be approved or issued to the Landowner, until the Landowner provides to the department of neighborhood development services: (i) copies of the Baseline Survey Report and Protective Plan, and NDS verifies that these documents satisfy the requirements of these SUP Conditions, (ii) documentation that the Baseline Survey Report and Protective Plan were given to the Adjacent Landowner in accordance with these SUP Conditions.
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Mr. Kevin Schafer of Design Develop, LLC, on behalf of the Chi Psi fraternity, has submitted a Special Use Permit (SUP) application for a fraternity house at 167 Chancellor Street (“Subject Property”). The Subject Property is zoned R-3H and is approximately 0.1380 acres. The General Land Use Plan calls for High Density Residential development. The Subject Property lies in the Corner Architectural Design Control District. Pursuant to Sec. 34-420, an SUP is being requested for a fraternity house with up to 16 residents. Additionally, modifications to yard regulations are being requested pursuant to Sec. 34-162.

In 1985, City Council approved a Special Use Permit to allow the use of the structures and properties at 165 and 167 Chancellor Street as a sorority complex with a maximum of 33 residents. The 1985 SUP also modified yard regulations for both properties by reducing the required front yard along Madison Lane. At the time of the 1985 SUP, both properties shared a single owner and a single use. This is no longer the case, and the sorority use at 165 Chancellor Street is expired and no longer valid. The application before you tonight only pertains to the fraternity use at the Subject Property (167 Chancellor Street).

The proposed fraternity use at the Subject Property is appropriate for the neighborhood. The Subject Property has been used as a fraternity or sorority for much of its roughly 100 year existence. A maximum of 16 residents is appropriate for the neighborhood and is just under half the number of residents allowed at 165 and 167 Chancellor Street by the 1985 SUP. Reasonable conditions have been recommended by the Planning Commission to mitigate any adverse impacts the proposed use will have on the neighborhood.

The Subject Property lies in an Architectural Design Control (ADC) District, so the Board of Architectural Review (B.A.R.) made a recommendation on this request. B.A.R. had no concerns about the modified yard regulations. B.A.R. also recommends that granting this SUP will NOT have an adverse impact on the Corner ADC District.
Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:

The project aligns with Charlottesville City Council Vision - 2025 by enhancing the City as A Center for Lifelong Learning. The project also aligns with Strategic Plan Goal 3: Beautiful Environment - Objective 3. Engage in robust and context sensitive urban planning and implementation.

Community Engagement:

The applicant held a Community Meeting for this application as required by Sec. 34-41(c)(2) on October 7, 2019, at the Subject Property (167 Chancellor Street). One neighborhood resident attended this meeting.

On October 15, 2019, the Board of Architectural Review held a hearing on this application. No members of the public spoke in favor of or against this application.

On November 12, 2019, the Planning Commission held a joint Public Hearing with City Council. One current fraternity member spoke in favor of this application and no members of the public spoke against this application.

Staff received no written comment from members of the public in favor of or against this application.

Budgetary Impact:

This has no impact on the General Fund.

Recommendation:

The Planning Commission took the following action:

Ms. Dowell moved to recommend approval of SP-19-00007 subject to the following conditions:

1. The fraternity house located at 167 Chancellor Street shall have a maximum of sixteen (16) residents. Any expansion of the fraternity house beyond sixteen (16) residents will require an amendment to this Special Use Permit.

2. 165 Chancellor Street: Special Use Permit approval for the land, buildings and structures located at 165 Chancellor Street to be used for a “boarding, fraternity and sorority house”, as that term is defined in City Code §34-1200 is expired and no longer valid. However, setbacks on this lot will remain modified as follows:

   a. Building setback (front), adjacent to Madison Lane: the required building setback along Madison Lane shall remain modified as shown on the site plan for 165 and 167 Chancellor Street approved on November 4, 1985.
3. **167 Chancellor Street**: The land, buildings and structures located at 167 Chancellor Street may be used for a “boarding, fraternity and sorority house”, as that term is defined in City Code §34-1200. The number of residents shall not exceed 16 at 167 Chancellor Street.

   a. **Building setback (front), adjacent to Madison Lane**: the required building setback along Madison Lane shall be 8 feet.

   b. **Building setback (corner side), adjacent to Chancellor Street**: the required building setback along Chancellor Street shall be 4 feet.

   c. **Building setback (side), adjacent to 165 Chancellor Street**: the required building setback along the property line shared with 165 Chancellor Street shall be 4 feet.

   d. **Building setback (rear), property corner adjacent to Chancellor Street and 165 Chancellor Street**: the required building setback from property corner adjacent to Chancellor Street and 165 Chancellor Street shall be 25 feet.

4. The “boarding, fraternity or sorority house” use approved by this special use permit, and (except as specifically modified within condition (2) and condition (3), above), all buildings and structures located on the Subject Property, shall comply with the provisions of City Code Sec. 34-353 and all other applicable provisions of Chapter 34 (Zoning) of the Code of the City of Charlottesville.

5. Bicycle storage facilities shall be provided at 167 Chancellor Street at a rate of one (1) bicycle storage facility per resident, and all such facilities shall be a type permitted by the zoning ordinance.

6. Sidewalk shall be extended along the frontage of Madison Lane as shown on the proposed preliminary site plan dated September 17, 2019.

7. Curb ramps shall be installed at the end of any proposed sidewalk on Madison Lane to align with the existing curb ramp on the east side of Chancellor Street.

8. The elevated sidewalk to the south on Chancellor Street must be repaired and vegetation cleared to remove obstructions. If this work is not done prior to requesting an updated Certificate of Occupancy for 167 Chancellor Street then the landowner shall provide a development agreement specifying the timing for completion of sidewalk work.

9. An accessible route from the public sidewalk to 167 Chancellor Street shall be required.

Ms. Green seconded the motion.

Mr. Lahendro, Yes
Mr. Solla-Yates, Yes
Ms. Dowell, Yes
Mr. Stolzenberg, Yes
Ms. Green, Yes  
Mr. Mitchell, Yes

The motion passed 6 – 0 to recommend approval of the SUP application to City Council.

**Alternatives:**

City Council has several alternatives following a public hearing:

(1) By motion, approve the requested SUP as recommended by the Planning Commission;  
(2) By motion, request changes to the attached resolution, and then approve the SUP; or  
(3) By motion, take action to deny the SUP; or  
(4) By motion, defer action on the SUP.

**Attachments:**

A. Resolution  
B. Link to the Staff Report and background information from the November 12, 2019 Planning Commission meeting:  
   [https://www.charlottesville.org/home/showdocument?id=67231](https://www.charlottesville.org/home/showdocument?id=67231)  
   (Staff Report begins on page 99)
RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZING A FRATERNITY HOUSE
AT 167 CHANCELLOR STREET FOR UP TO 16 OCCUPANTS

WHEREAS, pursuant to City Code §34-420, landowner Alpha Omicron of Chi Psi Corporation has submitted an application seeking to modify a special use permit previously approved in 1985, for the purposes of authorizing a “boarding, fraternity and sorority house”, as defined within City Code §34-1200, at 165 and 167 Chancellor Street (the proposed “Special Use Permit”); and

WHEREAS, the proposed Special Use Permit will apply to the land, buildings and structures located at 165 and 167 Chancellor Street (the “Subject Property”), which is further identified on 2019 City Tax Map 9 as Parcels 126 and 127 (City Parcel ID Nos. 090126000 and 090127000, respectively) and both lots are located within the City’s R-3 zoning district, subject to an historic district overlay (the Corner major design control district, per §34-272(6); and

WHEREAS, previously, on July 15, 1985 City Council granted a special use permit to authorize a “sorority complex” to be established at 165 and 167 Chancellor Street, consisting of two buildings: one, at 165 Chancellor, another at 167 Chancellor, together, having thirty-three (33) residents, total. The current owner of the land, buildings and structures located at 165 Chancellor Street (WADS Holdings, LLC) has confirmed in writing that it does not object to this application, which will update and modify the previously-granted special use permit as to both 165 and 167 Chancellor Street; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Special Use is generally described within written materials submitted in connection with SP19-00007, including: the application materials dated September 17, 2019, and related narrative; and a proposed preliminary site plan dated September 17, 2019 as required by City Code §34-158 (collectively, the “Application Materials”); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the Application Materials, and the City’s Staff Report pertaining thereto, and then, following a joint public hearing duly advertised and conducted by the Planning Commission and City Council on November 12, 2019, the Planning Commission voted to recommend that City Council should approve this proposed Special Use, subject to certain conditions; and

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the comments received during the joint public hearing, the Planning Commission’s recommendation, and the Staff Report, as well as the factors set forth within Sec. 34-157 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, this Council finds and determines that granting the proposed Special Use subject to suitable conditions would serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare or good zoning practice; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that, pursuant to City Code Sec. 34-420, the proposed Special Use is granted, subject to the following conditions:
1. The fraternity house located at 167 Chancellor Street shall have a maximum of sixteen (16) residents. Any expansion of the fraternity house beyond sixteen (16) residents will require an amendment to this Special Use Permit.

2. **165 Chancellor Street**: Special Use Permit approval for the land, buildings and structures located at 165 Chancellor Street to be used for a “boarding, fraternity and sorority house”, as that term is defined in City Code §34-1200 is expired and no longer valid. However, yard regulations for this lot will remain modified as follows:
   a. **Building setback (front), adjacent to Madison Lane**: the required building setback along Madison Lane shall remain modified as shown on the site plan for 165 and 167 Chancellor Street approved on November 4, 1985.

3. **167 Chancellor Street**: The land, buildings and structures located at 167 Chancellor Street may be used for a “boarding, fraternity and sorority house”, as that term is defined in City Code §34-1200. The number of residents shall not exceed 16 at 167 Chancellor Street.
   a. **Building setback (front), adjacent to Madison Lane**: the required building setback along Madison Lane shall be 8 feet.
   b. **Building setback (corner side), adjacent to Chancellor Street**: the required building setback along Chancellor Street shall be 4 feet.
   c. **Building setback (side), adjacent to 165 Chancellor Street**: the required building setback along the property line shared with 165 Chancellor Street shall be 4 feet.
   d. **Building setback (rear), property corner adjacent to Chancellor Street and 165 Chancellor Street**: the required building setback from property corner adjacent to Chancellor Street and 165 Chancellor Street shall be 25 feet.

4. The “boarding, fraternity or sorority house” use approved by this special use permit, and (except as specifically modified within condition (2) and condition (3), above), all buildings and structures located on the Subject Property, shall comply with the provisions of City Code Sec. 34-353 and all other applicable provisions of Chapter 34 (Zoning) of the Code of the City of Charlottesville.

5. Bicycle storage facilities shall be provided at 167 Chancellor Street at a rate of one (1) bicycle storage facility per resident, and all such facilities shall be a type permitted by the zoning ordinance.
6. Sidewalk shall be extended along the frontage of Madison Lane as shown on the proposed preliminary site plan for 167 Chancellor Street dated September 17, 2019.

7. Curb ramps shall be installed at the end of any proposed sidewalk on Madison Lane to align with the existing curb ramp on the east side of Chancellor Street.

8. The elevated sidewalk to the south on Chancellor Street must be repaired and vegetation cleared to remove obstructions. If this work is not done prior to requesting an updated Certificate of Occupancy for 167 Chancellor Street then the landowner shall provide a development agreement specifying the timing for completion of sidewalk work.

9. An accessible route from the public sidewalk to 167 Chancellor Street shall be required.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Special Use Permit approved by this Resolution amends and supersedes the special use permit previously approved by resolution dated July 15, 1985 for the buildings and structures located at 165 and 167 Chancellor Street.
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**Background:**

The City’s Standards and Design Manual (SADM) is an existing document that was adopted by City Council in 2008. The manual establishes design and construction standards for City projects and development projects throughout the City.

Since the adoption of the current SADM in 2008, there have not been any significant revisions, so the manual is out of date and does not meet the current needs of the City or the community. In December of 2016, City Council approved funding which allowed staff to proceed with the overhaul of the text of the current Standards and Design Manual. Through the procurement process and a Request for Proposal, Toole Design Group and RK&K collaborated to provide these services and were selected to assist the City in this effort. That contract was executed in August 2017. On October 15, 2018, a first draft of the manual was brought before Council. Staff was directed to conduct two more workshops to flush out outstanding concerns from stakeholder groups. Those workshops were conducted on June 13, 2019 and September 30, 2019.

The final manual, less the updated appendices, is available at [www.charlottesville.org/SADM](http://www.charlottesville.org/SADM).

**Discussion:**

One of the main goals of the SADM update was to incorporate the previously approved Streets That Work Plan, which defined street typologies and their associated characteristics. Other goals of the manual was to provide clear design expectations for development projects that impact the public right of way, clarify requirements for inspections, revise outdated construction details, provide a distinct reference to other governing agencies that influence the City’s infrastructure, such as VDOT, AASHTO, etc. Additionally, several new chapters were created such as a dedicated chapter on Environmental Sustainability, General Materials and Methods of Construction, Maintenance of Existing Infrastructure and Design Control Districts. These additional chapters will serve to provide guidance in areas that were previously vague or inconsistently applied.
The approach by the SADM team was first to conduct a series of workshops with City staff from various City departments who rely on the current manual (NDS, Public Works, Utilities, CAT, Parks & Rec, Fire, Police and the Attorney’s Office) to finalize an outline and establish the content that required revision. Following creation of a draft document, workshops were then held to give the public and stakeholders an opportunity to provide feedback and suggestions. A total of nine stakeholder groups were invited to participate in the process.

Much of the feedback that was received from the public and/or stakeholders was submitted via email sent to feedbackSADM@charlottesville.org, which is intended to remain active throughout the life of the manual. Of particular importance, it should be noted that the revised Standards and Design Manual is intended to be a living document and grow with the needs of the City. By maintaining a dynamic manual, it affords staff the opportunity to make adjustments as new technologies come about and continues to provide a mechanism for the receipt and incorporation of feedback and new ideas.

Work still to be performed on the SADM is the creation of checklists, construction details and specifications. This effort was held until the text of the SADM was completed, as the text of the manual drives the need for many of the details and specifications. Throughout the process of drafting the text of the manual, staff and the consultants have been compiling a list of existing construction details to revise, new details to create, new specifications, or supplemental specifications to VDOT’s standard specs.

**Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:**

This effort supports City Council’s Vision for A Green City and A Connected Community by maintaining a strong focus on environmental sustainability and stormwater management as well as a solid transportation network that offers effective multi-model uses.

**Strategic Plan Goal 3: Beautiful Environment**
- Goal 3.1 – The SADM implements urban planning by formalizing requirements of the Streets That Work Plan.
- Goal 3.2 – A primary function of the SADM is to ensure that reliable and high quality infrastructure are provided and maintained.
- Goal 3.3 – The SADM carries forward a strong focus on bike and pedestrian infrastructure including specific sections on ADA requirements and formally adopts PROWAG.
- Goal 3.4 – Three out of thirteen chapters are focused directly on protecting the environment and natural resources.
- Goal 3.5 – There is a chapter dedicated to design control districts to provide guidance for those working in those areas

**Strategic Plan Goal 5: Responsive Organization**
- Goal 5.3 – Having a current and detailed manual will provide the ability for staff to provide clear and consistent customer service for all aspects of development and community projects.

**Community Engagement:**

Staff has provided multiple opportunities for the public to provide input into the process. Prior to even selecting a consultant to assist in the effort, staff met with the Charlottesville Albemarle
Developer’s Roundtable to discuss opportunities with the upcoming changes and how feedback was to be received. The PLACE Design Task Force was also invited to review the Request For Proposal to help shape the scope of the project. In addition to the CADRE group and PLACE Design Task Force, stakeholders that were invited to participate in the process included the Tree Commission, City Council, the Code Audit/Streets That Work Advisory Committee, ADA Advisory Committee, Board of Architectural Review, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. A total of four (4) in-person workshops were conducted to provide opportunities for the public and stakeholders to provide feedback in June of 2018.

Additionally, feedback was received via an email address dedicated solely to the content of the SADM (feedbackSADM@charlottesville.org). On occasion, clarity was requested from those that provided feedback in order to properly inform changes to the draft manual. This email address is also intended remain active for the life of the manual and should be monitored periodically.

To date, nearly 800 comments of substantive nature were received, many of which contributed to positive changes to the final document. It should be noted that not all feedback was incorporated because it was either too general to result in an informed change, it violated a larger code requirement (state or federal), or was more geared towards a code, policy or operational change.

All comments received to date have been inserted into a spreadsheet on the City’s Engineering website where the manual is located. Responses to each of the comments is also included in the spreadsheet.

**Budgetary Impact:**

This has no impact on the General Fund. Funds used were previously allocated from year-end carryover funding of previous fiscal years.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends voting to approve the attached Resolution.

The Resolution has been drafted by the City Attorney’s Office, and it contains provisions allowing certain projects for which a proposed final site plan is currently under review to complete the review process under the old SADM provisions. The Resolution also clarifies that, going forward, modifications can be made by the City Engineer, with the concurrence of the City Manager and the City Attorney’s Office. It is advisable for the SADM to become a document that is adaptable, and we do not want to go for another decade without being able to be responsive to requests for consideration of new ideas or approaches; we want to be able to maintain the document as a “living document” over time. The City Attorney’s Office concurs with this, and has advised that this approach is correct, because City Code Sec. 2-154 vests the City Manager with general supervision and control of all streets, utility systems and public works.

**Alternatives:**

An alternate option is to not adopt the updated manual and continue to rely on the current (outdated) manual. The current manual is often unclear in the design expectation, does not
obviously document specific references for outside agency standards and is not conducive to implementing the goals of the Streets That Work Plan.

**Attachments:**

The final Standards and Design Manual is located at [www.charlottesville.org/SADM](http://www.charlottesville.org/SADM).

Attached hereto is a resolution to adopt the final manual for immediate implementation.
RESOLUTION
APPROVING AN UPDATED STANDARDS AND DESIGN MANUAL

WHEREAS, this City Council has provided for a set of design and construction specifications for public improvements and infrastructure, referred to within the City’s Subdivision Ordinance at City Code §29-140(6) and §29-141, and in various provisions of Chapter 10 (Water Protection), Chapter 28 (Streets and Sidewalks) and Chapter 34 (Zoning Ordinance) as the City’s “Standards and Design Manual” (SADM); and

WHEREAS, in 2017 the City commenced a process to review and update the contents of the SADM, which was originally approved by City Council in 2008 and had not received a comprehensive update since that time; and

WHEREAS, the text of the proposed updated SADM has been developed by the City Engineer in consultation with the departments and public officials referenced in City Code §29-61, and was made available for public review and comment, and many public comments have been incorporated into the SADM presented to this Council for approval;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville that the proposed updated Standards and Design Manual (2019), together with existing Appendices A through H, are hereby approved by City Council as the City’s official “Standards and Design Manual”, effective December 2, 2019 (collectively, the SADM approved by this resolution). In the event of any conflicts between the updated SADM text approved by this resolution and the contents of any existing Appendices, the updated text of the SADM shall be the controlling provision; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, consistent with the provisions of City Code §2-154, the City Engineer, with the approval of the City Manager and the concurrence of the City Attorney’s Office, may amend and update the SADM, or any appendices thereto. Any proposed amendment to the SADM or its appendices shall contain a specific revision date, and shall be posted on the City’s website for public information for at least ten (10) business days prior to being approved by the City Engineer and City Manager.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City Engineer shall have the authority to administer and interpret the provisions of the SADM, including, without limitation, the authority to issue technical bulletins or written interpretations of the contents of the SADM. This administrative authority shall be carried out subject to oversight by the City Manager or his or her designee, and subject further to the requirement that the Engineer’s findings and conclusions shall be official only with the concurrence of the City Attorney’s Office. Upon issuance of a technical bulletin or written interpretation containing the concurrence of the City Attorney’s office, the content of that document shall have the same weight of authority as the text within the SADM; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, notwithstanding the effective Date of December 2, 2019, the following may proceed using the SADM provisions in effect prior to December 2, 2019:
1. Development depicted within a final site plan approved prior to December 2, 2019;

2. Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA), South First Street Project (Phase 2);

3. Piedmont Housing Alliance, Friendship Court Redevelopment (Phase 1); and

4. Any common plan of development or sale, or an individual phase within such common plan, for which (i) a proposed final site plan was officially submitted on or after November 1, 2019 and (ii) that officially submitted plan satisfies all requirements necessary to be deemed final, per Va. Code §15.2-2261(A), on or before March 31, 2020.
605 Preston Place - Appeal of BAR decision to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) for a proposed 25-space parking lot in the rear yard of an Individually Protected Property (IPP).

Background:

605 Preston Place is an Individually Protected Property in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood Architectural Design Control (ADC) District. Built in 1857, Wyndhurst was the manor house of the 100-acre farm that is now the Preston Heights section of the city.

Property owner is appealing the Board of Architectural Review’s (BAR) October 15, 2019 denial of a CoA for a proposed 25-space parking at 605 Preston Place [Attachment 1. Applicant’s appeal].

The format for Council’s review of an appeal is: (1) Staff presentation of the BAR staff report; (2) Applicant presentation; and (3) BAR chair presentation of the BAR’s position.

The zoning ordinance requires that an applicant shall set forth, in writing, the grounds for an appeal, including the procedure(s) or standard(s) alleged to have been violated or misapplied by the BAR. In any appeal the City Council shall consult with the BAR and consider the written appeal, the criteria [standards for review] set forth within section 34-276 [Attachment 2. Criteria], as applicable, and any other information, factors, or opinions it deems relevant to the application.

At its June 18, 2019 meeting the BAR accepted the applicant’s request for deferral [Attachment 3. BAR action letter and staff report and Attachment 7. 605 Preston Place, June 2019 BAR submittal (5/28/2019)].

At its October 15, 2019 meeting, after reviewing the applicant’s resubmittal, the BAR voted to
deny a CoA [Attachment 4. BAR action letter and staff report and Attachment 8. 605 Preston Place, October 2019 BAR resubmittal (9/24/2019)].

On October 21, 2019 the applicant formally appealed the BAR’s October 15, 2019 decision.

**Discussion:**

In denying this CoA request, the BAR cited the Architectural Design Control District Guidelines for Site Design and Elements (Chapter II). The BAR noted the direction provided in the Introduction (section A): “The relationship between a historic building and its site, landscape features, outbuildings, and other elements within the property boundary all contribute to a historic district’s overall image. Site features should be considered an important part of any project to be reviewed by the Board of Architectural Review.” The BAR noted that the request conflicts with the provisions of Parking Areas and Lots (section F), including: “4. Avoid creating parking areas in the front yards of historic building sites.” “8. Provide screening from adjacent land uses as needed.” And “10. Select lighting fixtures that are appropriate to a historic setting.”

The BAR cited guidance from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties [aka Secretary’s Standards], which are included by reference in the ADC District Guidelines. Specifically, from Alterations and Additions for a New Use (page 146), the Secretary’s Standards recommend against “Locating parking areas directly adjacent to historic buildings where vehicles may cause damage to buildings or landscape features or when they negatively impact the historic character of the setting if landscape features and plant materials are removed.”

The BAR cited sections of the City Code for Historical Preservation and Architectural Design Control Overlay Districts. Specifically, portion of Charlottesville City Code Section 34-271 - Purposes: The City of Charlottesville seeks, through the establishment of its several historic districts and through the protection of individually significant properties, to protect community health and safety, to promote the education, prosperity and general welfare of the public through the identification, preservation and enhancement of buildings, structures, landscapes, settings, neighborhoods, places and features with special historical, cultural and architectural significance. To achieve these general purposes, the City of Charlottesville seeks to pursue the following specific purposes: … (2) To assure that, within the city's historic districts, new structures, additions, landscaping and related elements will be in harmony with their setting and environs[..]

[Attachments 5 and 6. BAR meeting minutes for June 18, 2019 and October 15, 2019, respectively.]

**Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:**

Upholding the BAR’s decision aligns with Council’s vision for *Charlottesville Arts and Culture:* Charlottesville cherishes and builds programming around the evolving research and interpretation of our historic heritage and resources; and for *A Green City:* Charlottesville citizens live in a community with a vibrant urban forest, tree-lined streets, and lush green neighborhoods. It contributes to Goal 2 of the Strategic Plan, to be a safe, equitable, thriving and beautiful community, and objective 2.5, to provide natural and historic resources stewardship.
Community Engagement:

For both BAR meetings, the abutting landowners were notified by letter and the meeting was publicly posted, as required by Charlottesville City Code.

At the June 18, 2019 BAR meeting, seven neighborhood residents spoke regarding the proposal. Six expressed concerns about the project, primarily regarding tree protection/removal and screening of the parking lot; one offered support. [See Attachment 5.]

At the October 15, 2019 BAR meeting five neighborhood residents spoke regarding the proposal. Four expressed opposition to or concerns about the project; one offered support. [See Attachment 6.]

Budgetary Impact:

None.

Recommendation:

Staff’s recommendation is to uphold the BAR’s action.

Alternatives:

Council could require that the applicant hold a work session with the BAR in an effort to develop an acceptable design. The applicant would then re-apply for a CoA.

Council could overturn the BAR’s action.

Attachments:

1. Applicant’s appeal
3. BAR action letter and staff report from June 18, 2019 BAR meeting
4. BAR action letter and staff report from October 15, 2019 BAR meeting
5. BAR meeting minutes for June 18, 2019
6. BAR meeting minutes for October 15, 2019
7. 605 Preston Place, June 2019 BAR submittal (5/28/2019)
8. 605 Preston Place, October 2019 BAR resubmittal (9/24/2019)
Attachment 1. Applicant’s appeal
Ms. Kyna Thomas  
Clerk of the City Council  
City of Charlottesville  
P.O. Box 911  
Charlottesville, VA 22902  

Re: BAR application #19-10-05, 605 Preston Place  

Dear Madam:  

In accordance with Charlottesville City Code 34-285(b), I hereby appeal to City Council the decision of the BAR of 15 October 2019 on the above application.  

The BAR ruled that parking on this lot is not compatible with the Property and other properties in the ADC District. This is demonstrably incorrect as most of the properties in the ADC have driveways and parking on their lots. The most obvious example, the design of which we were copying, is the new parking lot for Sigma Chi which is directly across the street from the Property.  

Mr. Werner’s email summarizing the action of the BAR stated: The BAR noted that the request conflicts with the provisions of Parking Areas and Lots (section F), including: “4. Avoid creating parking areas in the front yards of historic building sites.” “8. Provide screening from adjacent land uses as needed.” And “10. Select lighting fixtures that are appropriate to a historic setting.” Our plan, in fact, violates none of these. The parking is behind the building, and we have provided extensive screening (from the neighboring properties and also from the street as we re-designed our plan to save the deodar cedars and the large oak tree). There was no lighting for the parking in our plan that went before the BAR in June. We only added the lighting in response to comments from the BAR at the June meeting. There was no discussion about the specific light fixtures at the October meeting, other than to say that they would be “full cut-off.”  

The City’s Historic Preservation and Design Planner considered the same “Criteria, Standards and Guidelines” that the BAR was supposed to consider in evaluating this application. And, the Planner recommended approval of this application stating “Staff finds the request appropriate since the proposed parking area is appropriately screened and is placed behind the historic structure. Additionally, staff finds the number of trees proposed in the landscape plan appropriate to accommodate for the loss of tree canopy, and that the preservation of the two cedars addresses the BAR’s concerns over their removal.”  

More importantly, our grounds for appeal are that the BAR exceeded its authority in denying this application. The BAR cannot deny a by-right use allowed by the zoning code. There is no question that parking for a building is an allowable use in
a R-3 district. While the BAR might have discretion over the aesthetic and design aspects of a site plan, it cannot deny the permitted use of the Property. In response to comments at the June BAR meeting, we re-designed our parking lot plan from 26 spaces to 22 spaces. While we did not believe the BAR could force us to reduce the size of the parking lot, we did so as an accommodation to the BAR and the neighbors. Therefore, to deny us the use of the Property for parking violates both the letter and the intention of Division 2 of Article II of the Zoning Code.

Sincerely,

Neighborhood Investments – PC, LP by

[Signature]

Richard T. Spurzem,
President of the General Partner
Attachment 2. Criteria

City of Charlottesville
Division 2. - Historical Preservation and Architectural Design Control Overlay Districts

Sec. 34-276. - Standards for review of construction and alterations.

The following features and factors shall be considered in determining the appropriateness of proposed construction, reconstruction, alteration or restoration of buildings or structures pursuant to section 34-275 above:

1. Whether the material, texture, color, height, scale, mass and placement of the proposed addition, modification or construction are visually and architecturally compatible with the site and the applicable design control district;

2. The harmony of the proposed change in terms of overall proportion and the size and placement of entrances, windows, awnings, exterior stairs and signs;

3. The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation set forth within the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. §67.7(b)), as may be relevant;

4. The effect of the proposed change on the historic district neighborhood;

5. The impact of the proposed change on other protected features on the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls and walks;

6. Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure or site, or adjacent buildings or structures;

7. When reviewing any proposed sign as part of an application under consideration, the standards set forth within Article IX, sections 34-1020, et seq. shall be applied; and

8. Any applicable provisions of the city's design guidelines (see section 34-288(6)).

(9-15-03(3))
Attachment 3. BAR action letter and staff report from June 18, 2019 BAR meeting

From: Lasley, Timothy G  
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2019 3:57 PM  
To: Collins, Scott  
Cc: Werner, Jeffrey B  
Subject: BAR Action - June 18, 2019 - 605 Preston Place

June 19, 2019

Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 19-06-05  
605 Preston Place  
Tax Parcel 050111000  
Neighborhood Investment – PC, LP, Owner/Collins Engineering, Applicant  
Parking Lot Expansion

Dear Applicant,  
The above referenced project was discussed before a meeting of the City of Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR) on June 18, 2019. The following action was taken:  
This item was pulled from the consent agenda.  
Motion: Mohr moved to accept the applicant’s request for deferral. Balut seconded  
Approved (9-0).

If you would like to hear the specifics of the discussion, the meeting video is on-line at:  
http://charlottesville.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=1370

If you have any questions, please contact either myself, or Jeff Werner at 434-970-3130 or wernerjb@charlottesville.org.

Sincerely yours,  
Tim Lasley  
--  
Tim Lasley  
Acting Assistant Historic Preservation and Design Planner  
City of Charlottesville | Neighborhood Development Services  
University of Virginia | Class of 2020  
School of Architecture  
Phone: (434)-970-3398  
Email: lasleyt@charlottesville.org
Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 19-06-05
605 Preston Place
Tax Parcel 050111000
Neighborhood Investment – PC, LP, Owner/Collins Engineering, Applicant
Parking Lot Expansion

Background
Built in 1857, 605 Preston Place is an Individually Protected Property located in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. Known as Wyndhurst, it was the manor house of the 100-acre farm that is now the Preston Heights section of the city. It is a typical two-story, three-bay, double–pile white weatherboard house with Greek Revival details. (Historic survey, photos and drawings of the original building are attached.)

Prior BAR Actions
October 17, 2017 – The BAR moved to find that the proposed renovations satisfy the BAR’s criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. The BAR would encourage zoning to look into the 50 foot setback, because the BAR believes it would be a more successful design with a back porch.

August 14, 2017 – The BAR approved moving [to 506-512 Preston Place] the house, porch, chimneys, and east side additions located at 605 Preston Avenue and demolition of the rear additions.

Application
Applicant submitted:
- Collins Engineering submittal dated May 28, 2019: Project narrative, images of existing historic house on parcel, images of existing site conditions and context, proposed permeable pavers precedent, proposed brick wall with bluestone cap, landscape plan, and paver cut sheet.
- Collins Engineering Preston Apartments Site Plan amendment submittal dated May 29, 2019: Cover (page 1), existing conditions and demolition plan (page 2), layout, grading, and drainage plan (page 3), drainage map, storm profiles, and calculations (page 4), notes and details (page 5), landscaping plan (page 6), erosion and sediment control plan narrative (page 7), erosion and sediment control plan (page 8), and stormwater management plan (page 9).

Request to construct a 25-space, permeable paver, parking lot in the rear yard of the historic structure.

Permeable pavers will match those used for the parking surface at 608 Preston Place, across the street. The color of the proposed ECO paver will be Harvest Blend. The parking lot will have a
flush, concrete curb that follows the Preston Court Apartment’s property line. Near the entrance to Preston Court will be low, brick seating walls capped with bluestone.

New plantings will provide screening, however, six trees will be removed to accommodate the parking lot. Proposed landscaping will mitigate the loss of this tree canopy. One 36 inch Oak tree in the northwest corner will remain.

**Discussion**
Staff finds the request appropriate since the proposed parking area is appropriately screened and is placed behind the historic structure. Additionally, staff finds the number of trees proposed in the landscape plan appropriate accommodate for the loss of tree canopy in regard to the removal of the six existing trees.

Regarding the 36 inch oak to remain, staff recommends that the BAR consider a condition of approval that requires the applicant to consult with a licensed arborist to establish—and implement—stringent measures to protect the tree during construction. Such steps might include the installation of rigid fencing to limit—if not preclude—traffic within the entirety of the tree’s dripline.

**Suggested Motions**
Approval: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the parking lot expansion satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this Individually Protected Property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

(or with the following modifications...)

Denial: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the parking lot expansion does not satisfy the BAR’s criteria and is not compatible with this Individually Protected Property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted.

**Criteria, Standards, and Guidelines**
**Review Criteria Generally**
Sec. 34-284(b) of the City Code states that, in considering a particular application the BAR shall approve the application unless it finds:

1. That the proposal does not meet specific standards set forth within this division or applicable provisions of the Design Guidelines established by the board pursuant to Sec.34-288(6); and  
2. The proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application.

**Pertinent Standards for Review of Construction and Alterations include:**
1) Whether the material, texture, color, height, scale, mass and placement of the proposed addition, modification or construction are visually and architecturally compatible with the site and the applicable design control district;

2) The harmony of the proposed change in terms of overall proportion and the size and placement of entrances, windows, awnings, exterior stairs and signs;

3) The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation set forth within the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. §67.7(b)), as may be relevant;

4) The effect of the proposed change on the historic district neighborhood;

5) The impact of the proposed change on other protected features on the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls and walks;

6) Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure or site, or adjacent buildings or structures;

7) Any applicable provisions of the City’s Design Guidelines.

Pertinent Guidelines on Site Design and Elements

B. PLANTINGS

Plantings are a critical part of the historic appearance of the residential sections of Charlottesville’s historic districts. The character of the plantings often changes within each district’s sub-areas as well as from district to district. Many properties have extensive plantings in the form of trees, foundation plantings, shrub borders, and flowerbeds. Plantings are limited in commercial areas due to minimal setbacks.

1) Encourage the maintenance and planting of large trees on private property along the streetfronts, which contribute to the “avenue” effect.
2) Generally, use trees and plants that are compatible with the existing plantings in the neighborhood.
3) Use trees and plants that are indigenous to the area.
4) Retain existing trees and plants that help define the character of the district, especially street trees and hedges.
5) Replace diseased or dead plants with like or similar species if appropriate.
6) When constructing new buildings, identify and take care to protect significant existing trees and other plantings.
7) Choose ground cover plantings that are compatible with adjacent sites, existing site conditions, and the character of the building.
8) Select mulching and edging materials carefully and do not use plastic edgings, lava, crushed rock, unnaturally colored mulch or other historically unsuitable materials.

E. WALKWAYS & DRIVEWAYS

Providing circulation and parking for the automobile on private sites can be a challenging task, particularly on smaller lots and on streets that do not accommodate parking. The use of appropriate paving materials in conjunction with strategically placed plantings can help reinforce the character of each district while reducing the visual impact of driveways.

1) Use appropriate traditional paving materials like brick, stone, and scored concrete.
2) Concrete pavers are appropriate in new construction, and may be appropriate in site renovations, depending on the context of adjacent building materials, and continuity with the surrounding site and district.
3) Gravel or stone dust may be appropriate, but must be contained.
4) Stamped concrete and stamped asphalt are not appropriate paving materials.
5) Limit asphalt use to driveways and parking areas.
6) Place driveways through the front yard only when no rear access to parking is available.
7) Do not demolish historic structures to provide areas for parking.
8) Add separate pedestrian pathways within larger parking lots, and provide crosswalks at vehicular lanes within a site.

F. PARKING AREAS & LOTS
Most of the parking areas in the downtown consist of public or private surface lots or parking decks. Along West Main Street, Wertland Street, and the Corner, some larger lots have parking areas contained within the individual site.

1) If new parking areas are necessary, construct them so that they reinforce the street wall of buildings and the grid system of rectangular blocks in commercial areas.
2) Locate parking lots behind buildings.
3) Screen parking lots from streets, sidewalks, and neighboring sites through the use of walls, trees, and plantings of a height and type appropriate to reduce the visual impact year-round.
4) Avoid creating parking areas in the front yards of historic building sites.
5) Avoid excessive curb cuts to gain entry to parking areas.
6) Avoid large expanses of asphalt.
7) On large lots, provide interior plantings and pedestrian walkways.
8) Provide screening from adjacent land uses as needed.
9) Install adequate lighting in parking areas to provide security in evening hours.
10) Select lighting fixtures that are appropriate to a historic setting.
Attachment 4. BAR action letter and staff report from October 15, 2019 BAR meeting

From: Werner, Jeffrey B  
To: Collins, Scott; Spurzem, Richard  
Cc: Watkins, Robert; Miller, Melanie; Ikfuna, Alexander; Waisman, Sebastian; Winter, Joseph  
Subject: October 15, 2019 BAR Action - 605 Preston Place  
Date: Thursday, October 17, 2019 1:52:06 PM

October 17, 2019

Applicant: Scott Collins <scott@collins-engineering.com>  
Owner: Richard Spurzem <richard@neighborhoodprops.com>

Re: Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 19-10-05  
605 Preston Place  
Tax Parcel 050111000  
Neighborhood Investment – PC, LP, Owner/Collins Engineering, Applicant  
Parking Lot Expansion

Dear Mr. Collins and Mr. Spurzem:

The above referenced project was discussed before a meeting of the City of Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR) on October 15, 2019. The following action was taken: Motion: Gastinger moved, Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the parking lot expansion does not satisfy the BAR’s criteria and is not compatible with this Individually Protected Property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR denies the application. (Miller seconded. Motion passed 6-0.)

In its denial, the BAR cited the Architectural Design Control District Guidelines for Site Design and Elements (Chapter II). The BAR noted the direction provided in the Introduction (section A): “The relationship between a historic building and its site, landscape features, outbuildings, and other elements within the property boundary all contribute to a historic district’s overall image. Site features should be considered an important part of any project to be reviewed by the Board of Architectural Review.” The BAR noted that the request conflicts with the provisions of Parking Areas and Lots (section F), including: “4. Avoid creating parking areas in the front yards of historic building sites.” “8. Provide screening from adjacent land uses as needed.” And “10. Select lighting fixtures that are appropriate to a historic setting.”

The BAR cited guidance from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties [aka Secretary’s Standards], which are included by reference in the ADC District Guidelines. Specifically, from Alterations and Additions for a New Use (page 146), the Secretary’s Standards recommends against “Locating parking areas directly adjacent to historic buildings where vehicles may cause damage to buildings or landscape features or when they negatively impact the historic character of the setting if landscape features and plant materials are removed.”

Memo to CC re: 605 Preston Place appeal (Nov 22, 2019)
The BAR cited sections of the City Code for Historical Preservation and Architectural Design Control Overlay Districts. Specifically, segments of Section 34-271 - Purposes: The City of Charlottesville seeks, through the establishment of its several historic districts and through the protection of individually significant properties, to protect community health and safety, to promote the education, prosperity and general welfare of the public through the identification, preservation and enhancement of buildings, structures, landscapes, settings, neighborhoods, places and features with special historical, cultural and architectural significance. To achieve these general purposes, the City of Charlottesville seeks to pursue the following specific purposes: … (2) To assure that, within the city's historic districts, new structures, additions, landscaping and related elements will be in harmony with their setting and environs[.]

(Note: These do not represent verbatim comments. If you would like to hear the specifics of the discussion, the meeting video will be posted on-line at: http://charlottesville.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=1391)

In accordance with Charlottesville City Code 34-285(b), this decision may be appealed to the City Council in writing within ten working days of the date of the decision. Written appeals, including the grounds for an appeal, the procedure(s) or standard(s) alleged to have been violated or misapplied by the BAR, and/or any additional information, factors or opinions the applicant deems relevant to the application, should be directed to Kyna Thomas, Clerk of the City Council, PO Box 911, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 434-970-3130 or wernerjb@charlottesville.org.

-----------------------------
Jeff Werner, AICP
Historic Preservation and Design Planner
City of Charlottesville
Neighborhood Development Services
City Hall | P.O. Box 911
610 East Market Street
Charlottesville, VA 22902
Phone: 434.970.3130
Email: wernerjb@charlottesville.org
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
STAFF REPORT  
October 15, 2019

Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 19-10-05  
605 Preston Place  
Tax Parcel 050111000  
Neighborhood Investment – PC, LP, Owner/Collins Engineering, Applicant  
Parking Lot Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year Built:</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District:</td>
<td>Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Individually Protected Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also known as Wyndhurst, 605 Preston Place was the manor house of the 100-acre farm that is now the Preston Heights section of the city. It is a typical 2-story, 3-bay, double-pile white weatherboard-clad house with Greek Revival details. (Historic survey is attached.)

Prior BAR Actions  
June 18, 2019 – Request to construct a 25-space parking lot in the rear yard of the historic structure. The BAR moved to accept the applicant’s request for deferral (9-0).

October 17, 2017 – The BAR moved to find that the proposed renovations satisfy the BAR’s criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. The BAR would encourage zoning to look into the 50 foot setback, because the BAR believes it would be a more successful design with a back porch.

August 14, 2017 – The BAR approved moving [to 506-512 Preston Place] the house, porch, chimneys, and east side additions located at 605 Preston Avenue and demolition of the rear additions.

Application  
Applicant Submitted:  
- Collins Engineering submittal dated September 24, 2019: Email, project narrative, list of updates to application, existing photographs and images of materials planned for project, site plan amendments, notes and details, lighting plan, erosion control narrative and plan, stormwater management plan.

Request to construct a 20-space, permeable paver, parking lot in the rear yard of the historic structure. Permeable pavers will match those used for the parking surface at 608 Preston Place, across the street. The color of the proposed ECO paver will be Harvest Blend. The parking lot will have a flush, concrete curb that follows the Preston Court Apartment’s property line. Near the entrance to Preston Court will be low, brick seating walls capped with bluestone. New plantings will be provide

Memo to CC re: 605 Preston Place appeal (Nov 22, 2019)
New plantings will provide screening. Two cedar trees, previously planned for removal, will be retained and the entrance of the parking lot has been shifted north in respect to the existing drip line of these trees, as well as an existing oak tree. The entrance to the parking lot will be on the western side of the property and egress from the parking lot will be on the eastern side of the property. Site lighting has been added to the plan for safety. A wooden fence will run along the northern property line, matching the existing wooden fence in the front yard along the north property line to the limits of the western property line.

Discussion
Staff finds the request appropriate since the proposed parking area is appropriately screened and is placed behind the historic structure. Additionally, staff finds the number of trees proposed in the landscape plan appropriate to accommodate for the loss of tree canopy, and that the preservation of the two cedars addresses the BAR’s concerns over their removal.

Regarding the 36 inch oak to remain, staff recommends that the BAR consider a condition of approval that requires the applicant to consult with a licensed arborist to establish—and implement—stringent measures to protect the tree during construction. Such steps might include the installation of rigid fencing to limit—if not preclude—traffic within the entirety of the tree’s dripline.

Suggested Motions
Approval: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the parking lot expansion satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this Individually Protected Property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted

(or with the following modifications/conditions…)

Denial: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the parking lot expansion does not satisfy the BAR’s criteria and is not compatible with this Individually Protected Property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR denies the application as submitted, for the following reasons….

Criteria, Standards, and Guidelines
Review Criteria Generally
Sec. 34-284(b) of the City Code states that, in considering a particular application the BAR shall approve the application unless it finds:

1) That the proposal does not meet specific standards set forth within this division or applicable provisions of the Design Guidelines established by the board pursuant to Sec.34-288(6); and

2) The proposal is incompatible with the historic, cultural or architectural character of the district in which the property is located or the protected property that is the subject of the application.
Pertinent Standards for Review of Construction and Alterations include:
1) Whether the material, texture, color, height, scale, mass and placement of the proposed addition, modification or construction are visually and architecturally compatible with the site and the applicable design control district;
2) The harmony of the proposed change in terms of overall proportion and the size and placement of entrances, windows, awnings, exterior stairs and signs;
3) The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation set forth within the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. §67.7(b)), as may be relevant;
4) The effect of the proposed change on the historic district neighborhood;
5) The impact of the proposed change on other protected features on the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls and walks;
6) Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure or site, or adjacent buildings or structures;
7) Any applicable provisions of the City’s Design Guidelines.

Pertinent Guidelines on Site Design and Elements
B. PLANTINGS
Plantings are a critical part of the historic appearance of the residential sections of Charlottesville’s historic districts. The character of the plantings often changes within each district’s sub-areas as well as from district to district. Many properties have extensive plantings in the form of trees, foundation plantings, shrub borders, and flowerbeds. Plantings are limited in commercial areas due to minimal setbacks.

1) Encourage the maintenance and planting of large trees on private property along the streetfronts, which contribute to the “avenue” effect.
2) Generally, use trees and plants that are compatible with the existing plantings in the neighborhood.
3) Use trees and plants that are indigenous to the area.
4) Retain existing trees and plants that help define the character of the district, especially street trees and hedges.
5) Replace diseased or dead plants with like or similar species if appropriate.
6) When constructing new buildings, identify and take care to protect significant existing trees and other plantings.
7) Choose ground cover plantings that are compatible with adjacent sites, existing site conditions, and the character of the building.
8) Select mulching and edging materials carefully and do not use plastic edgings, lava, crushed rock, unnaturally colored mulch or other historically unsuitable materials.

E. WALKWAYS & DRIVEWAYS
Providing circulation and parking for the automobile on private sites can be a challenging task, particularly on smaller lots and on streets that do not accommodate parking. The use of appropriate paving materials in conjunction with strategically placed plantings can help reinforce the character of each district while reducing the visual impact of driveways.

1) Use appropriate traditional paving materials like brick, stone, and scored concrete.
2) Concrete pavers are appropriate in new construction, and may be appropriate in site
renovations, depending on the context of adjacent building materials, and continuity with
the surrounding site and district.
3) Gravel or stone dust may be appropriate, but must be contained.
4) Stamped concrete and stamped asphalt are not appropriate paving materials.
5) Limit asphalt use to driveways and parking areas.
6) Place driveways through the front yard only when no rear access to parking is available.
7) Do not demolish historic structures to provide areas for parking.
8) Add separate pedestrian pathways within larger parking lots, and provide crosswalks at
vehicular lanes within a site.

F. PARKING AREAS & LOTS
Most of the parking areas in the downtown consist of public or private surface lots or parking
decks. Along West Main Street, Wertland Street, and the Corner, some larger lots have parking
areas contained within the individual site.

1) If new parking areas are necessary, construct them so that they reinforce the street wall of
buildings and the grid system of rectangular blocks in commercial areas.
2) Locate parking lots behind buildings.
3) Screen parking lots from streets, sidewalks, and neighboring sites through the use of
walls, trees, and plantings of a height and type appropriate to reduce the visual impact
year-round.
4) Avoid creating parking areas in the front yards of historic building sites.
5) Avoid excessive curb cuts to gain entry to parking areas.
6) Avoid large expanses of asphalt.
7) On large lots, provide interior plantings and pedestrian walkways.
8) Provide screening from adjacent land uses as needed.
9) Install adequate lighting in parking areas to provide security in evening hours.
10) Select lighting fixtures that are appropriate to a historic setting.
Attachment 5. BAR meeting minutes for June 18, 2019

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
June 18, 2019
Certificate of Appropriateness Application  
BAR 19-10-05  
605 Preston Place  
Tax Parcel 050111000  
Neighborhood Investment – PC, LP, Owner/Collins Engineering Applicant  
Parking Lot Expansion  

Staff Report, Jeff Werner - This was built in 1857 and is an Individually Protected Property located in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District. It was originally known as Wyndhurst, it was the manor house of the 100-acre farm that is now the Preston Heights section of the city. It is a typical two-story, three-bay, double-pile white weatherboard house with Greek Revival details. The house was approved for relocation in 2017, which has not occurred yet. That status of that is unknown and it is unclear if that plan is still active. The request involves an area between the house and its backyard and the adjacent Preston Court Apartments. The request is to construct a 25-space, permeable paver, parking lot in the rear yard of the historic structure. The permeable pavers will match those used for the parking surface at 608 Preston Place across the street. The color of the proposed ECO paver will be Harvest Blend. The parking lot will have a flush, concrete curb that follows the Preston Court Apartment’s property line. Near the entrance to Preston Court will be low, brick seating walls capped with bluestone. New plantings will provide screening, however, six trees will be removed to accommodate the parking lot. The proposed landscaping will mitigate the loss of this tree canopy. One 36 inch Oak tree in the northwest corner will remain. Staff finds the request appropriate since the proposed parking area is appropriately screened and is placed behind the historic structure. Additionally, staff finds the number of trees proposed in the landscape plan appropriate accommodate for the loss of tree canopy in regard to the removal of the six existing trees. Regarding the 36 inch oak to remain, staff recommends that the BAR consider a condition of approval that requires the applicant to consult with a licensed arborist to establish and implement stringent measures to protect the tree during construction. Such steps might include the installation of rigid fencing to limit, if not preclude, traffic within the entirety of the tree’s dripline.

Applicant, Scott Collins - The owners have met with the neighborhood several times about this project. Most recently a few concerns have come about whether the parking lot would have circulation to decrease the amount of traffic going down Preston Place and it does. It has a one out entrance in and one way entrance out, which takes all that traffic out and helps keep it closer to Grady Avenue. Another concern was lighting and at this time they aren’t planning on any lighting for the parking lot because there is enough ambiance with the two buildings that are adjacent to it. Although we are applying the S2 buffer along the north boundary line, there was a concern that we do more screening and we are happy to do that. We are happy to abide by the conditions set forth by staff. The tree it is a very prominent one and we are happy we could incorporate it into our design. They aren’t planning on moving the house. At one point they wanted to move it down to the lots at the back of the neighborhood and they looked at doing a
much more intense development on the site but they backed off of that considerably and felt that this was a lot more appropriate after discussions with the neighborhood. They have been checking in with the neighborhood.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Willem van Dijk - Resides at 653 Preston Place, which is now 625 on the building and 635 on the online catalog. There is a concern regarding cars parking facing the home because I am the unit on the ground level facing the parking lot. What kind of fencing will be placed and what kind of light screening will be placed to ensure that the home experience doesn’t change?

Mr. Collins - We have a fair amount of buffering and we are happy to add additional landscaping. We are also happy to look at a fence there if that is something that is more desirable.

Mr. Gastinger - To be clear, two feet of the five foot distance is a grass space for overhang. Is it correct that there is only three feet available for additional screening?

Mr. Collins - That is correct. There is a total of 5 feet and the fence would be on the back side of that.

Mr. Lahendro - There is a cut in the stone wall with steps coming up from the lower site around the house to what will be the parking lot. Will that be kept? How would the fence work around it? If Mr. van Dijk wants to keep that, it would be a break in the fence. Is the point to keep it so far? I don’t see any notes about demolition.

Mr. Collins - The fence could run overtop the stairs. It does come on our property but the steps are on Mr. van Dijk’s property.

Mr. van Dijk - They are useless and they are sitting steps, but I’d like to keep them if possible.

Mr. Lehandro – You would like to keep that access?

Mr. van Dijk – It is not even access. It turns the patio into a seated area of some sort. It does allow me to get up on the wall to clean the gutter, which is also a good function.

Paul Wright - Resides at 612 Preston Place and is the Venable Neighborhood President. Initially when we looked at this design there was an entrance and exist on the left and we had significant concerns about how the headlights would shine into neighbors’ homes. They also talked about making that part of the street two-way, but it was crazy to allow them to come back out the same entrance they went in. This have evolved after talking to several neighbors. Some neighbors like it and others don’t, but the exit is now curved, which will prevent people from making a wrong turn on the one-way street. This circulation is a big relief on any traffic congestion and it’s great that there is no lighting. We would like you to spend a little time on the screening of plants and make sure they are sufficient. Overall, assuming they are allowed to have a parking lot, this is about as good as it’s going to get.

Beth Turner - Resides at 630 Preston Place. My property exactly parallels the entire length of the parking lot. The application is for a driveway extension, but they do not have a driveway. They have a construction site on what once was a grassy knoll and they are going to construct a
parking lot and a driveway. Secondly, the proximity of this is so important for the BAR to understand. The headlights of any car is going go straight through there even if there is a board fence. They will hear the engines and see the lights, and people are trying to live their lives around what is become an increased density. The Preston Court Apartments have been renovated to the point that they are at least 1/3 more occupants that will be in there than previously. It is being fitted out as a dormitory and we expect the arrival of 179 more people. Density in a historic district, and they are asking for a parking lot. Maybe it is by-right, but they are paving the entire hill and will cut down two amazing trees to do it. This neighborhood is a jewel and it is at a tipping balance and the BAR is holding the line. I don’t know how you will enforce whatever plantings. I hope that they are mature enough to screen as they promise they will be? How will you enforce the plantings? The entrance and exit route is supposed to be one-way, but there is nothing preventing them from coming out the entrance. How are they going to enforce the screenings?

**Greg Kendrick** - Resides at 622 Preston Place. The character of Preston Place is a unique street in that it has a tree canopy as you pull into Preston Place. There is a concern about changing a core character of the street by removing some very large old trees along that edge. Has everything been done to potentially save the large old trees along that line of the property to maintain the canopy? Whatever plantings they do will be waiting several decades to have a similar canopy. Most of these trees were planted 50-100 years ago and we will be losing some of that with these plans.

**Mr. Collins** - We have looked at several iterations of the parking lot and one of our first iterations was to put the entrance more further north and keep the two cedar trees. However, the whole site slopes to the north pretty hard. Any entrance from anywhere other than we have it has Preston Place falling off and the site still sits up, which is a lot more invasive on the whole site because it required cutting the site down 2-3 feet, if not more up next to the building in order to make it work as a parking lot. The place to come in for the parking lot to actually function is where we show it that way it can work with the existing grades above the lot without moving a lot of dirt.

**QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Schwarz** - The topography is confusing because it looks like you are dropping a couple of feet and there is no indication of how that’s being feathered back out onto the site. You go from new topo lines on the parking lot to existing on the site and no indication of new on the surroundings. If that is the case, how will the topography change around the parking lot and how it will affect any surrounding site walls and existing features? Additionally, will the City allow you to have no lighting? I think that is fantastic. It sounds great, but there is a worry that someone will tell you to light it for security reasons and if that happens we would need to see it and it would drastically change my opinion of the parking lot if it has to be lit to a certain level. When it comes to the fence, we are going to want to know what it is and how tall it is because we don’t generally approve tall fences.

**Mr. Collins** - The northern part of the parking lot is right at grade and the northeast corner has an existing grade at that point at 693, which feathers right into that area and the northern part of the site is tying right into the grades. There is no change in topography there.

Memo to CC re: 605 Preston Place appeal (Nov 22, 2019)
Mr. Schwarz – Where you have three parking spaces that are coming up against the tax map parcel 5-113, isn’t the grade quite a bit lower at those parking spaces than it is existing?

Mr. Collins – You have a 592 to the northeast of those parking spaces. Those parking spaces move across the contour 592, 591, and 590. That corner where that tree is, you have a 590. You have the parking lot feathering right into that.

Mr. Schwarz – You have a 588 cutting across the parking lot coming to the left side of that tree. Does that still work out?

Mr. Collins – It does. You have a 588, a 589, and a 590 right there.

Mr. Schwarz – It does look like that you are going to have to cut into the dripline of the oak tree

Mr. Collins – You also have the curve right there too and it allows the building to step up. As you’re coming in, you basically have a 587 and a 588 coming in across the site. At the largest cut, you have a 592 right there in front of the handicapped space. It’s about a 4 foot cut right there. The parking lot is still rising up through there. It gets to a 590 right in front of the house. At the house, there is a 594. That is where the ceding wall comes in and the entrance. We are keeping the original steps on that house. We’re having the sidewalk and the additional stairs tie right into those existing wooden stairs coming off of the house on the porch.

Mr. Schwarz – At the handicapped space, are you going to feather the grading?

Mr. Collins – It ties in the handicapped space with the sidewalk being installed right now in Preston Apartments. That’s where you get the handicapped access and that works its way around to give you handicapped access to the apartment complex. It then steps down where the existing entrance to the patio area and inner courtyard for the Preston Apartments. This area sits up a little higher than that. We also have enough lighting from the two buildings so we don’t have to put lighting in. If for some reason we did have to look at lighting, we would look probably look in the smaller low bollard area to keep lighting low in this area.

Mr. Balut – I am curious about the fence.

Mr. Collins - Regarding the wood fence, this is the first time we are just hearing about it but we envision a 6 foot high opaque wooden fence that fits in with the residential neighborhood feel. Some of that would block the light. We would want something that would block the light with landscaping on the back of it to help with noise from the cars.

Mr. Balut – What would the maximum height be?

Mr. Collins – Six feet. That would be six feet on top of a stone wall.

Mr. Schwarz - We need to figure out if it would be a total of 6’ or if it would be 6’ on top of the stone wall. If you put a 6’ wall on top of it, we would be looking at an 8-10’ wall.

Ms. Christine Colley - I am the owner of the property with a fence adjacent to this that could potentially be extended. It would be better design-wise if the existing fence would be tied into it. It has varying heights, but having an integrated fence would be far superior.
Mr. Werner - Our Guidelines talk about not exceeding 6’ so the fence would not exceed that height, but we still would like to know what they are proposing. If it matches what is there and the 6’ is acceptable, is that okay or would it need to come back to the BAR?

Mr. Lahendro - It looks like it is about a 4’ tall fence towards the road and then it steps up to about 6 feet right at the house. It just needs to be coordinated with that.

Mr. Werner – It is similar with what we talked about with 600 Lexington with the two foot drop. It looks like 7 feet west to east. A staggered fence

Ms. Miller - That one little part would come back just because it’s a requirement of everyone and we should be fair.

Mr. Mohr - When you talked about the possibility of moving the driveway slighting and lowering the grade, what is the subgrade condition?

Mr. Collins - There is a stone wall along that portion of the road. The further the entrance moves north it drops across the whole entire site. It really affects how it ties in with the old house.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Richard Crozier - Resides at 624 Preston Place. One of the problems we’ve noticed is that there is considerable flooding in the area and in the front lawn. Having a heavily graded parking lot might not contribute to the problem but it could be a little worrisome.

Mr. Collins - It would contribute 0%. We recently installed a new drainage system for the apartment complex. When it was constructed 100 years ago it had an interior courtyard that drained into the basement and pumped out to the street. We replaced that entire storm line. This is pervious paving and there is gravel so if any water gets in there it should seep into We also have an overflow pipe system that picks up all the drainage from the parking lot and takes it east to tie into the drainage system from Preston Place down to Grady.

Lisa Kendrick - Resides at 622 Preston Place. In the beginning of this we were very supportive of the project and we believed it would decrease the concentration of people in the neighborhood to maintain the graceful and integrity of this historical site. It has changed so much from when we were in support of it. This parking lot becomes the focal point and the BAR has been give the responsibility to the City to maintain the integrity of historical communities. It is a place that people love and walk through and living together in this community. It used to be a grassy knoll and instead now there is a paving stone parking lot. The trees that have been there for such a long time are gone and the owl doesn’t even live there anymore. It is confusing to me that if your mission is to maintain the integrity of these historical parts of Charlottesville, how is this okay? This was a beautiful knoll that everyone walked around and enjoyed. How can it become this? You may put in hedges to block some light but the gracefulness it once had is gone. It’s not about those of us who are living there now, it’s about the next people. Is it really the best fit?

Beth Turner - They are building a parking lot without any lights, which makes no sense. If the applicant thinks he’s getting enough light coming from the building, have you approved the flood lights that are going to be on the side of the building that will spill over into the whole

Memo to CC re: 605 Preston Place appeal (Nov 22, 2019)
neighborhood? This will be filled with headlights and flood lights lighting up that area. How are they directing the lights from the building if they think they can light the parking lot with that?

**Ms. Miller** - There are no floodlights associated.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD**

**Mr. Gastinger** - Thank you to the members of the public who spoke on this project. There is no way I can find this appropriate. In the Site Design and Elements, it says “the relationship between a historic building and its site, landscape features, outbuildings, and other elements within the property boundary all contribute to a historic district’s overall image. Site features should be considered an important part of any project to be reviewed by the BAR… The resulting character of many of the residential streets in the historic districts is one of lush plantings and mature shade trees. While there may be much variety within the house types and styles along a particular street, the landscape character ties together the setting and plays an important role in defining the distinctiveness of the districts.” Amongst our Guidelines we are to assess whether the mass and placement of proposed modifications are visually and architecturally compatible with the site and the applicable design control district. We are to assess the effect of the proposed change on the historic district and the impact of other protected features on the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls, and walks. We are to assess whether the proposed method of construction, renovation, or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure, site, or adjacent buildings or structures. In Site Design and Elements, we are encouraged to retain existing trees and plants that help define the character of the district. From the Department of the Interior’s Standards, one of the not recommended items for rehabilitation is locating parking areas directly adjacent to historic buildings where vehicles may cause damage to buildings or landscape features, or when they negatively impact the historic character of the building site if landscape features and plant materials are removed. The corner of the building is about 3’ from the road, as well as the porch. Introducing new construction on the building site isn’t recommended when it is visually incompatible, which destroys historic relationships on the site. Both entrances and exits of this building are altered. The back stair is removed from the patio and the existing front stair, which is a simple wood stair that comes down from the porch, is now on an obnoxious little brick patio. It gives a totally different sense of what this house is in its relationship to the landscape. It is crazy that we are even considering this as a way to treat one of the architectural features of this neighborhood and really important structure in the development of Charlottesville.

**Mr. Ball** - At this point, this is all one lot. Has dividing it up been looked into or are you just figuring the parking lot would be on the historic lot?

**Mr. Collins** - Right now the parking lot would be on the historic lot.

**Mr. Mohr** - The original parking for this structure was down at the end of the street where the garages were, right?

**Mr. Kendrick** - Yes. Recently it’s only been street parking. We have never had an issue with parking and there were always empty spaces on the street, even when the building was occupied.
Mr. Mohr - When they talked about moving the house, there were tradeoffs for how this was going to work, but now it’s crowding the old house, which is a crown jewel of Charlottesville. It is one of the oldest houses. The appealing part about moving it was it was restoring a sense of having an open frontal approach that it had before Preston Place went up. Without having that in place, it changes the game. Is the parking is actually street adequate? Do they still own the land where they are proposing to move the house? If this is primarily student housing, is there any reason to encourage these cars or compromise the neighborhood and the integrity of the old house for that reason? It does seem like you have to force the grades to make everything work with the house. It does take a pretty quick rise up to there.

Mr. Lahendro - This seems like a continuous increase in density. This house was a plantation house that sat by itself in a lot of land. Preston Place is an intrusion on the site, as well as the houses that are there now. Preston Place, the apartment building is an intrusion. I actually voted with the State Review Board to allow the house to be moved because its current situation and placement has lost its frontal and openness in front of the building. It is a very poor siting of the house now as it exists. The parking lot is another development in the density of Charlottesville. The most disturbing part is the destruction of the cedars and it’s hard to believe that it couldn’t be redesigned to avoid that.

Mr. Sarafin - The new siting of the house might have been pleasing in some ways but I am glad it isn’t going anywhere. That said, this doesn’t do it much of a service, at least in its historic context. It has been eroded with the Preston Court Apartments contributing greatly to that. This isn’t an appropriate treatment of what remains of that site.

Mr. Mohr - It feels haphazard how it relates to the courtyard of Preston Plaza going back to the driveway. In the name of preserving trees, it needs more trees in the center of the parking lot. You have to pull away some of those parking spaces and get some large trees in there because it is going to be a broiler oven in the summer. Perhaps something 1/3 of that size could be done for those who have to have a car every day, but it seems like a lot to have on that site.

Mr. Schwarz - It’s great that the house is staying because there is a lot of history there and if you were to move it the other site you’d no longer recognize the whole story makes sense. There probably needs to be compromises on this site at some point, whether some parking gets introduced, but it’s unfortunate that nearly every square inch seems to be filled with parking spaces. There is nothing left of the site. As far as parking lots go, this is a beautiful parking lot. There are tons of trees, screening, and pavers, etc. but it’s still eating up the entire site and this neighborhood’s character is defined with lots of trees, plantings, and yards. I could see some compromise but this is too much.

Ms. Miller - Agreed. We should base our thoughts around maintaining the Guidelines. There seems to be consensus on the Board. It’s in the applicant’s interest to request a deferral so that they can come back at their leisure.

Mr. Balut - The parking lot is very successful in keeping the circulation out of the neighborhood. The wrap around is very successful and the parking lot is shielded in a successful way. We don’t want to lose trees, especially key feature trees. It is an attractive parking lot. If this were to come to fruition and the plantings were to come to maturity, all visibility of the
house is going to go away from the west side. The east side would be fairly well landscaped and would look typical and ordinary, like many of the houses. From an entry and exit and considering the traffic in the neighborhood, it is a successful strategy in itself. The main problem is that it is too big and you’ve jammed in too much too close to the house. The way the parking lot addresses the interaction with the historic structure is just overcrowding the structure, which is the most offensive part of the presentation. The more distance you can get around the house to keep its integrity, the closer you will get to approval.

**Mr. Collins has requested a deferral**

**Mr. Werner** - The BAR review is of the design and things are allowed to occur on the site by-right. The role of the BAR cannot be to freeze this backyard in its current condition. It is simply not in our purview to say no.

**Mr. Balut** – We have approved many additions to historic structures and changes to the site. I ask that the proposal shows some deferece and respect to the historic properties.

**Motion:** Mohr moved to accept the applicant’s request for deferral. Balut seconded Approved (9-0).
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Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 19-10-05
605 Preston Place
Tax Parcel 050111000
Neighborhood Investment – PC, LP, Owner/Collins Engineering Applicant
Parking Lot Expansion

Staff Report, Jeff Werner - Also known as Wyndhurst, 605 Preston Place was the manor house of the 100-acre farm that is now the Preston Heights section of the city. It is a typical 2-story, 3-bay, double-pile white weatherboard-clad house with Greek Revival details. Request to construct a 20-space, permeable paver, parking lot in the rear yard of the historic structure. Permeable pavers will match those used for the parking surface at 608 Preston Place, across the street. The color of the proposed ECO paver will be Harvest Blend. The parking lot will have a flush, concrete curb that follows the Preston Court Apartment’s property line. Near the entrance to Preston Court will be low, brick seating walls capped with bluestone. New plantings will be provide. New plantings will provide screening. Two cedar trees, previously planned for removal, will be retained and the entrance of the parking lot has been shifted north in respect to the existing drip line of these trees, as well as an existing oak tree. The entrance to the parking lot will be on the western side of the property and egress from the parking lot will be on the eastern side of the property. Site lighting has been added to the plan for safety. A wooden fence will run along the northern property line, matching the existing wooden fence in the front yard along the north property line to the limits of the western property line. Staff finds the request appropriate since the proposed parking area is appropriately screened and is placed behind the historic structure. Additionally, staff finds the number of trees proposed in the landscape plan appropriate to accommodate for the loss of tree canopy, and that the preservation of the two cedars addresses the BAR’s concerns over their removal. Regarding the 36 inch oak to remain, staff recommends that the BAR consider a condition of approval that requires the applicant to consult with a licensed arborist to establish—and implement—stringent measures to protect the tree during construction. Such steps might include the installation of rigid fencing to limit—if not preclude—traffic within the entirety of the tree’s dripline. This is going through a site plan review.

Richard Spurzem, Applicant – I brought six other renditions of this plan. We have been on this for about thirteen months. After the June meeting, I did meet with the neighbors, and spent some time on the site with several of them. We decided to move the entrance a little further to the north to save the two cedar trees and the large oak tree. That did result in the loss of several parking spaces. It was a concession that we were willing to make. The neighbors said that ‘one way in, one way out,’ was important to them. The traffic would not be going around the complete circle of Preston Place. That is what we have arranged here. I think that it least intensive for this property that we could come up with.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC
Lisa Kendrick – As you are driving down Preston Place, there had been a rock wall. I had thought that the rock wall was going to be replaced that would have been on the side of the
parking lot. I did not hear that. Most of Preston Place does have a rock wall, extending down and around it. I wanted to be clear on that.

Richard Spurzem – There is a rock wall along Preston Place in this area. There are parts of it in good condition and parts in not so good condition. The cedar trees are actually pushing the wall outwards. At the entrance, the rock wall would be taken down. The rock wall on either side would be retained. We were going to retain the stone wall on the other side too.

Lisa Kendrick - Balance of rock wall on both sides would be a good idea. If a sidewalk goes in that side of Preston Place, those trees are going to have to come down, which is horrible.

Richard Spurzem – We are putting in a waiver for that as part of this site plan. If the city requires a sidewalk, those trees are history. The brick was the ceding wall where the exit is.

William Bird – The last time that I was here, I had requested that a wall be put up to give me some privacy in my home. I have been living in this place for the past four months. In those four months, 15 or 20 construction workers have shown up at 6:55, and stand five feet from the bedroom window. I am not excited about the construction going on. There was a comment made by a neighbor that there was not a care for green space. The contractor had basically said that they did not care about that. This is one of the last green spaces in the town. If we put down a parking lot, it is not going to turn into green space again. The six of you have the ball in your court. I think that it would be ridiculous to allow this to happen. The stones that my neighbor noted are gone. They were removed to allow the CATs to get into the construction site more easily. Does the Board know of parking lot that has been turned back into green space?

Mr. Gastinger – I think that it is pretty clear. It is going to be a parking lot and stay a parking lot.

William Bird – This is one of the last standing homes from this era with green space available. The green space has been turned orange due to the construction site and the mud. If restored properly, this home would be one of the last places in the town to have green space. We should not turn it into a place for metal boxes for college kids.

Elizabeth Turner – I believe that there are two errors in the application. It is applying for an expansion to a parking lot. There was never a parking lot there. The application says that the proposed parking lot is going in the back of the house. It is not the back of the house. The back of the house is pressed up against the property line. This house has two beautiful faces. One is a porch and the other is a beautiful and elegant façade. The windows on the façade are elegant. They are proposing to take away half of the terrace, all of the steps, and leave no green space/no buffer for this structure. It is a structure that should be protected by the BAR and should be respected by the neighborhood.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – Are the light fixtures on a pole? How tall is the pole?

Richard Spurzem – It is two heads and 12 to 16 feet in height.
Mr. Mohr – Are the heads canted?

Richard Spurzem – No. They go straight down.

Mr. Mohr – Why is the in-lane so wide?

Richard Spurzem – That is for fire-rescue. They wanted a 20 foot access.

Mr. Gastinger – There is not a 20 foot access to the site. Access to the building is from the three street sides. Didn’t you remove all of the fire escapes from the building?

Mr. Mohr – Is there a fence that addresses the headlight issue?

Richard Spurzem – There is the existing fence in the front that goes all of the way to the back along the property line.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Lisa Kendrick – The twenty parking spots does not solve the problem of traffic. Before the property was sold, they had a parking lot. It has been separated. They’re trying to get rid of all the grass in the grassy knoll that goes with the historical home to solve the problem. It does not solve the problem. There are going to be so many students living there. There is still going to be a rush to find a parking spot. To destroy the property around the historical home that gives you gracefulness and elegance is unsettling to me that this would happen. There may be other ways to solve the problem, rather than destroy this green, diminish the elegance of this historical home. We want to lessen the use of cars. There is a bus stop right off of Grady Avenue. Students are likely to park their cars and use the bus, bike, or walk, rather than driving. To have offsite parking is not unthinkable. The view from these apartment buildings is going to be this parking lot rather than this grassy knoll. It is diminishing our neighborhood. It enhances this whole community. Everyone, who came tonight, are homeowners. We take care of the land. We are good stewards, and you’re going to put up a parking lot because it is more economical. It is a historical neighborhood and designated for a reason.

Paul Wright – I am going to address the design of the parking lot. My largest concern is the pass through to eliminate traffic. In this design, one of the big problems was the trees, which has been addressed. I know that some of you have a concern about the frontage of the house, but that ship sailed in 1929, when they built the building in front of it. As a design, the pass through and the trees have been addressed. On this side is the fire hydrant, and they would not be pulling on that side anyway. They put a fire hydrant on the other side of the street, which is where they would go. I support the design.

William Bird – We are creating parking lot for twenty cars, and it is costing our street three spots. Three spots are not available now to be given up with the 15 people, who have already moved into the finished part. They park all the way up to 625. This is a twenty foot cut being taken out of our street, which is twenty feet where we can’t park. (Addressing the applicant). You should sell the home to somebody, who cares about the green space in the city. Honestly, it is an embarrassment.
Elizabeth Tuner – I thought of one more mistake in the application. It is the comparison with Wertland Street. Wertland Street is a street of beautiful homes that have been turned into dormitories, rooming houses, yards paved over, and a dangerous place totally student ghetto. The comparison in the application, was to the parking areas on Wertland Street. The last time that I looked on the City of Charlottesville website, we have a different historic overlay than Wertland Street. There is no precedent for a parking area with more than twelve parking spaces, even with beautiful pavers. We are asking you for less paving, fewer parking spaces, and more green buffer for the historic structure. We are asking to maintain this historic overlay. We are at a tipping point, and we are asking you for help. There is an onslaught of students coming to live in the Preston Court Apartments. They are going to overrun us. We are asking you to stop, to preserve, and to help.

Greg Kendrick – I appreciate the changes that have been made since the last time, which includes the saving of the trees. The canopy of the trees does add to the character of the street. We are trying to keep some kind of flow of traffic from the backside. This is the cleanest way to do this other than making the entrance two way. Those are solving some significant issues there. We are asking you, the Board of Architectural Review, to hold this property to the full standard for such a historic property. With regards to green space, our trust is in you to hold. I would be willing to yield as to what that looks like. Since the last meeting, there has been major excavation to put in a drainage line right next to these trees. We are concerned that major root damage may have been done to these trees. It seems that would be something that you would be looking at. Fences were put up. The number of parking spots is a trivial item in the big scope. I wonder if the parking is significant when eighty residents are not going to have a parking spot.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – Whether a parking lot goes on this is a question that we need to deal with and that we can grapple with. I will just cite from the code that allows us to our actions. It asks to review whether or not the proposal meets the specific standards set forth in the design guidelines. It also asks whether or not the proposal is compatible with the historic, cultural, or architectural character of the district in which the property is located and the protected property that is the subject of the application. We are thinking both in terms of protecting the architectural character of the neighborhood, the site the subject property is on and the building itself. For many reasons, I was opposed to this project before, and I think any of the design changes are really just, in my view, are just sharpening the lipstick on the pig. It’s really a question whether or not a parking lot belongs here at all. I really think there is no single piece of evidence that this fits any of our guidelines as it relates to the protection of architectural and historic districts. There are a couple of pieces that I would to reference in particular. This is the very beginning of our guidelines on site design and elements. The relationship between a historic building and its site landscape features and other elements in the property boundary all contribute to a historic districts overall image. Site features should be considered important part of any review by the BAR. In addition, I want to add a comment that is from the Secretary of the Interior’s standards, which our guidelines reference. In their recommendations for building site, they discourage placing parking areas adjacent to historic buildings where vehicles may cause damage to the buildings or landscape features or when they negatively impact the historic character of the building site if landscape features and plant materials are removed. The comments that have been made today both by the public and what is discernable from the materials is that the construction of this parking lot is going to have irrevocable change to the entire Preston Place neighborhood. That
lawn serves to provide some setting to the historic structure. The garden entrance is an important element that has been discarded and that green space provides some buffer between the large scale element of the Preston Court Apartments and the smaller residential scale neighborhood. I can’t see anyway that you can reshape a 24 stall parking lot in this yard and make it fit our design guidelines. Moreover, I have not seen an inkling of intention that has tried to meet our guidelines.

**Ms. Miller** – When I was looking at the guidelines, generally we’re to consider the effect of the proposed change on the historic district/neighborhood, the impact of the proposed change on other protected features of the property, such as gardens, landscaping, fences, walls, and walks. Whether the proposed method of construction, renovation, or restoration could have an adverse impact on the structure on the site, and other things. Locate parking lots behind buildings to be perfectly fair, this building is a little unusual. When they built the apartments, it altered what became the front and the rear of the house. There is no way to build behind that house. Avoid creating parking areas in the front yards of historic buildings, avoid excessive curb cuts to gain entry to parking areas, and select lighting fixtures that are appropriate to the historic setting. I don’t think that a 12 foot tall light fixture is appropriate to a neighborhood. The reason that I am on the BAR is because I live in a historic district. I am representing homeowners theoretically, and I live across the street from a parking lot. It used to have two historic homes in it that were torn down so that we could have a parking lot. It was initially screened, and the owners of the parking lot changed. The screening is dying. The neighborhood would have been better served to keep the houses there. This is a little different because it is green space. Parking lot adds value, and I agree with the neighbors’ comments. It such a small amount of spaces with what is really needed. It is not worth the cost of it. Destruction of the rock wall is problematic that we have diligently sought to protect other parts of the city. We made the city build one back, where they have taken it down. It is a little concerning to hear about the rock wall that may have already been taken down during the construction. In looking at potentially move the house, it sounded like an insane idea. The more we thought about it, it an individually protected property and maybe it did make sense, and it is oriented and facing towards the street. The Board has been willing to work with the applicant. I should commend the applicant. I do think that this application is a lot better than the first attempt. For me I don’t ever see a way where it is ever going to make sense.

**Mr. Sarafin** – I would just add to that just acknowledging that after the proposal to move the house. The applicant decided to work on the house where it sits. That certainly was a preferable action. I do tend to agree with you, Melanie. We have readily worked with applicants over the years. The current applicant tried to accommodate.

**Ms. Miller** – I should also mention that this is an individually protected property. It was like a mini historic district. Those properties in particular, the city has recognized it as something really special. It is not just a piece of a greater thing that is important to the city.

**Mr. Schartz** – The last time I told you guys that as far as parking lots are concerned. It’s a really nice parking lot. I can see that everyone is in a really hard place. The neighborhood, no matter what, is going to end up with cars on their street. No more on street parking for the residents, regardless if you build this or not. This should have been a preliminary discussion before you even starting working on the apartment building. I have a feeling that you are going to be in a really bad place if you don’t have any parking. Twenty spaces for how many residents. I don’t know what your numbers are. This has become a really bad situation for everybody. In terms of
zoning, this house has two fronts. You are building a parking lot in a front yard. You are screening it quite well. It is still a very large parking lot in a front yard on a residential street. I am not sure that removing five spaces has done much to mitigate that. I appreciate you trying to narrow down the egress to ten feet. I really think the ingress would have to be narrowed down to ten feet. Maybe that is a conversation with the fire department and us. Places have gotten involved with the fire department before. There is stuff that has been brought up that just does not make sense. You can gain a lot more green space by eliminating that ten feet of ingress on the entry drive. I don’t think that I can fully support this. You guys have made a valiant effort. It is still a very large parking lot in a front yard.

**Mr. Bell** – I agree with that. The lot is the historic house. The parking lot is completely designed on the lot that goes with the historic house. Unfortunately, the historic house had a giant apartment building built in front of it. I can’t imagine any other residential historic property where we would allow a giant parking lot to fill the entire lot.

**Mr. Mohr** – The only place where that occurs is behind those houses on Park Street.

**Ms. Miller** – I think that this is worth pointing out. That when somebody lives in a historic district, it is a bummer. They have to come to the BAR with their changes that they want to do their house. They are kind of giving up their own rights. The tradeoff is that things like this come up, we stand up and protect them.

**Mr. Sarafin** – The parking is going to be an issue no matter what. That is true of the entire neighborhood. That is almost city-wide. A parking lot is a lot more difficult to restore to a previous condition or gets replaced by a building.

**Ms. Miller** – It seems that the application does not have enough support this evening and generally in favor of all applicants doing a deferral. In this case, that is almost a deceptive thing because I don’t think that this project has support. They have done everything that they can do that we asked them to do last time.

**Mr. Mohr** – What was the Board’s feeling if you basically make it an access where it picks up those three or four spaces per moving? Is that something that is viable? Ninety percent of the lawn and terrace is still there and have some way of passing through. The green is running down to the road. You are still acknowledging that this building has a lot of people and a necessity for drop off. In places like New York, that is something they do and the parking is off site. You don’t have internal site circulation and for functional use. There is the number of people in this building. It seems that they need a district wide approach to parking, regardless of this parking lot.

**Mr. Schwartz** – I might see a ten foot drive. I don’t know how you get into the building if you are in a wheelchair. I see that you have an ADA space. You are probably going to need a few more.

**Ms. Miller** – The main building that needs parking is so close to the street on three sides that would allow for some of that moving.

**Mr. Mohr** – It is a narrow street.
Mr. Gastinger – There are any number of ways that this site could be developed and be respectful of both the building and the contexts and the neighborhood. I don’t think that they are anywhere close to that. Maybe someday it’s architectural. There certainly are ways that it can be done. I don’t want that to be a takeaway that this site can never be touched. There are definite ways that it can be developed in a much more sensitive way. Maybe some that you are talking about is possible if you take into account the site context and the neighborhood.

Mr. Mohr – Right now it is just a big lump in the middle of the site. There is no sense of it being a driveway. A lot of it is given away to circulation because of the configuration of the parking lot. That terrace is coming off the house.

Ms. Miller – The issue with the fire department is completely ludicrous. Any sort of entry into the site is going to be a problem. That is not the applicant’s fault.

Mr. Schwartz – If the applicant wants a deferral, let him have it. If the goal is a parking lot, I am not sure how we are going to be satisfied. Last time I thought maybe he would figure out some way that he would make feel like this is less of an impact. The more I look at it, I am not sure.

Mr. Mohr – When we were originally talking about possibly moving the house and doing strategies like that, there was also discussions about basically doing an underground structure and that the sense of openness and the bulk of the green space remained intact. I would have to assume that is completely unattainable from a budget standpoint.

Mr. Schwartz – None of trees would be there anymore.

Mr. Mohr – You would be starting over. If you move the old house, then what is the position for that? Is that how you come into the parking lot area? It would have required a whole lot of architectural ledger to get around to pull it off. Regardless, this doesn’t do it and doesn’t get us anywhere. The question for Richard. Is it better to say ‘no,’ and he can appeal this? Is it better for him to defer it?

Mr. Sarafin – To accept a deferral leads one to believe another iteration of what we are looking at might acceptable or appropriate. This is fundamentally at odds with the guidelines that, that isn’t the case. I don’t think that is the right route

Mr. Mohr - Let’s not lead him on.

Mr. Gastinger – We can choose to take a vote. We don’t even have to accept a deferral.

Mr. Mohr - Is there no way forward with this? Is there a solution based on what he has here?

Mr. Schwartz – I don’t think there is a way forward, but if the applicant wants a deferral, let him spend some more time figuring it out. I agree with you guys. If it is going to be twenty car parking lot, we are going to end up in the same place.

Mr. Mohr – That is why I was asking for something more like an access road in the back of the building with 5 or 6 lots for parking. Is the scale of that seems like something like that can work.
on the site?

Mr. Schwartz – Anything that a moving van can get into would be problematic.

Mr. Mohr – It is a series of kinks. If you are just running like that with parallel parking, you can get a vehicle into there.

Mr. Sarafin – Where would you enter?

Mr. Mohr – You would have to modify that entrance. You wouldn’t kill the cedars. The truck would have to come around this way.

Ms. Miller – I don’t see why the truck couldn’t pull up on the street.

Mr. Mohr – I am just being devil’s advocate. Is there a minimum that can be done there or is the conclusion no vehicles should be behind the building?

Mr. Sarafin – This is a lot of activity on the back side/the courtyard side. This small space between the two structures really is service area. It really can’t help but be service area at this point. Do you let it be that and preserve access to the house to the west? Do you preserve that as open green space and just let this be a service corridor up close the courtyard side? It would make sense on access with the house to have that with the landscape intact. That is what you would want to keep that context, the terrace, and the site lines.

Ms. Miller – It is pretty tight no matter what.

Mr. Schwartz – Maybe we are delivering something that we shouldn’t be. Mr. Spurzem, would you like a deferral?

Richard Spurzem – No

Mr. Schwartz – I think we have our answer.

Jeff Werner – I will read straight from the city code. A decision may be appealed to City Council by the applicant or any aggrieved persons by filing a written notice of appeal within ten days of the date of the decision. The statements that have been made so far in the discussion can be cited and that they are certainly valid. There is no deed in the motion in the denial to restate everything. The opportunity would be for the applicant to appeal to Council. We would prepare a report and they would have a hearing. A decision by Council can be appealed to the Circuit Court. Your input is valued. The BAR can make the determination ultimately how the site is used relative to the zoning. You raised a really good point by what the extent of a parking lot is required relative to what fit in a landscape. Is that all clear in the motion that you make? The audience and applicant are clear on what comes next.

Motion
Mr. Gastinger - Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, I move to find that the parking lot expansion does not satisfy the BAR’s criteria and is not compatible with this Individually
Protected Property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR denies the application. (Miller seconded. Motion passed 6-0.)
Preston Apartments – Parking Lot Expansion (605 Preston Place)

APPLICANT: COLLINS ENGINEERING

DATE: May 28, 2019

PROJECT NARRATIVE

605 Preston Place is an existing parcel with a Historic House located on the lot. The parcel is adjacent to the Preston Apartments, which is currently under construction for interior renovation and exterior maintenance. The lot has access to Preston Place along the front of the parcel and rear of the parcel. The existing Historic house fronts on the Preston Place, and is consistent to the streetscape along this roadway.

Currently, this lot is being utilized for construction access for the Preston Apartments renovation. Contractor staging areas are currently located on the property, and the house is currently being used as a construction field office. The owners are proposing to construct a permeable paver 25 space parking lot on this parcel in the rear yard, behind the existing historic house for the benefit of the Preston Apartment building. The entrance to the parking lot will be a one-way entrance into the lot from Preston Place along the rear of the property, and the parking lot will exist at the front of the parcel onto Preston Place, see the attached application plan. The proposed parking lot will be constructed of permeable pavers, matching the pavers that were installed on the Sigma Chi property across the street. The pictures and specifications for these pavers are included in this narrative document. The color of the proposed ECO paver (EP Henry) permeable paver product will be Harvest Blend. A concrete sidewalk is proposed along the Preston Apartments property line (on the Preston Apartments property) tying in the parking lot to the apartment building. Concrete steps and brick retaining walls/seating walls will be used to connect the parking lot to the sidewalk and to the access steps to the apartment building. The brick seating walls will match the brick walls on the Preston Apartment building, and will have the same bluestone cap, see attached pictures in this document. The concrete sidewalk and steps will match the required color used for Charlottesville concrete sidewalks and curbing. All handrails shall match the Preston Apartment railings.

Landscaping will be installed for the parking lot expansion to screen the cars from Preston Place and the neighborhood. There is an existing 36” Oak tree in the northwest corner of the parcel that is proposed to remain. Additional trees and shrubs shall be planted along the rear property line and North property line to screen the parking lot from the adjacent properties. Interior trees and landscaping are also proposed in the parking lot, exceeding the minimum interior landscaping requirements of the City of Charlottesville. A 36-inch cedar tree, a 30-inch cedar tree, a 10-inch maple, and (3) other trees will be removed the construction of the parking lot on the property. The proposed landscaping will mitigate the loss of this tree canopy and provide additional tree canopy on the existing lot.

At this time, no review is being requested for the existing historic house. Any modifications or changes to the existing house will be submitted to the BAR as a separate application for review.
Existing Historic house on the parcel
Preston Apartments – Currently under construction / renovation

Existing 36” Oak Tree to Remain
Proposed brick wall / seating wall with bluestone cap – matching Preston Apartments
ECO Paver


Available in a standard 6" x 9" unit, ECO Paver is an ideal choice for those seeking a sustainable stormwater management solution in compliance with local regulatory requirements.

Color Selections

- Autumn Blend
- Harvest Blend
- Pewter Blend

Because our products are made from natural materials, variations in colors are to be expected. Be sure to see actual samples of the products you are considering, and visit one of over 150 independently owned EP Henry Authorized Landscaping Distributors.

Product Dimensions
Attachment 8. 605 Preston Place, October 2019 BAR resubmittal (9/24/2019)
September 24, 2019  

Alex Ikufuna  
Director of Neighborhood Services  
Charlottesville, VA 22902  

RE: Preston Apartments Parking Lot Expansion – Exception Request  

Dear Alex Ikufuna:  

Please allow this letter to serve as our formal request for an exception to the width of an egress one-way travelway for the Preston Apartments Parking Lot expansion plan. Pursuant to Section 34-975(e), one-way paths of ingress and egress are prohibited unless the director or planning commission approves an exception “necessitated by the peculiar character of the proposed use or site”. The applicant is requesting an exception for the egress travelway from the proposed parking lot to Preston Place, due to the peculiar site restraints.  

The owners of the Preston Apartments are proposing a parking lot expansion on the adjacent property to the Apartment building. The 20 space parking lot will be constructed with permeable pavers, and will have a direct access to the courtyard and sidewalks adjacent to the Preston Apartment building. Access to the proposed parking lot shall be from the western portion of the site from Preston Place. The access into the site has been designed to preserve the two existing cedar trees and one large oak tree on the property. The entrance into the site from the western property line is 20 feet wide, in accordance with the City ordinance.  

During the design and review stages of the project, the owners have been meeting with the neighborhood with respect to the development of the lot for a parking lot, and the renovations to the existing Preston Apartment building. The neighborhood has requested that the applicant explore the possibility for creating an entrance only from the western property line and egress only from the eastern portion of the site onto Preston Place. The reasons behind the request for this traffic pattern is to limit the traffic on Preston Place. If the traffic enters from the west and exits the property from the east, this traffic pattern substantially reduces student residential traffic from a portion of Preston Place that is an established residential neighborhood. The issue is that the area between the existing Preston Apartment building and the Existing historic Manor house can not accommodate a 20’ egress travelway. Therefore, we are proposing a 12’ egress travelway for this portion of the project for egress from the site to accommodate the requests of the neighborhood. The existing 20’ entrance could also serve as an egress, however, the owners shall provide signage to ensure the one-way ingress and egress of the site. The 12’ egress travelway will also help reduce the impacts to the side yard adjacent to the Manor house, and no parking will be included along this portion of the egress road that is less than 20’ wide. Fire and rescue service vehicles will be able to utilize the 20’ ingress entrance for both ingress and egress from the site for fire and life safety.  

The exception request for the reduction of the travelway is for the benefit of the neighborhood and to preserve the area around the historic Manor house. The reduction of the travelway width will have a smaller impact to the Manor house lot, and the egress from the eastern portion of the property will help limit the traffic within the residential neighborhood. Please see the attached site plan for additional information for the exception request.  

Thank you again for the consideration of this exception request for this project, and please contact me if you have any questions or require any further information.  

Sincerely,  
Scott Collins
Preston Apartments – Parking Lot Expansion (605 Preston Place)

APPLICANT: COLLINS ENGINEERING

DATE: May 28, 2019
UPDATED: September 24, 2019

PROJECT NARRATIVE

605 Preston Place is an existing parcel with a Historic House located on the lot. The parcel is adjacent to the Preston Apartments, which is currently under construction for interior renovation and exterior maintenance. The lot has access to Preston Place along the front of the parcel and rear of the parcel. The existing Historic house fronts on the Preston Place, and is consistent to the streetscape along this roadway.

Currently, this lot is being utilized for construction access for the Preston Apartments renovation. Contractor staging areas are currently located on the property, and the house is currently being used as a construction field office. The owners are proposing to construct a permeable paver 25 space parking lot on this parcel in the rear yard, behind the existing historic house for the benefit of the Preston Apartment building. The entrance to the parking lot will be a one-way entrance into the lot from Preston Place along the rear of the property, and the parking lot will exist at the front of the parcel onto Preston Place, see the attached application plan. The proposed parking lot will be constructed of permeable pavers, matching the pavers that were installed on the Sigma Chi property across the street. The pictures and specifications for these pavers are included in this narrative document. The color of the proposed ECO paver (EP Henry) permeable paver product will be Harvest Blend. A concrete sidewalk is proposed along the Preston Apartments property line (on the Preston Apartments property) tying in the parking lot to the apartment building. Concrete steps and brick retaining walls/seating walls will be used to connect the parking lot to the sidewalk and to the access steps to the apartment building. The brick seating walls will match the brick walls on the Preston Apartment building, and will have the same bluestone cap, see attached pictures in this document. The concrete sidewalk and steps will match the required color used for Charlottesville concrete sidewalks and curbing. All handrails shall match the Preston Apartment railings.

Landscaping will be installed for the parking lot expansion to screen the cars from Preston Place and the neighborhood. There is an existing 36” Oak tree in the northwest corner of the parcel that is proposed to remain. Additional trees and shrubs shall be planted along the rear property line and North property line to screen the parking lot from the adjacent properties. Interior trees and landscaping are also proposed in the parking lot, exceeding the minimum interior landscaping requirements of the City of Charlottesville. A 36-inch cedar tree, a 30-inch cedar tree, a 10-inch maple, and (3) other trees will be removed the construction of the parking lot on the property. The proposed landscaping will mitigate the loss of this tree canopy and provide additional tree canopy on the existing lot.

At this time, no review is being requested for the existing historic house. Any modifications or changes to the existing house will be submitted to the BAR as a separate application for review.
BAR REVIEW – MAY 2019

The project was reviewed by the BAR at the May session based on the original submission. During the meeting, the applicant requested a deferral on the vote for the project so they could make some modifications to the proposed project to address some of the concerns expressed by the neighborhood and the BAR members. Attached is the updated site plan for the project, which takes into consideration many of the ideas and suggestions from the meeting. The following is a summary of the changes to the site plan and BAR proposal:

1. The parking lot plan has been updated and adjusted in order to save the two existing cedar trees along the western property line. Five parking spaces have been removed, and the entrance into the parking lot has been shifted to the north to allow the preservation of these (2) trees. The canopy of these two trees and the existing oak tree have been added to the site plan and the improvements have been designed with respect to the existing drip line of these trees.
2. The owner has met with the neighbors about the updated plan for the property. Two options of the changes to the site plan were presented to the neighborhood. The first option included and entrance and exit on the western side of the property with no access of the east side of the property. The second option, which is what we are presenting to the BAR for approval, included an entrance along the western property line and egress from the site from the east side of the property. While option #1 was less intrusive on the existing Manor house, the benefit of limiting traffic on Preston Place outweighed the egress travelway adjacent to the Manor house. As discussed with the neighborhood residents, we are submitting Option #2 for review and acceptance from the BAR for the project.
3. As suggested during the BAR meeting, we have shown on the site plan the extension of the wooden fence along the northern property line, matching the existing wooden fence in the front yard along the north property line to the limits of the western property line.
4. Site parking lot lighting has been added to the plan for safety of the parking lot.
5. The elevation of the egress road from the parking lot to the eastern property line and Preston Place has been raised to an elevation consistent with the existing wooden steps and walkway. The walkway will tie-in to the travelway, as shown on the site plan, and no additional steps or landings will be necessary for the transition of the steps to the walkway.
6. The landscaping around the parking lot has been updated with the changes to the parking lot. The existing oak tree will remain, along with the (2) existing cedar trees.
7. The parking lot will still be a permeable paver system.
8. Drainage inlets will still be installed within the limits of the parking lot, routing the excess run-off from the parking lot South to Grady Avenue, and the run-off will not drain to the existing neighborhood street.
Preston Apartments – Currently under construction / renovation

Existing 36" Oak Tree to Remain
Proposed brick wall / seating wall with bluestone cap – matching Preston Apartments
ECO Paver

Driveway in ECO Paver, Harvest Blend


Available in a standard 4 3/4” x 9” unit, ECO Paver is an ideal choice for those seeking a sustainable stormwater management solution in compliance with local regulatory requirements.

Color Selections

- Autumn Blend
- Harvest Blend
- Pewter Blend

Because our products are made from natural materials, variations in colors are to be expected. Be sure to see actual samples of the products you are considering, and visit one of over 100 independently-owned EP Henry Authorized Hardscaping Distributors.

Product Dimensions