

Planning Commission Work Session

November 25, 2025 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM

Hybrid Meeting – City Space Conference Room

Commissioners Present: Chairman Schwarz, Commissioner Mitchell, Commissioner d’Oronzio, Commissioner Solla-Yates, Commissioner Stolzenberg, Commissioner Roettger, Commissioner Yoder, Commissioner Joy

Staff Present: Missy Creasy, Remy Trail, Dannan O’Connell, Krisy Hammill, Matt Alfele, Ben Chambers, James Freas, Sam Sanders

Chairman Schwarz called the Planning Commission Work Session to order at 5:02 PM

1. Capital Improvement Program

Staff Presentation

The first parts of the work session were not recorded. The Work Session recording started during the staff presentation on the CIP Budget proposal with the Education Slide of the presentation.

Krisy Hammill, Budget Director –

Next Slide – Education

A total of half-million. That has obviously stayed. We are carrying that through to this plan.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If we have a big plan coming that is up in the air, including big questions about what entire buildings and campuses are used for, does it make sense to be putting \$40 million into Walker right now?

Sam Sanders, City Manager – That is not considered for Walker. That is an earmark for the Pre-K Center. Whether it happens at Walker, which is where it is scheduled to be today, or it will be moved to Oak Lawn. That is why Oak Lawn was there as a reference point. We knew that people would ask about Oak Lawn.

James Freas, Deputy City Manager – The clarity is that the preschool is a new building, whether it is as the Walker campus or Oak Lawn, it is a new separate building that is specifically designed for preschool use.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Is there any part of that investigation on whether the Pre-K center should remain distributed in neighborhoods?

Mr. Sanders – That is how we already got to that. That assessment was already done and concluded that we were building a Pre-K center. The only reason Oak Lawn is part of the consideration is that it just landed in ‘our lap’ the way that it did this fall. Otherwise, it would be full steam ahead at the Walker site.

Commissioner Roettger – Is there any consideration to doing 2?

Mr. Sanders – That would have been a part of the assessment work that was previously done. I inherited it. It was done. I asked questions like that. It was already determined that it would be at the Walker site. Until the FEI site came into the conversation, it was done. FEI shifted that conversation. Oak Lawn became the secondary location.

Next Slide – Facilities Capital Projects

Ms. Hammill – There is one new addition here. It is the McGuffey roof that needs to be replaced. We have currently put that in as a placeholder in FY30. As I mentioned earlier, there is a commitment from the City Manager. Additional funds have been added for the HVAC replacement. That puts us at about \$4 million in facilities projects for 2027 and just over \$26 million for the 5 years.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Solar funding goes to zero?

Ms. Hammill – That is currently zero. Those funds have been deployed to other projects such as the bypass, and I think CATEC. There is a bigger discussion about solar in general.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Does that mean we are doing PPAs in the future or that we are not rolling out solar in the future?

Ms. Hammill – We are investigating PPAs.

Commissioner Yoder – That too would be something that you would see more of, or we may go back to allocating specific project by project.

Mr. Freas – When Ms. Hammill referred to the bypass, we meant the solar panels on the bypass firehouse.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We have been investigating PPAs for a while. Is there a process to follow on that? Is there an estimated time we will finish investigating PPAs?

Ms. Hammill – We have done our due diligence from a financial standpoint. Can we do one? How would we do one? When we use tax-exempt bonds, that adds an additional wrinkle to what we can or cannot do with a private business. We have done that piece. It has now been given to the Office of Sustainability, who is working through the details of a potential contract.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Should we expect that process to wrap up before this budget is adopted and a decision will be made?

Ms. Hammill – We can get you more clarification. I don't know the answer to that. I know that there are things that must be worked out with Dominion and other partners. They are working on that.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – With the McGuffey roof replacement, I don't see a connection to the Comprehensive Plan on this item. Where does this sit in the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Freas – Broadly, it is a city facility. It lives in the world of maintaining city facilities. The roof needs to be replaced. It is our building to maintain.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What Commissioner Solla-Yates is addressing is that we are renting this building for \$30,000 a year. If we must replace the roof for \$1.2 million, it will take 40 years to recoup just the roof cost in our rent. We have a 5-year lease that was signed in 2023. Can we expect revenue coming into the CIP from our tenants there to defray this cost after that lease?

Mr. Sanders – We are in a policy conversation right now. You would need Council to make that determination as it relates to the arrangements that we have. Those leases are set in regards they are city facilities, but also the partnership and the opportunity for what is happening in that building for community enrichment. That will be

part of their assessment. Do they feel comfortable replacing a roof on a building that is owned by the city being used in that manner for the lease amount that we target policies?

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If we are looking for schools to temporarily put people in, we own a whole other school building close to downtown and connected to bus routes.

Next Slide – Public Safety & Justice

Ms. Hammill – Not a lot of changes here, except for the mobile data terminals. That is basically a cost escalator, not additional computers. Most of the equipment is expensive. Rather than trying to do the lump sums at once, we try to spread those out so that they can make small replacements during the year in a more cyclical manner than all at once. That is why you see these recurring amounts, except for firetrucks.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – I had a question about firetrucks yesterday. The ones that we purchase are custom-expensive. My understanding is that it is a 2-year lead time to get them. It is a challenging market. Physically, a lot of what we do in the city is limited by the large firetrucks that we have difficulty buying and fitting into our old and small city. Is it possible to fix this?

Ms. Hammill – I think that they might know more than this. What little I know, we might have to get you some more information. I know that they are exploring other options. There are different ways that everything does not have to be custom now. I think there are some off the line trucks that you can buy at this point. They are working through those details to see what may or may not work.

Mr. Sanders – The focus has been on how we cut down on the lead time. The lead time is market driven. That is just a matter of the various parts being available, getting to the suppliers to do what needs to be done. We are not looking at shrinking fire trucks. That is not something that we have considered. The reality is that we have been able to confirm that we have not found it impossible or impassable for any truck to get where we need to go. I found our team doing things that were amazing for what they can do with a truck that big. We have not approached that conversation specifically. I imagine if it got harder to procure the equipment, we would probably have to do something else.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What I am hearing is we are going to revise our Standards & Design Manual to reflect that new streets can be similar in design to our older streets if it is not a problem.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – That is the constant issue with all these site plans. A buyer says that they cannot do x in here. It is a combination. There is this philosophy of where we are going; we don’t need roads. They are so big. I get the sense that it is limited in some of these places particularly with the sub-lotting and the moving around of access to where we are. The size of the truck and the design and its relationship to the design manual is going to become more of a thing.

Mr. Sanders – I will not disagree that it will not get harder based on decisions that we are making and when we see our landscape change. At this moment, where you see the purchase of apparatus.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – It is concerning to hear that fire is not looking at trucks. Going back to when I was on PLACE Design Task Force, Emily Pellicia was deputy chief.

Mr. Sanders – When I say looking at, I mean not making a change to the order. Are they considering it? I am sure they are at this moment. I have complained about how much trucks cost and how long it takes to get them. I would not say that it has not occurred to them that they may need to come up with something at some point. I am saying what is on the list to be acquired at this time is normal size.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Do we know what type of trucks in FY27 and FY29?

Mr. Sanders – There is no change. Whatever we have ordered, I will have to find that out for you. I am not aware of any change in model or brand.

Next Slide – Transportation and Access

Ms. Hammill – It is just over \$11 million for FY27 and just under \$51 million over the 5 years. There is no change except to add the 5th year in this section, except for the ones that are highlighted. You will notice a sizable increase in the new sidewalks. In your packet, we provided you with a list of the plans for the sidewalks and the tiers of those to be replaced using those funds. The CAT bus replacement plan is their normal replacement plan. These are revised costs of just the regular to replace their regular fleet now. There are no changes in terms of EV or otherwise at this point. With ITS, I believe it was a slight increase. Their right-of-way pertinence was an increase. I think that was previously funded at \$100,000. That was bumped to \$150,000. The historic dollars in total went up slightly. The timing changed to move that up to FY27. We added the Dominion Pole remediation. That was an addition this year. That is to help purchase right-of-way to get the poles out of the way for more accessibility.

Mr. Freas – It is mostly to buy right-of-way. Dominion had moved the poles themselves.

Chairman Schwarz – How many poles can you move for \$100,000?

Commissioner Stolzenberg – They do it at no cost, but they won't buy the right-of-way. These are for their ADA violations or are these non-violating?

Mr. Freas – We are going into an area that we could spend hours talking about and not get to a finish point.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – Some of these poles date to 1927.

Mr. Freas – As does our franchise agreement that allows them to exist. It does not expire.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – Some of that agreement isn't our agreement. Part of the agreement was Albemarle County. We bought South Belmont. We pulled South Belmont from that as well. With sidewalk repair, I assume that this is about capacity. It is getting enough bodies and contractors to do this work.

Mr. Sanders – It is about being able to do that work. That team is also working on the new sidewalks in addition to the contractors.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – This is the new in-house concrete team.

Mr. Sanders – That is correct. They have already been working. Some of this is tied to them. I would not say all of it.

Mr. Freas – That team is still forming. We just had another member join the city.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I had not noticed that sidewalk repair was zeroed out this fiscal year. Was that because there was so much?

Ms. Hammill – That was because there was a big balance.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – With the citywide transportation plan and Three Notched Trail Plan, where do those live?

Mr. Freas – The citywide transportation plan was funded via surplus money. That was voted on about a month ago. With Three Notched Trail, I am not sure that I have seen any cost estimate. I have not seen anything about where the County is on Three Notched Trail.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – They have a grant that only goes to the city line.

Ben Chambers, Transportation Planner – We don't have a plan or scope for the Three Notched Trail in the city.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – With bicycle infrastructure, we got an email this afternoon. I recently recall a conversation that addressed this point that we are going to conspire on the work that is slated for Cherry and West Main. It is not necessarily new bicycle infrastructure. It is about accommodating proper bicycle infrastructure in those areas. Do I have that right?

Mr. Freas – After the rebuild of West Main and Cherry Avenue? If we are milling and paving things, we are going to be striping.

Mr. Chambers – We are coordinating with utilities and public service on their repaving plans for Cherry, Elliott, and West Main going forward over this winter.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – There was some concern that we were being cheap about it. Most of this is improvements in conjunction with much larger dollar projects.

Mr. Chambers – With the improvements in those corridors, we would want to add on to the existing work that is going to happen there. With the funding that you are looking at in the bicycle infrastructure fund, part of the reason that is not going up is that we have a current balance that we are spending down on projects like 5th Street. We are also looking at Rose Hill Drive as part of that repaving. We might need to have some additional funds from our bike infrastructure so that some of those improvements are done as well.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – There is \$1 million in the balance. How much will be spent on Rose Hill and 5th Street?

Mr. Chambers – With 5th Street, we have a cost estimate of about \$600,000. We are hoping to work that down with using in-house crews and identifying some cheaper materials than what the VDOT consultants gave to us. With Rose Hill, we are not sure yet. We are currently scoping that. With the planning phase of that, we should have a better idea in March.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – It seems to me that we are potentially funding constrained in the next fiscal year, given what will be used on those 2 plans if we also want to do studies, including significant community engagement for West Main and Cherry. Depending on the timelines, those may have to begin within the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chambers – We are looking at West Main starting in FY26 for the utilities project. We don't know when the endpoint of that is going to be. They are working through what the designs would be for that. They have had to rework some of their designs. We will have a better idea of what the endpoint will be. We are expecting that at the end of that project, public service will come back and do a repaving through that corridor that will allow us to put in the final striping design. That puts us on a timeframe of having a few years for us to go in and do

that work. Right now, we are trying to focus on the work that we have already started doing the planning for. Get that done and then come through with a scope for what we do with West Main and what we do for Cherry and Elliott, which seems to be on a similar timeframe in terms of when they are coming through that corridor and when we will do repaving.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – You say a few years. This budget goes through 2 years.

Mr. Chambers – We are looking at 3 to 4 years from when that needs to be done. We have a little buffer.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – That includes the central line water project?

Mr. Chambers – The central water line project is around 5 years for both phases that are going all the way across the city.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Are they repaving as they go?

Mr. Chambers – That is correct. They are going to be doing patch repaving. Most of their work is going to be along the parking lane. They will be doing patch repaving as they go. We are working with public service to see if there will need to be more thorough repaving once they are done there. Once you disturb one part of the pavement, it impacts on what is happening on the rest of the street. We are going to try to make sure that is lined up correctly over this winter.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I get that there are other priorities and we a few years out from the first phases of these being done. You are saying that there is no chance of any planning work starting prior to July 2027.

Mr. Chambers – I don't have that in my work plan right now to complete by then.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – On the Bicycle Infrastructure line item, we were funding this at \$200,000 from at least FY16 to FY20. If you adjust for inflation, that is \$275,000 a year. That was accruing a balance because, historically, we were unable to spend any money. It now sounds like we are going to be able to spend more than \$700,000 this year. These are bondable funds that we don't issue until we need them. It seems that it would be appropriate to resume funding at least \$200,000, if not inflation adjusted to \$275,000, so we can begin to build up a balance in that fund for more of these larger corridor reconfiguration projects like we are doing on 5th Street, on Cherry, and on West Main. Eventually, we have East High and Ivy coming. We have several other corridors that need work. It seems to me that, based on what Council says are our priorities and what our Comprehensive Plan priorities are, funding this at a third of the level we were 10 years ago seems not to be in line with those priorities.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – Is there a concern that we end up in the same situation we were?

Commissioner Stolzenberg – There is a difference between going years without spending any money at all or having plans to spend any money at all or ability to spend any money at all. We have now built up a balance. We are finally spending 6 figures a year, even higher than 6 figures in some years and building up a balance to spend money again in larger chunks. We have a pipeline of projects, even if it is longer. Like we do in other items in our CIP, we have a policy or practice of building up money year by year with steady funding so that we can spend it.

Mr. Freas – I want to point out the new sidewalk line.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – New sidewalks are great. We are finally funding it.

Mr. Freas – What is different about that line and the bike line?

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We are finally funding it. We are making up for all those years.

Mr. Freas – Remember every year. We are building a specific plan. What we used to do, there were often times this similar conversation about sidewalks at this table, we had a flatline. We said that we are going to come back, and we are going to put together a specific plan of how much we are going to spend every year. We are going to try that. That is what you are going to see in the CIP. That is the approach we are now taking. We are trying to move away from putting money away in accounts and move towards specific plans of investment that we are tying specific money to.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – We are moving away from the layaway plan.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – That is great for when we have more than 2 or 3 years of a project pipeline. When we have a 6-year planning process that we have funds to do sidewalks, that works. Otherwise, we are going to have 3 years of projects that are using old funds. We are going to have new projects pop up that we have not thought of yet. There is no placeholder for it in the CIP. That is how you end up with your tail years in the CIP having much lower funding amounts. We are suddenly tossing \$100 million school reconfiguration that was never on that 5th year of the CIP.

Mr. Sanders – That was prior practice that you are referencing.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Hopefully that does not happen again.

Mr. Sanders – That was prior practice. Part of what you are speaking to is about philosophy. It is about philosophy. A lot of the conversations that I have had with this team was about what I deemed to be rather inappropriate of how we would tuck away in the CIP categories. We never believed that we could come back and get a ‘yes’ from the budget team to get the money we needed to do a project. I have worked very hard to eliminate that from the practice of what drives the conversation of believing that we cannot come back with a solid plan and get it funded. What you are seeing here, as Mr. Freas alluded to with the new sidewalks plan, it was me standing before you a couple years ago saying, please don’t try to give me more money because I cannot do anything with it.’ I remember saying that. That was meant to get your attention. There is the planning aspect of what needs to come before you with the ask for increased funds. I think what we are saying to you in this bicycle infrastructure lane is that we are working on it. We are not there because we have been working on sidewalks, schools, and other things. We are trying to get those numbers right so that what appears in the 5-year plan is more accurate. As to what we need money for and what we are going to get done. That has not been what has driven it. I am not saying that we didn’t do it right before. I am saying that I am choosing to push for it to be done differently. That is what this now reflects. The money is there. I could simply take your request and go back. Ms. Hammill and I could figure out what is a good number to plug in there. We could say that will put in \$300,000 for FY28, FY29, and FY30 and make you happy.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I think what we are hearing is that there is a pipeline of projects that will be coming in 2029 and 2030.

Mr. Sanders – He has not given me that list yet. He is not there yet. What he knows is that he can give me a list now and get the funding that he needs because the new sidewalk line and a lot of other things came out of his hands. If we were to start putting numbers in the boxes again, we would just put numbers there that we don’t know tied to a project list or even are possible for us to get done. We would have an inability to spend that money that particular year because we needed to take that line in proximity to everything else that we are trying

to get done as well. If there is a capacity issue, that could interfere with our ability to spend. That is the reason why the thing to remember about this is that this is a 5-year plan. We revisit it every single year. We will be right back here next year with Mr. Chambers putting in a number in one of these boxes at least for one of these years. That is what I am projecting and pushing forward. It is a different approach to rushing to putting a number in the box for a number to be in the box. I want to make sure it is as close to the right number in the box associated with the projects, which is why we share it with you. The list that you got this year for the sidewalks is because I wanted you to be able to see what sidewalks are going to get done. I have been waiting on that list too.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I agree. I think it is great to have the funding numbers be tied to specific projects and our best estimate of them that we can get now. I hope that we can at least get placeholders for the projects that we know are in the pipeline by the time that this is adopted in April.

Commissioner Yoder – What I am hearing is that the reason why the bicycle line is what it is because there is not a list of projects with cost estimates associated. It is great to see specific projects in the plan because it is tangible. I hope that we can get there with bike facilities as well. Hopefully, next year we are looking at a list of what we are going to do with this bike money.

Commissioner Joy – We have received several emails from people in the community. There is a lot of head scratching. It does not seem like the budget lines up with the value systems. A lot of this is optics. I feel the budget is a tangible reflection of where our priorities are. I don't know if there is a way/color shading to highlight these. These are their future plans. These future plans might change. I wonder if you can color out cells saying that this is pending, comprehensive studies for bike & pedestrian.

Mr. Sanders – I just want to point out that we probably need to spend some time identifying where else is there bicycle infrastructure recurring that is not related to that line. We are doing other projects that have abilities to touch the fact that we are working on bicycle infrastructure.

Commissioner Joy – Maybe it is an asterisk with a footnote that is saying that there is already a surplus that is being tapped into so that the public feels that bicycles are a priority.

Mr. Sanders – We need to visualize what progress we are making while trying to get to a place of a bigger number in those boxes that are tied to projects.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – On that note, we now have \$150,000 a year in citywide traffic engineering improvements. We are continuing to have \$100,000 in neighborhood transportation improvements. I think those are the funding sources we have historically used for things like our quick build program. I think the goal of the quick build program would be that we validate that some things work, maybe some things don't work, and we change up and do a new thing, and we eventually lay some concrete and harden them. Is there money to harden them? Is this funding them at the level where we can still keep putting down paint and plastic?

Mr. Freas – When you get to hardening them, they must move into one of these other lines.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – None of the other lines have any money for that yet.

Mr. Sanders – Not being saved for that, no. We will take those projects when they have matured to that point.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – On the other side, we have small area plan implementation still being funded at \$200,000 a year. This is the fund formerly known as SIA Implementation, immediate implementation. There is now \$1.8 million in Authorized but Not Issued funding in that pot. We did manage to spend \$200,000 this year

on that. I don't know what we spent it on. It was maybe the bridge over by Jordan Park or the new bridge over by south First Street.

Mr. Sanders – That is what is about to come out of that. It is to get that Pollacks Branch Bridge done. It will be a big chunk of that \$1.8 million.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We are going to keep funding that at \$200,000 a year with no specific plans.

Mr. Sanders – That is different. The Strategic Investment Area (SIA) was a policy action. That is different. It had its own individual course of it receiving \$200,000 a year. The fact that it built up money over time is why we decided that we no longer wanted to make it just exclusively tied to the Strategic Investment Area, but then available to implement small area plans. The reality is for us to figure out how to spend it, which is why the implementation fund has at least 2 sizable earmarks to it right now. What you see is what is sitting. It is going to be spent. The \$200,000 a year is to make sure that we get moving into identifying projects. We have not been doing that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We will be identifying projects.

Mr. Sanders – That is why I can tell you this. It is on my target list. I don't like storing money away for no specific reason. It is not infinite.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – With street milling and paving, we are starting to see this get significantly untethered from the historical amount we have dedicated to it and the amount that we get from VDOT each year. That is not our budget for street milling and paving. We get \$5.6 million from VDOT every year for street milling and paving.

Ms. Hammill – That is for maintenance, which is a different budget in the general fund.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – There is \$2.5 million this year, which is already up 25 percent over a few years ago. We are getting \$2 million a year for 4 years.

Mr. Sanders – We project that we are going to get more milling and paving done.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Is that because we are targeting a higher quality index? The last time I checked, the documents have not been posted. Our pavement quality index was above our target.

Mr. Sanders – I don't think it is that. I think this is about getting more done. That is the pressure point that I have made.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We are getting more done because there is a backlog. Isn't the backlog a list of streets that are below our target pavement quality. Are we making policy choices implicitly to increase our target pavement quality?

Mr. Sanders – No, I don't believe that is the case. I believe that we are just catching up.

Ms. Hammill – I think some of the backup is related to sidewalk work that needed to be done in advance.

Mr. Sanders – I think that our index will probably increase just as a matter of getting more done. I think it is also because we need more done. We have not been consistently doing that. That is part of the question that

came when Public Works came before us to meet. One of the conversation points that did request follow-up on is that subject.

Ms. Hammill – That should probably be highlighted in yellow.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – ADA is our equity project that eats up ‘the pie.’ How long is that ‘pie’ going?

Mr. Sanders – That is not even close. That might be a nice slice, that 5-year plan. The result of the ADA Transition Plan was around \$150 million across the entire city for issues collectively. That \$2 million a year was a request that I made in putting the budget together to Council to indicate that as best effort. That has been part of the conversation that I have had with them for the concern that other communities have had the Department of Justice come in. You don’t want that. What they do when they come in is tell you that you must do what you already knew that you needed to do. You do it on their schedule. When you do it on their schedule, it does not matter how much it costs. A lot of the things that we are talking about moving around, I would have to shift to a bigger number in that 5-year plan to meet their settlement agreement. We will be signing one if they come because our issues are that significant. A community that has been around since 1762. We have a long list of issues. It does not matter that you have been around that long. It does not matter that the agreements that we signed were in the early 1900s. None of that matters. When the law was changed, we were supposed to start working on it. We have not chosen to. This is the beginning of doing that in a real substantive way. I will say that number could double or triple depending on the amount of work we choose to do as we get into some of the more complicated projects for the volume of what we know is the problem, the scope of the problem.

Commissioner Yoder – Did the larger study have a prioritization list associated with it?

Mr. Sanders – Part of what I was looking for was an ability to indicate that if we were to allocate \$2 million, I know what you are thinking. That is contradictory to what I said. I knew that it was going to have \$150 million situation. With \$2 million a year, I have the plan covered. What we knew coming out of that scenario was that we were going to have to figure out what our capacity needs were going to be to do more. Part of the first year was to shift funds to Parks & Recreation and have them prioritize their projects that are barrier removal and access focused. They then check the ADA box and the Park Master Plan box. It is to give us time so that we can figure out more about what we can do and what additional resources we need.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – The size of the ADA bucket in terms of our overall equity spend makes me worry that there are other buckets that we are not spending on. Is that true?

Mr. Sanders – I would say that is not equity alone. Globally, the local government’s work is supposed to be conscious of equity improvements. Since we have a wide variety of things that appear in our CIP and in our budget for where we are spending money, I would argue that we are checking that equity box in significant ways. Can we be more intentional and get to some of the harder to serve areas of our population of our neighborhoods? Absolutely. That is part of where we get to prioritize more work in the transition plan to make sure that we go into areas that are the last ones that we might visit under normal circumstances. It is part of the test for the paving and milling scenario. Part of my question to the team will be how do we know that we need to go there? I know it is on the list. Why must we go in that order? Why can’t we go in this order instead? They don’t like it when I do that. That is Ok. That is part of my job. From an equity standpoint, it is about the intentional work of making sure that we are not leaving anyone or any part of the community behind. With a global look at this, I would say that we are checking most of our boxes. We probably could be checking some a little better. Identifying that Dominion pole remediation and acknowledging that with money being earmarked for pole removal is being more conscious of the problem that we knew existed. We know it because we walk on sidewalks ourselves. If 2 or 3 of us are walking together and we must move, we know that there is a problem.

Commissioner Roettger – Did this include school-related?

Mr. Sanders – Yes. It did include part of the school assessments.

Commissioner Yoder – I have a question about the CAT transit bus replacement. I know there are a couple of different types of buses that are currently operating. There are the regular transit bus and the smaller vehicles. Are we purchasing more transit buses or are we going in the direction of the smaller vehicles?

Mr. Sanders – The smaller vehicles are usually for field trips and special activities. Our transit department has a responsibility to do special needs transport as well. We would not use a big bus for that.

Commissioner Yoder – I saw in the write-up that some of the buses may be alternatively fueled vehicles. I have read that there has been some major disruption in bus manufacturing and electric battery buses have had a lot of significant issues. Are we sticking with the tried-and-true buses? Are we doing anything new and potentially expensive?

Mr. Sanders – We have a commitment to convert our fleet. That Council action has already been taken. We have a period of time before we start procuring those buses. We have had an internal conversation about discussing that more with Council after Councilor Fleischer joins and begin to look at what the concerns that we might have the constraints that might be there and maybe a reason to adjust the schedule, not to stop a plan to convert but adjust the timing of it.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – To recap, CAT just submitted a no-low grant to the feds to improve their facilities on Avon to accommodate electric and hydrogen fueling. If they get that, that will pay for the fixed costs of that.

Mr. Sanders – We have been informed that we did not get it.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Council committed to both battery electric and hydrogen.

Mr. Sanders – That is the basis of why the conversation had to come back.

Mr. Freas – I want to clarify that Council's commitment was to try both of those and then decide. It is not a commitment to do both. It is a commitment to try both. We must have facilities to repair both to do that.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – That would mean a purchase of vehicles, or we would have some sort of lease arrangement for those.

Mr. Freas – I think that everything is purchased.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – Presumably, we are going to ditch either electric or hydrogen or maybe we will do both.

Mr. Freas – At some point, we will decide. We will say that this is the technology that we will move forward with. That will be what the purchases will be going forward.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Is CAT now submitting for smart scale for the same grant or with the same improvements?

Mr. Freas – There is a plan B and a plan C.

Mr. Sanders – We are not done. It was just one decline happening now in this fiscal year.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – I love copper. It is great technology, and it works. If we were to step back and rethink, could we consider copper wire as an option? It was described based on aesthetic concerns. I love aesthetics.

Mr. Sanders – I don't know. We will have to investigate that; not since I have been here. For the past 4 years, no. It was not part of the conversation. I don't know if it was prior.

Commissioner Yoder – With the historic districts and entrance corridors, that was the design that was cut off. Are we getting updated design guidelines for \$150,000 next fiscal year? With the historic district and entrance corridor design guidelines, we are getting a new guidebook or an updated guidebook for historic districts and entrance corridors.

Kellie Brown, NDS Director – We are working to scope that study right now. The goal is to evaluate the guidelines and see where updates would be appropriate.

Next Slide – Parks and Recreation

Ms. Hammill – There is a lot of yellow here largely because we are still waiting on specific plans. That is what we have termed this year's callbacks to look at details and plans before we nail down numbers on both the Master Park Plan, The Downtown Mall Tree Management Plan, and Downtown Mall infrastructure repairs in general. The city-county park maintenance is a new request this year. For any of the jointly owned parks, such as Darden Towe and Ivy Creek, if there is work that is planned, both the city and county put in 50 percent of that in their budget. The county has approached staff and asked for an opportunity to have a pot of money for general maintenance. It is not specific. We are getting more details and figuring out how that might work. That is why that is yellow.

Mr. Sanders – The first 2 lines being yellow and they appear as placeholders is because we are expecting that we will have actual numbers by year before this budget cycle closes. That was the request that I made.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Council approved or at least saw that plan. Are we moving forward with phase one at some point during this?

Mr. Sanders – That is what that requires.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Phase two would be 5 years later. I don't understand the staggering of all this.

Mr. Sanders – What we can make sure you get is parks and share their information to look at that. That reflects the actual tree work getting done. That was the schedule that they came back to us with. They adjusted based on the fact that I would not put placeholders in for them to force them to give me real numbers. That is what they came back with.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We separately have an active life cycle management.

Mr. Sanders – I asked that question. We are going to get an answer on that one. Do we need that to continue while we are replacing them? Do we then get to move that somewhere else temporarily?

Mr. Freas – The motion on that line is that it is supposed to be responsive to large dead limbs and dead trees that present a hazard. It is almost operational.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – With the Parks Master Plan implementation, we adopted a parks master plan with the comp plan. It cost a lot of money.

Mr. Sanders – A lot of the results for the plan came back as maintenance driven. There are several things that I would imagine that the first couple of years are going to be probably lower than you see in the out years, so that we can focus on the maintenance activities first. There is probably a bigger bang that the public can appreciate if we focus there and then get to bigger projects, which is why they are going to come back to make more. I would imagine that there will be bigger numbers.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – The Master Plan is split into stuff with parks and this huge new paved trail network, which complements our other on street bike/ped facilities. Is this reflective? I note that the parkland and trails acquisition and development are unchanged. Is this putting the shared-use path network on hold?

Mr. Sanders – That is a good question. The master plan also includes trails. I would imagine that they would either include those numbers in the parks master plan implementation line, or they may ask us to change the trails line if they can identify what acquisition work could be done and/or what improvement work could be done. That is a question for part of that follow-up that we have with them.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I know there are external grants to tap others that they can leverage. They might need money allocated so they can help those.

Mr. Sanders – One of the changes that is occurring with the trails management is that we are shifting some responsibilities to the capital division within Public Works. There is some coordination that needs to be done between the two departments before those numbers go dramatically different. There could be some adjustments.

Chairman Schwarz – What do we get from the urban tree planting? Is that 5 trees?

Mr. Sanders – It is a significant number.

Chairman Schwarz – Is there any funding for trees on West Main that were lost? I think we lost over 10.

Mr. Sanders – I would not imagine it would be part of repaving. Part of the scenario has been the tenor of the conversation about the West Main redevelopment project itself. That is where the trees were anticipated being addressed. Since that was removed off the table, it is a matter of it getting back on the table. Planting in the interim might be something to look at.

Mr. Freas – I think that those trees on West Main are not going to come back until after the utility project.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Are you saying that the West Main streetscape could come back?

Mr. Sanders – I did not say that. That is a political decision. You have your conversations with who you need to have those conversations with.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I am not saying that is bad. We should maybe just put some trees in the wells.

Mr. Sanders – I think there is an order to that process. I would imagine that staff would come and ask me: Do you want trees in all those holes? Would you like to confirm that?

Commissioner Mitchell – It looks like you have zeroed out the ash tree treatment. Is there a reason?

Mr. Sanders – I think that was their request.

Ms. Hammill – I think that was done last year as part of the plan. We can follow up on that. Most of that work had been done. We shifted the funding and increased it a little bit in one of the other lines. I think it went to the urban tree planting.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – All the dead trees are dead. We are going to keep inoculating the ones we saved. A lot of that money was just taking down.

Next Slide – Affordable Housing

Ms. Hammill – There are no changes to this section. Last year during the CIP planning process, the Carlton Mobile Home Park was new. The final terms were not known at that time. The numbers here have been adjusted to reflect the final financing that was received for that project.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – Three years ago, navigating that and getting the data on that, that was awkward. Last year, it was better. This year is another level of smoothness on the budget book, the CIP, and accessing things. This upgraded platform is better. With Carlton Mobile Homes, we pay principal and interest there at \$19,000 a month. Is that \$4 million going to be bonded to pay that ballooning loan off? What is the \$4 million four years out?

Ms. Hammill – It is a balloon. The financing is set with a balloon payment. We are basically paying interest in the 4 years that are here: interest payment and one principal payment in this current fiscal year. The rest is interest. It is not bondable for us. It is not our loan. It is PHA’s loan.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – If we are doing something like that, we are creating an entity in which the city has a piece of the action to get close to that. We are just going to pay it. Presumably, that could also fall into some sort of financing arrangement and not having to pay off this.

Ms. Hammill – That would potentially be up to them.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Do we have a performance agreement on that?

Ms. Hammill – There is a funding agreement.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – I noticed that on CISRAP we are taking a dive into the program itself. I think that it is overdue for a couple of reasons. Some of them are in the weeds. The present structure was how this is funded and works. It was worked out when Mike was the acting city manager. That arrangement there has needed a re-examination for a while. The original thing was clunky. Our fix to it was not quite right. It was we could do with what we had. I am glad to see that it is done. It is a policy decision if we start increasing that number. Can John Sales manage the throughput with the current housing stock that we have?

Mr. Sanders – We are deep in that item. We had a big conversation about it earlier today.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – My other comment would be on the Affordable Housing Fund. I am going to be a broken record on this capacity piece. We are now down to Ms. Metzler being focused on that. Unless you want to be putting anything else on her desk.

Mr. Sanders – We did not lose the 2nd position. We will begin recruiting at some point for the 2nd position and have conversations about expanding that.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – One of my concerns about the staffing of it is that the less staff we have, the fewer projects and the bigger they get. It does not produce a ticking through process if we can be doing a lot of these things that are larger in scale.

Mr. Sanders – It is not just the projects that we are doing ourselves. It is also the things that we are investing in and the responsibilities that come with tracking those. We have always understood that we would be adding to that team. It was just a matter of that catching up. The zoning ordinance being stuck for the moment that it was stuck. We will now see what comes as a result of being unstuck.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – At one point, we had a conversation about dedicating in addition to the \$10 million, a certain amount dedicated to staffing on that. Is that \$1.5 million inclusive of the designated recipients that you have generated the necessary services designated?

Mr. Freas – That will be in addition to this.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – With the low-barrier shelter, is the Salvation Army item correct? Is there a new item related to this topic?

Mr. Sanders – That is a construct related to Cherry Avenue, that location exclusively. It is a matter of whether we would be able to have a facility in partnership with the Salvation Army. Our purchase of Holiday Drive technically eliminates that. Since I don’t give up on things and try to continue to work on things. It is still there because we have other conversations going. There might be an opportunity to do something else. That would still be in the service of the needs of the unhoused.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – Is there a Holiday Drive item that will appear?

Mr. Sanders – It will eventually appear. We are not sure that we are going to need to do it out of the CIP. The intention was that we would not pay for the improvements of the building. Our philanthropic friends in the community have offered to step in if we were going to spend that much to acquire some. That is being negotiated.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – With a land bank, we took all the money from the land bank. Did we put the money back in? Will we put the money back in?

Mr. Sanders – The land bank conversation has been moving. We are now looking at the revolving loan fund through the Economic Development Authority as a more viable option. What would happen is that any funds we had earmarked for the land bank could go to that to support that being bigger. There are still a couple more questions and conversations to have to make that more viable as the option. That would be a question for the city to look at. I would consider that more of a 1-time cash injection versus planning that out in the CIP until we started doing some things.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Did I hear that there is a \$500,000 total revolving fund?

Mr. Sanders – I did not say a number. I think the conversation being had is most important, the mechanics of the revolving loan fund, and then the determination of what goes into it as a cash contribution will be happily entertained and taking that to Council.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – The University of Virginia bought some property and is leasing it for affordable housing. Have we talked about us doing a similar model where we use bondable funds to purchase land and then lease it out for affordable housing? Where are we on that idea?

Commissioner Stolzenberg – That is the structure of the 10th Street and Fontaine projects. They own the land. They are going to lease it to these nonprofits. If we purchase land, we can bond it.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – That would be great for a land bank to act as a land trust in that environment.

Mr. Sanders – We do own a piece of land that is vacant and could be used in that manner. We are not there yet. Future acquisitions are in the cards at this moment because we are carrying quite a load already. I am not seeing that yet as the next step.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – With the CAHF, we have wanted the CAHF big and running projects through the CAHF. We generally don’t do that. For FY31, could we increase the CAHF in FY31?

Mr. Sanders – It is not likely that it will stay that small with what we know. Is it possible to do it now and blindly?

Commissioner d’Oronzio – We have a capacity problem. There is a lot to administer there.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What we have discussed in the past is that specific projects tend to end up on this table out of the blue to us in a sense. Without a cost-benefit analysis or a competitive process comparing projects, we have a table with 2 providers, when we know there are more providers out there perhaps beyond the projects we have already committed to. We could and should have some rigorous defined process to decide what gets these large allocations. The RFIs we have started to do are a start.

Mr. Sanders – We can give you that.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – Who has that initial discussion?

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Part of the Affordable Housing Plan was this idea that we should have oversight structures that became the CAHF Committee that was not HAC. HAC was populated by people requesting funds. That became the CAHF Committee. Only a tiny subset of money goes to the CAHF through the CAHF Committee. Maybe we need to expand the purview of the CAHF Committee or maybe create a new structure if necessary to think about these larger projects and that \$1.5 million so that these conversations can happen in a public forum and happen at all where we can make tradeoffs and different projects against each other.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – I think we said last year and the year before that we need some sort of implementation system for this. We have no idea what that looks like.

Mr. Sanders – With the RFI process (Request for Investment), was what was established to make it not blind. Individuals would have to meet a deadline. It was listed as a part of our notice of funding availability that goes out in the fall. With each subsequent month, there is a deadline for a pot of funds that are available. The RFI round is the open period that any developer can submit where they are asking us to consider investment. We have now followed that process for 2 years. We will be bringing those to Council in the budget brief on the 15th of August. They will be in public light. We can share with you the three summary proposals that we have received. That is the plan process for going forward so that they are considered by Council as a giving reaction to what was requested and therefore giving me the indication that they want it to fit into the CIP. That is the

purpose of those briefs as they are being held. If you are asking for the Planning Commission to be the stand-in for reviewing them since the CAHF Committee scenario did not work out. I agree with you that it did not work out, we can take that to them and let them tell us what they want to do.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If the CAHF Committee is not working, we should fix the CAHF Committee. Are CRHA projects included in this? Were they intended to respond to the RFI? I know that they have future projects.

Mr. Sanders – Up until now, the FY28, which is the last year for Westhaven Redevelopment was to coordinate through Council commitments and action for that to appear up to FY28. They recently made requests through the fundamental process since they are now on that list around \$200,000, as part of a development project that is being shifted to the RFI process. I think it was scattered site. There has been no money allocated specifically to scattered site long term.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Of the CRHA projects that I have on my list that I have not seen any funding anywhere include 6th Street Phase 2, scattered sites, and the Dogwood portfolio including the random duplexes that they have recently purchased from excess CISRAP money. I believe the intent was to develop those properties. I don't know if they have any concrete plans for any of those.

Mr. Sanders – Not that we are aware of.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – The question was where does that eventual request go? Does that go through this RFI process?

With Friendship Court, Phase 4, we still have committed funding. Have we seen a plan for Friendship Court? The last I checked; it was Phase 4 TBD.

Mr. Sanders – I would say that we are working on that. Even today we had conversations about that specific Phase.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – 501 Cherry did not get 9 percent LI HTC. I now see that they applied for 4 percent LI HTC. Our commitment to funding has not changed. Do we know how that project has changed to accommodate the much lower funding amount they are apparently getting?

Mr. Sanders – It is being considered currently as well. It could be a matter of change of project or request for funds or a combination of the two.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – These are the sorts of things that I feel should be public, particularly when we are committing millions of dollars to these projects. I would also argue that we should request and require that we see project performas as a part of these funding commitments.

With the \$11 million in cash, what are we going to do with it? Have we gotten an indication of whether they are going to choose on-site units or in lieu payments?

Ms. Hammill – That is why it is not on the sheet yet.

Mr. Sanders – It could be anywhere between that based on any changes or mixed changes. We are excited to know that it is coming. We would love to know when we are going to see it.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – The exact amount because it is set as a multiple of the old inclusionary zoning requirement in lieu requirement under 34-12, which is per square foot in excess of 1.0 FAR at a certain dollar amount that is adjusted for inflation.

Mr. Sanders – We are excited that the money is coming. We know it is coming.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – That will be a pot of money that our future RFI process will have available to allocate through that.

Mr. Sanders – That will be when Council makes that determination. There are still questions around that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Just want to make sure we spend it within the statutorily required period before we must give it back.

Mr. Sanders – That is my job. We will do that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Are there other cash proffers that we are aware of on the horizon?

Mr. Freas – No.

Next Slide – Technology Infrastructure

Ms. Hammill – That \$40,000 is basically funded through PEG fees that are collected and must be spent on public access. The citywide IT infrastructure is an account that we use to help with technology infrastructure that has happened during the year. Most recently, we have used the funds in that account to help get implementation underway for asset management. We also used it for an upgrade to procurement system at one point. Our voting equipment is due for replacement. This was funded over 2 years. That will be taken care of in FY27.

Next Slide – What's Next?

We have had the work session tonight. You have a joint public hearing with Council on December 9th. That is when you will frame your formal recommendation to the City Manager for consideration with his proposed budget. That will be released to Council on March 2nd. We have the budget explorer tool. If you scroll down, there is also a new CIP quarterly report.

Mr. Freas – In the CIP quarterly report, you will see projects that are underway with updates as to where there are the statuses of them. There is information about each project. It is one of the reasons why we are moving away from lump sums to specific projects. We can more readily report on specific projects. This is intended to be a public asset for people to understand the work that is happening and the timeframe under which this is happening. The document is highly sortable, navigable. We are building it out over time. The same managing these projects are responsible for providing those updates and getting more of them into the system. We are trying with each quarter to get more projects into that system.

Mr. Sanders – You have seen that there is significant cash that is being used in this CIP. There is CIP contingency that is being used. Balancing all of that is really the task at hand. There is no desire to push back and hold off. It is really about just trying to make sure that our numbers are accurate, that this CIP is tight in a sense of what is in there, and should be in there for getting something done.

Adjournment

The work session was adjourned at 6:45 PM.

Public Comments

There were no public comments submitted during this work session.