CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
"A World Class City"

Department of Neighborhood Development Services

City Hall   Post Office Box 911
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902
Telephone 434-970-3182
Fax 434-970-3359
www.charlottesville.org

June 15, 2012

TO: Charlottesville Planning Commission, Neighborhood Associations & News Media

Please Take Notice

A Work Session of the Charlottesville Planning Commission will be held on **Tuesday June 26, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. in the NDS Conference Room in City Hall (610 East Market Street).**

AGENDA

1. Discussion of potential Joint City/County Comprehensive Plan Goals – Preservation, Environment, Entrance Corridors
2. Capital Improvement Plan Project Process
3. Public Comment – 15 minutes

cc: City Council
      Maurice Jones
      Aubrey Watts
      Jim Tolbert
      Neighborhood Planners
      Melissa Thackston, Kathy McHugh
      Mary Joy Scala
      Craig Brown, Rich Harris

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

MEMORANDUM

To: Charlottesville Planning Commission
From: Missy Creasy, Planning Manager and Summer Frederick, Project Manager
Date: June 19, 2012
Re: June 26, 2012 Work Session on Potential Joint City/Council Goals

As discussed at the City/County Joint Planning Commission meeting, held on April 17, 2012, the Livability Project (the Project) has completed its first series of public workshops, whose purpose was to solicit community input on existing Comprehensive Plan goals. The Project's next phase includes both Planning Commissions working on several issues that have been identified as appropriate for the creation of joint goals. In order to have the most productive conversation possible at the next City/County Joint Planning Commission, Project staff will be facilitating conversations focused on the identified issues with each Planning Commission, separately, over the course of the summer months.

Planning Commission meetings held on June 26, 2012 will be the first of these meetings for each locality. The following topic areas are to be discussed – Historic Preservation, Entrance Corridors, and Environmental Resources.

Relevant background information relating to each topic includes the following (most located at http://www.1-community.org/events.asp):
- Public Workshop Posters with existing relevant City Comprehensive Plan goals;
- Public Workshop Summary Brief;
- Public Workshop comment transcriptions and,
- Joint City/County Planning Commission meeting memos (attached).

Relevant themes staff heard during their own review of the above listed materials are as follows:
- Water quality;
- Urban tree coverage;
- Natural resources;
- Entrance corridor; and,
- Historic resources.

Questions for Commissioners to explore in preparation for the work session:
1. Is the above list of themes accurate?
2. Are there any themes missing?
3. What specific issues are encompassed within these themes?
4. Where are the opportunities for the City to work with the County to address these issues and create joint comprehensive plan goals?

Planning Commission Joint Work session
City of Charlottesville Planning Commission/Albemarle County Planning
Commission
March 22, 2011
Minutes

City of Charlottesville Commissioners present:
Mr. Jason Pearson (Chairman)
Mr. Kurt Keesecker
Ms. Genevieve Keller
Ms. Lisa Green
David Neuman (UVA Architect-Ex –Officio)

Not Present:
Mr. Dan Rosensweig
Mr. Michael Osteen
Mr. John Santoski

City of Charlottesville Staff Present:
Missy Creasy
Brian Haluska
Richard Harris
Michael Smith
Ebony Walden
Deronda Eubanks

Albemarle County Commissioners present:
Don Franco
Calvin Morris
Linda Porterfield
Tom Loach
Duane Zobrist (Chairman)
Mac Lafferty
Julia Montieth, Ex-Officio

Albemarle County Staff Present:
Wayne Cilimberg
David Benish

Also present:
Stephen Williams (Executive Director-TJPDC)
Summer Fredericks (TJPDC)

Mr. Pearson convened the meeting at 6:30pm.

Mr. Pearson turned the meeting over to Ms. Creasy. She gave an overview of the purpose of the meeting and asked for a round of introductions. Ms. Creasy then turned the meeting over to Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams gave an overview of the purpose of the Grant and what items will be focused on in the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that there are 5 issues of focus and stated that other agencies would provide input on certain issues such as, outreach, data analysis, research and mapping.

Mr. Williams stated that the Grant will have some basic focus such as Housing, Transportation, Environment and Economy.

Ms. Frederick gave the date, time and place of the first public kickoff event, which will be April 27th from 3-7pm at the Albemarle County Office Building.

Both the City and County would like their Plans to be available online in a searchable format.

Commissioners wanted both plans to be coordinated.
Mr. Keesecker wanted to know more about UVA's role in the grant and the role of other parties.

Mr. Williams stated that UVA is a partner and collaborator.
The City and County would like some focus to be on city/county edges such as the Rivanna River, MJH, 29 North and the Woolen Mills area. They would also like Entrance Corridors and their linages to growth areas in the County reviewed.

Mr. Pearson would like larger areas looked at for the plan to see what barriers we may face.

Mr. Lafferty wanted to know about coordination of planning with Jaunt, CAT and UTS.

Ms. Montieth would like natural areas looked at.

Mr. Benish stated that the performance measurements are valuable and that we are not relying on outside agencies to write the plan.

Mr. Pearson sees the potential for a shared vision between the city and county.

Mr. Lafferty would like the goals of the city and county looked at and see where they match up.

Ms. Keller proposed coordination on the city/county edges – particularly Woolen Mills, Pantops 29N/Hydraulic and physical planning solutions.

Mr. Pearson noted that 29 North, downtown and the UVA form a concentration of development which is the "L shape" area of density and the center of the community. He feels the Rivanna River should have a more active role in the community.

Ms. Green would like to see focus on transportation and trails. Mr. Lafferty agreed.

Mr. Morris would like some focus on the pedestrian bridge across the Rivanna River.

Mr. Pearson asked for Public Comment.

Tom Olivia, of the Piedmont Sierra Club, was pleased to see the goals. The club is really looking forward to this and would like to see natural areas addressed in the discussion.

Mr. Pearson closed Public Comment.

Mr. Pearson asked for any more comments. There were no additional comments.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00pm

JOINT MEMORANDUM

To: County of Albemarle and City of Charlottesville Planning Commissions
From: Elaine Echols and Missy Creasy
Date: July 14, 2011
Re: Joint Planning Commission Meeting – August 16, 2011 – Livability Project and Community
         Comprehensive Planning
_____

Since the March 22, 2011 joint work session, staff has done significant work towards supporting the grant products as well as kicking off the Comprehensive Plan updates. At the August meeting, we will provide you with an overview of those activities as well as gain your feedback on next steps.

Joint City/County Community issues

At the March meeting, Commissioners provided staff with a number of issues to review as part of this process. Those items are listed below with a brief explanation as to the anticipated way they will be addressed in the process. Commissioners are asked to review this information and provide confirmation that these items are reflective of the March conversation and provide any feedback.

- The Rivanna River – *This will be discussed as part of the environmental session and the land use session to include study of the land uses on each side of the River to establish how the river relates to city and county land use.*
- Neighborhoods/amenities that straddle City/Co. line – *To be reviewed as part of the common future land use map.*
- Vision shared by both the County and the City. Show where city/county goals line up – *This will be presented by topic at the community meetings. A comprehensive searchable database of community goals is being developed as part of the grant and will be available later in the process.*
- ECs and linkages to growth areas – *Entrance corridors will be introduced in the Land use discussion and explored further in the Preservation public meeting.*
- L-shaped study area – 29 from North of City going south and east to include part of Pantops - *The Common Land Use map will allow for analysis of this concept.*
- Multi-modal coordination – *This will be addressed in a number of the public sessions but in most depth at the Transportation session.*
- Plans should be searchable on-line – *We intend to do this.*
- Land Use by geography: City for development/Co. for preservation – *Education will be provided to assure that community members understand the County growth areas. The common future land use map will provide guidance for discussion at various community sessions.*

Workshops held to date

Two public events have been held to date in association with this project. Materials provided at that event are located at http://www.1-community.org/events.asp. Members of the public took the opportunity to comment on materials at the events, at follow up events and have access to on line commenting opportunities. Comments received from each of those events have been organized and are included in your packet for review. As you review the materials, please prepare to identify issues that you feel the Commissions should explore further.

Public Input Process

The first round of the public input process will begin in September 2011 and include monthly workshops through March/April 2012. Meeting format will include a repeating one hour schedule from 4-7 pm with time allotted to review informational posters and hear a short overview presentation by staff followed by a Q&A period. The proposed meeting schedule and meeting format is included in your packet. These workshops are intended to educate the public about existing City & County policies relevant to each Comprehensive Plan topic area and obtain feedback about whether or not these policies adequately address current and future community needs. Commonalities in policies between the jurisdictions will be highlighted and questions posed regarding these linkages. We will capture this input by multiple written formats at the workshops and using online resources.

At the conclusion of this meeting series, staff is recommending that the Planning Commissions hold a joint meeting to review the input and take additional input from the public. That will provide an additional opportunity for members of the public to give input. Staff recommends that 3 minutes be provided for each speaker to accommodate as many speakers as possible, unless the commissions would like to provide additional time.

Preview of Public Input Meeting Series Material

At the August meeting, staff will provide you with a preview of the material on Greenways that will be used at the first public input meeting. In advance of that meeting and presentation, we are asking that you review the attached materials to provide direction to staff.

Commissioner assignments for the August 16, 2011 meeting

1. Review joint city county issues and be prepared to provide feedback
2. Review the comments from previous public meetings. Identify any issues you feel should be explored further by the Commissions.
3. Provide comments on the meeting format. Are we on the correct path concerning the meeting structure? Will this format be productive? What are we missing?

If you have limited time for review prior to the meeting, it is requested that you focus your efforts on materials related to the public forums first to be followed by review of the performance measurement materials.

<u>Next Joint City County Planning Commission meeting</u>: September 20 in the Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room in City Hall.

Attachments:

Attachment A: March 22, 2011 meeting notes http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=3033

Attachment B: April 27, 2011 Kickoff meeting comments

Attachment C: June 23, 2011 Performance Measurement meeting comments

Attachment D: Performance Measurement Posters (these are available on line. Please contact staff if you would like paper copies)

Attachment E: Where are we NOW? – Performance Measurement meeting handout

Attachment F: Many Plans One Community Fall meeting schedule and format

Attachments B-E are available at http://www.1-community.org/events.asp

The Joint County/City Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Calvin Morris, Vice Chair– County and Genevieve Keller, Chair– City.

- Other County Commissioners present were Mr. Smith, Ms. Porterfield, Mr. Lafferty, Mr. Loach, Mr. Franco and Ms. Monteith (UVA Architect – Ex-officio). Mr. Zobrist was absent.
- Other City Commissioners present were Jon Santoski, Dan Rosensweig, Natasha Sienitsky, Lisa Green, and David Neuman (UVA Architect – Ex-officio). Kurt Keesecker and Michael Osteen were absent.
- City staff present were Missy Creasy, Richard Harris, Michael Smith and Willy Thompson.
- Summer Frederick and Matthew Weaver with Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission were present.
- County staff present were Wayne Cilimberg, Elaine Echols, Andy Sorrell, Greg Kamptner, and Sharon Taylor.

A review of the March 2011 Joint Work Session took place along with an update of activities which have occurred since that time. The citizen participation workshop schedule for the fall was reviewed and staff presented the greenways portion of the meeting in order to obtain input on the presentation material. The following sections indicate comments from Commission members during the meeting:

Comments following staff presentation for City/County
1. Look at City and County goals side-by-side to see how they line up or don't. Do this first.
2. Have City and County define and agree to the goals and objectives as early as possible in the project.
3. Make sure you have the right performance indicators to measure success of existing goals. Add performance measures as you can.
4. Identify trails that would likely never be built so that decision-makers can decide whether those trails should be included in the plan.
5. Provide for prioritization of projects.
6. Show where the land use plan comes into conflict with existing zoning that may prohibit trails and such uses from being realized.

For the Workshop
1. Show County Development Area boundaries on maps and include the Village of Rivanna.
2. Add landmarks and some street names to the map to help people better orient themselves.
3. Have a "context map" – one at a different scale than the up-close ones.
4. Differentiate between existing and proposed trails.
5. If you are showing side-by-side goals at the workshop, don't put the entire list of goals on the page. Provide a manageable number or "uber" goals for comparison. The public can't effectively provide feedback on long lists.
6. Have series of maps where similar items are clustered together to illustrate a topic, such as steep slopes with streams and parks with greenways, etc.
7. Goals and objectives should be reflected on the maps. For example, if the goal is to "promote significant natural or man-made corridors" identify the significant natural or man-made corridors on the map.

8. De-emphasize the roads.
9. Show conservation easements.
10. Provide a laptop computer for people to type in comments.
11. Have maps illustrate how well goals and objectives are currently met. For example, if linking the parks with greenways is done or already planned, show it.
12. Help ensure that the public knows that they did not need to stay for the entire length of the 3 hour workshops, just 1 hour.
13. Comment from Commissioner after the meeting: enlarge the "up-close" map even more to help people better orient themselves.
14. Comment from Commissioner after the meeting: when you are getting input from the public, make sure you have them write down enough information to understand what they are saying. Post-it notes don't always convey what a person is really trying to say. Usually more clarifying language is needed to understand what was intended.

For the on-line version of maps and information
1. Put the maps on the county's online GIS website and continue to provide on-line opportunities for comment.
2. Provide longitude and latitude for use with Google Earth. See if you can get the Google Earth function to work on the City/County maps that are put on-line.

The following public comment was received

Neil Williamson, with Free Enterprise Forum, agreed with some of the points brought up with regard to goals and data being critically important. It is a question of chicken and egg and the need to have the data to go towards the goals. As he sees the process moving forward, it seems they are coming to meetings that seem to be planning meetings. He was concerned that he did not hear the discussion of the goals. There should be a substantive discussion because they have 67 pages of goals in Albemarle County. There are probably about 35 to 45 pages of goals in the Charlottesville. The community needs to have that high level discussion early rather than later to be able to understand both the Sustainability Grant and what they are trying to achieve.

The discussion adjourned at 7:30pm.

Charlottesville and Albemarle County Planning Commissions
Joint Work session
April 17, 2012
Notes

Charlottesville Commissioners Present:
Ms. Genevieve Keller (Chairperson)
Mr. Kurt Keesecker
Ms. Lisa Green
Mr. Dan Rosensweig
Ms. Natasha Sienitsky
Mr. David Neuman

Albemarle Commissioners Present
Mr. Calvin Morris (Chairperson)
Mr. Ed Smith
Mr. Richard Randolph
Mr. Bruce Dotson
Mr. Mac Lafferty
Mr. Tom Loach
Mr. Don Franco

Charlottesville Staff Present:
Jim Tolbert
Missy Creasy
Richard Harris
Michael Smith

Albemarle Staff Present:
Wayne Cilimberg
Lee Catlin
Elaine Echols
Ron White
Andy Sorrell

TJPDC Staff:
Steve Williams
Amanda Burbage
Matt Weaver
Summer Frederick

Ms. Keller and Mr. Morris convened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and turned the time to Steve Williams, Director of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission and staff for the Livability Project provided a "big picture" view of how the four planning efforts are being worked on at the same time: City Comprehensive Plan, County Comprehensive Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and the Livability Project.

Amanda Burbage provided an overview of the workshops and conclusions from those workshops for environment, transportation, land use, economic development, entrance corridors, and housing. The Commissioners provided feedback and noted the following conclusions: there was a general desire to make sure that there is sufficient community representation in the identification of the issues that are important to the community, there appears to be underrepresentation of the full-spectrum of the citizenry, especially senior citizens and several suggestions were made on how to increase public input or confirm that the input truly represents a cross-section of the community.

Missy Creasy reminded the Commissions of the agreements to date on areas to study together: environment, transportation, and land use. She noted the recent regional Target Industry work that is providing for joint economic development efforts and that staff is still working on entrance corridor issues.

Elaine Echols reviewed the County's Housing goals and Kathy McHugh provided a presentation on the City's housing programs. Summer Frederick presented the current housing indicators for the City and County. She took comments from the Commissions on their thoughts about the indicators as well as observations about the programs. Commissioners commented on a variety of issues including, green building, housing availability and type and housing affordability. It was noted that some developers try to "buy their way out" of affordable housing and there is interest in having mixed income on sites rather than separation. It was noted that tax assessments do not link with "affordability" of a unit and that should be addressed. Discussion on aging housing stock as well as units that still do not have adequate plumbing and kitchen facilities occurred.

1

After the Commissions concluded their comments, Cal Morris, Chair of the Albemarle County Planning Commission opened the floor for public comment. Comments were received from the following seven individuals.

1. **Charles Winkler** – City resident representing the Jefferson Area Tea Party. Thanked the staff for the opportunity to attend and provide public comment at the workshops. Would like the opportunity for partner groups to review and comment on the final deliverable that contains public input before it is finalized. Also stated that the meetings were self-selective and those that attended were people who had a particular interest in the workshop topic. Commented that categories of comments need to be attached to the question to tie those comments to the line item on the poster.

2. **Charles Battig** – Stated that nothing he said was to criticize people. Stated that sustainability and livability are found in the 1998 sustainability accords. Population distribution is based on racial components and diversity is not well represented on councils and boards. Stated that the questions are stacked based on the existing plans. Stated that what has been missing from the conversation is a discussion of costs, and cost effectiveness and property rights. Communities with the highest amount of regulations also have the highest problems with unemployment and a lack of manufacturing.

3. **Edward Strickler –** Thanked staff for engaging in the process and using the community to help gather diverse comments.

4. **Scott Bandy** - Disagreed that bike lanes should be designated anything other than for recreational purposes (such as a means of transportation). Felt it was inappropriate to conduct the transportation workshop right before Mia Burke spoke because that likely stacked the comments in favor of bike advocates.

5. **Nancy Carpenter –** Living wages are needed for affordable housing especially from large employers like UVA.

6. **Dave Reddins** – City resident – Appreciates the One Community project and its outreach efforts. Stated that he does use his bike for transportation riding 40 miles a week. Would like to see more bike lanes and bike paths. Suggested options for co-housing with seniors so they can remain in their homes while a younger couple lives there too and helps maintain the home.

7. **Morgan Butler** – Southern Environmental Law Center –Thanked staff for the work that has been done so far. Stated that affordable housing has a transportation component and there is a need to recognize the overlap. Development patterns affect connections to other modes of transportation which effects affordability. Also stated that an affordability indicator is the percentage of household income that goes to transportation.

Next steps – Elaine Echols summarized the conclusions of the Albemarle County Planning Commissioners concerning public input. Generally there is a desire to make sure that there is enough community representation on the issues that are important to the community. There appears to be underrepresentation of the full spectrum especially senior citizens. Project staff needs to find a way to test whether we have an accurate representation of community opinion and desires. One suggestion was that the final product be taken out to the community for response to see if we captured the important community issues. Another idea was to take the results of the workshops out to community groups. A third idea was to have a survey (representing a cross-section of the community) to make sure we got the public opinion portion correct in relation to the goals and priorities.

Ms. Echols stated that next steps would be for Summer Frederick to work with the commissions individually over the summer on potential joint goals before bringing the commissions back together sometime in the fall.

It was the consensus of the Albemarle County Commissioners that they preferred to discuss housing issues in-house before coming together with the City again to discuss housing and it was recommended that city housing resources might be helpful for those conversations.

Meeting adjourned at 8:07 PM.

City of Charlottesville
City Manager's Office
MEMO

America's #1 City!

TO:	Planning Commission
FROM:	Ryan Davidson, Budget and Management Analyst
CC:	Maurice Jones, City Manager
	Leslie Beauregard, Director, Budget & Performance Management
	Jim Tolbert, Director, NDS
	City Council
DATE:	June 19, 2012
SUBJECT:	**Capital Improvement Program Request Process Revisions**

Since FY 2008 the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) request process for the City of Charlottesville has involved the use of Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria. Over the past 5 years the criteria and the ranking process have continued to change and evolve as new criteria are added and the relative importance of each criteria is adjusted. In recent years the difference between what scores highly in the criteria ranking process versus what actually gets funded in the 5 year CIP has become more pronounced. This growing divide initiated staff to begin looking at the current CIP project request and review process.

A CIP Request Process Revision Committee was formed to look into making changes to the CIP request and review process. This committee consisted of Charlottesville Leadership Development Academy (CLDA) graduates and other key staff from the City Assessor's Office, Department of Finance, Public Works, Clerk of Council, Neighborhood Development Services (NDS), and Budget and Performance Management. Prior to the first committee meeting staff researched the CIP processes of other localities both within the State of Virginia and across the country. Also prior to the first committee meeting one-on-one meetings were held with some of the key stakeholders in Public Works, Parks and Recreation, and NDS, which are the three departments that consistently submit the most CIP requests. As a result of the one-on-one meetings, staff research, and the CIP Request Process Revision Committee meetings, the following changes to the CIP request and review process are being proposed.

Differences from FY 2013 – 2017 CIP Process

CIP Evaluation and Ranking Criteria
For the FY 2013 – 2017 CIP Request process there were nine different Ranking Criteria and seven Areas of Special Consideration for which a project could receive points in the ranking system. For the FY 2014 – 2018 CIP request process, the proposal is that the number of criteria be reduced to seven with no areas of special consideration (the differences will be outlined below). Previously the criteria were given different weightings to make some criteria worth

1

more than others. The CIP Request Process Revision Committee is proposing that all criteria be given the same weighting, setting the maximum amount of points you can get at 5 and the minimum at 0. The final proposed change to the criteria ranking system is to make the duty of assigning the initial scores for each criteria the responsibility of the Staff Ranking Committee and not the departments. In previous fiscal years the departments scored their own projects on each criteria and the Staff Ranking Committee reviewed and adjusted those rankings. Since the Staff Ranking Committee reviews and adjusts each criteria the requesting departments will no longer be asked to score each criteria but simply to fill out the criteria justification and the Staff ranking Committee will score the projects.

The differences in the ranking criteria to be used to evaluate projects are outlined below:

Criteria Not Being Changed

- Criteria #2 – Public health and safety **-** *How does the project eliminate or prevent an existing health, environmental, or safety hazard?*
- Criteria #3 – Infrastructure investment / protection **-** *How does the project protect and preserve the City's infrastructure?*
- Criteria #4 – Impact on City operational finances / revenue generation - *Explain how the project will have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on the City's operational Finances.*

Additions to Existing Criteria

- Criteria #1 – City Council Adopted Strategic Vision and/or Priorities - *How does the project help meet the goals of the City Council Strategic Vision and/or the City Council Priorities?*
  There has always been a criteria related to the City Council Strategic Vision the change for FY14 is to also incorporate the City Council Priorities into criteria to allow projects to receive points for meeting either the Strategic vision or the Council Priorities.

New Criteria

- Criteria #5 – Leverages outside funding - *How will the project leverage outside funding to facilitate completion of the project, and how much additional funding will be leveraged?*
- Criteria #6 – Ties in to other projects / organizations **-** *Does the project tie into other existing or proposed projects, and/or will the project be done in partnership with another non-City organization?*
- Criteria #7 – Improves and/or increases the level of service provided by the City **-** *How does the project improve and/or increase the level of service provided by the City?*

All three of these new criteria were previously in the Areas of Special Consideration and the CIP Request Process Revision Committee felt that they belonged as standalone evaluation criteria.

Criteria No Longer Receiving Scoring

- Legal Mandate – This criteria no longer receives a ranking score and the scope of what can be included under this criteria has been dramatically narrowed. The department must now answer the question of whether or not the **entire requested project** is required under a State or Federal mandate, City Code, or Court order. If so they must cite specific laws and/or ordinance numbers, or the specific court order requiring the entire project, and the project then goes to the top of the priority listing.

- Comprehensive Plan Goal/Chapter – This criteria also no longer receives a ranking score because all projects in the CIP must relate to the City's Comprehensive Plan in some way. For this criteria the department has to answer the question of whether or not the project is related to a Comprehensive Plan goal or chapter. If yes then identify what item in the City of Charlottesville's Comprehensive Plan that this project addresses or is related to. If the answer is no then additional justification must be provided as to why the request is to be included in the City's CIP.

FY 2013 Criteria No Longer Being Utilized

- Environmental Sustainability/LEEDS Building Certification **-** *Does the project support the City of Charlottesville's environmental sustainability goals and commitments?*
- Encouragement of Economic Development - *Will the project directly help stimulate development or redevelopment of properties and/or encourage economic development in the City corridors?*

The CIP Request Process Revision Committee felt that these criteria in some instances allowed departments to "double dip" and get points multiple times for the same thing. Both criteria are either part of the Strategic Vision or Council Priorities or both.

Request Form Changes
In addition to the changes to the project evaluation and ranking criteria there have also been three proposed changes to the project request form.
- *(8) Project Expenditures* – This had previously been anticipated project costs but the changes is designed to obtain more information related to the amount of expenditures to be incurred in each fiscal year (spend rate). This change will now provide the CIP Budget Development Committee with a more accurate picture of the amount of funds necessary for the project in each fiscal year.

- *(9) Project Phase* – For each fiscal year in which there are projected expenditures (see above item), the department will provide the phase of the project that will incur these expenses during that fiscal year. In the row of cells highlighted in yellow there is a drop down menu with three options: Design/Planning – to be selected if only design and/or planning is expected to occur in the fiscal year; Design and Construction – to be selected if both Design and Construction are anticipated to occur in that fiscal year; and Construction – to be selected if only construction will be occurring in the fiscal year.

- *(11) Departmental Priority* – This item was added because a few instances in the past departments have had what they considered to be "lower priority" items receive funding while what the department considered "higher priority" items went unfunded. If a department submits multiple new and/or modified capital project requests, they will be asked to provide a departmental priority ranking, reflecting the level of importance to their department. If applicable the department could provide the justification behind the ranking - i.e. Project essential to department business operations, Council requested project, etc. Rankings should not be duplicated – i.e. if a department submits 15 new/modified projects then each project will receive a ranking of 1-15 based upon the level of importance to that department.

Other Proposed Changes
The next proposal is that once the new and modified projects have been scored, the projects will then be grouped into different categories so that they may be evaluated next to other projects of a similar purpose. The categories being proposed are:

- Ongoing Maintenance of Existing City Assets/Infrastructure
- Major One-time Renovation/Repair of Existing City Assets/Infrastructure
- Acquisition or Creation of New City Assets/Infrastructure
- Other Governmental Initiatives

The duties and responsibilities of the Staff Ranking Committee have continued to evolve as the CIP process has evolved. The Staff Ranking Committee no longer solely reviews and adjusts the project rankings. The Staff Ranking Committee now reviews everything from project timing, to scope, to timing of project funding. This committee also asks project clarification questions and serves to gather as much information for the Budget Development Committee as possible. This committee is also tasked with making recommendations to the Budget Development Committee for their consideration. Since this committee is no longer simply tasked with ranking projects the CIP Request Process Revision Committee proposes to change the name of this committee to the Technical Review Committee.

Lastly the CIP Request Process Revision Committee wants to stress the importance of project manager training/education. With all of the changes to the request forms and how the process is being changed, the committee proposes holding training sessions for the project managers. Two to three different sessions will be provided at varying times of the day in order to best accommodate the schedules of the project managers/requestors. Training will be provided by the Budget and Management Analyst and members of the CIP Request Process Revision Committee with the training program and materials to be developed by the CIP Request Process Revision Committee.

Additional Supplemental Material
Attachment I – Evaluation Criteria for Project Ranking
Attachment II – Project Request Form – New and Modified Projects
Attachment III – Project Request Form – Existing Projects
Attachment IV – Project Request Form Instructions – New and Modified Projects
Attachment V – Project Request Form Instructions – Existing Projects

Attachment I

Evaluation Criteria for Project Ranking

City of Charlottesville, Virginia
FY 2014 – 2018 Capital Improvement Program
Project Evaluation and Criteria Scoring

Proposed Criteria

1. City Council Strategic Vision and/or Priorities

2. Public health and safety

3. Infrastructure investment/protection

4. Impact on operational finances/revenue generation

5. Leverages outside funding

6. Ties into other projects/organizations

7. Improves and/or increases the level of service provided by the City

Criteria #1 – City Council Adopted Strategic Vision and/or Priorities
How does the project help meet the goals of the City Council Strategic Vision and/or the City Council Priorities?

Review Committee Scoring
5   Project meets the goals of the City Council Strategic Vision and/or Priorities
0   Project does not meet the goals of the City Council Strategic Vision and/or Priorities

Criteria #2 – Public health and safety
How does the project eliminate or prevent an existing health, environmental, or safety hazard?

Review Committee Scoring
5   Project completely eliminates or prevents an existing health, environmental, or safety hazard.
3   Project partially eliminates or prevents an existing health, environmental, or safety hazard.
0   Project does not eliminate or prevent an existing health, environmental, or safety hazard.

Criteria #3 – Infrastructure investment / protection
How does the project protect and preserve the City's infrastructure?

Review Committee Scoring
5 The project improves and / or protects the City's infrastructure.
3 The project maintains the City's infrastructure.
0 The project does not protect or preserve the City's infrastructure.

Criteria #4 – Impact on City operational finances / revenue generation
Explain how the project will have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on the City's operational Finances.

Review Committee Scoring
5 The project will result in a positive net impact on City finances.
3 The project will result in a neutral net impact on City finances.
0 The project will result in a negative net impact on City finances.

Criteria #5 – Leverages outside funding
How will the project leverage outside funding to facilitate completion of the project, and how much additional funding will be leveraged?

Review Committee Scoring
5 The project will leverage outside funding for project completion.
0 The project will not leverage outside funding for project completion.

Criteria #6 – Ties in to other projects / organizations
Does the project tie into other existing or proposed projects, and/or will the project be done in partnership with another non-City organization?

Review Committee Scoring
5 The project ties into another existing project(s) or the project will be done in partnership with another non-City organization
0 The project does not tie into another existing project and will not be done in partnership with another non-City organization.

Criteria #7 – Improves and/or increases the level of service provided by the City
How does the project improve and/or increase the level of service provided by the City?

Review Committee Scoring
5 The project improves and/or increases the level of service provided by the City.
0 The project does not improve and/or increase the level of service provided by the City.

Attachment II

Project Request Form –
New and Modified Projects

City of Charlottesville
FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program
New or Modified Project Request Form

(1) Project Title

(2) Project (WBS) Number if Existing Project

(3) Project Manager

(4) Requesting Department Head

(5) Estimated Project Start Date

(6) Estimated Project Completion Date

(7) Requested Project Funding

Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected FY 14	Projected FY 15	Projected FY 16	Projected FY 17	Projected FY 18	Requested 5 Year Total	Request Status
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

(8) Project Expenditures

Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected FY 14	Projected FY 15	Projected FY 16	Projected FY 17	Projected FY 18	Projected Beyond FY 18
-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Design/Planning	Design and Construction	Construction			

(9) Project Phase

(10) Revenue Sources

	Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected Revenue FY14 - FY 18	Projected Revenue Beyond FY 18	KNOWN PROJECT REVENUE
City	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-
State	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-
REVENUE TOTAL	-	-	-	-

(11) Departmental Priority

If Department submitted multiple new/modified projects provide departmental priority and reasoning behind priority ranking.

(12) Project Description

Provide a detailed description and history of the project.

(13) Project Changes

List all changes to the project (funding, timing, scope, ect.) since the submission of the original project request.

(14) Legal Mandate

Yes or No - if yes provide actual law or court mandate requiring project.

(15) Comprehensive Plan Goal/Chapter

Yes or No - if yes provide Comprehesnive Plan Goal and/or Chapter that the project falls under.

(16) Criteria #1 - City Council Adopted Strategic Vision and/or Priorities

Explain how project meets the goals of the Ciyt council Strategic Vision and/or Priorities.

(17) Criteria #2 - Public Health and Safety

Explain how the project prevents or eliminates an existing public health, environmental, or safety hazard.

(18) Criteria #3 - Infrastructure Investment / Protection

Explain how the project protects or preserves the City's Infrastructure.

(19) Criteria #4 - Impact on City Operational Finances / Revenue Generation

Explain how the project will have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on City finances.

(20) Criteria #5 - Leverages Outside Funding

Explain how additional outside funding will be leveraged to facilitate the completion of the project, how much, and the sources of the additional outside funding.

(21) Criteria #6 - Ties Into Other Projects/Organizations

Provide details as to how this project ties into another existing City project(s) or if the project will be done in partnership with another non-City organization(s).

(22) Criteria #7 - Improves and/or Increases the Level of Service Provided by the City

Explain what City service this project will improve, or what increase in service this project will result in, and how.

(23) Alternate Scope(s) to Project

Is there an alternative method for completing the project, such as spreading the project over more than one fiscal year, using different materials, or only completing a portion of the original project request?

(24) PLEASE ATTACH A PICTURE OR MAP TO BETTER EMPHASIZE WHAT IS BEING ADDRESSED BY THE REQUESTED PROJECT

Paste picture(s) or map here.

FOR TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE USE ONLY
Is the project request form complete with adequate project information and criteria justification? **YES/NO**

Attachment III

Project Request Form – Existing Projects

City of Charlottesville
FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program
Existing Project Request Form

(1) Project Title **(2) Project (WBS) Number** **(3) Project Manager**

(4) Requesting Department Head **(5) Estimated Project Start Date** **(6) Estimated Project Completion Date**

(7) Requested Project Funding

Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected FY 14	Projected FY 15	Projected FY 16	Projected FY 17	Projected FY 18	Requested 5 Year Total	Request Status
						-	Currently in 5 Year CIP

(8) Project Expenditures

Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected FY 14	Projected FY 15	Projected FY 16	Projected FY 17	Projected FY 18	Projected Beyond FY 18
-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(9) Project Phase

(10) Revenue Sources

	Approved FY 09 - 13	Projected Revenue FY14 - FY 18	Projected Revenue Beyond FY 18	KNOWN PROJECT REVENUE
City	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-
State	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-
REVENUE TOTAL	-	-	-	-

(11) Project Description

Provide a detailed description and history of the project.

(12) Project Changes

List all changes to the project (timing, scope, funding, ect.) since the submission of the original project request.

(13) Alternate Scope(s) to Project

Is there an alternative method for completing the project, such as spreading the project over more than one fiscal year, using different materials, completing the project in different phases, or only completing a portion of the original project request?

(14) PLEASE ATTACH A PICTURE OR MAP TO BETTER EMPHASIZE WHAT IS BEING ADDRESSED BY THE REQUESTED PROJECT.

Paste picture(s) or map here.

Attachment IV

Project Request Form Instructions–
New and Modified Projects

City of Charlottesville
FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program
Request Form Instructions

New and Modified Projects

The information presented below will help guide you through the completion of the CIP Request Form for **new projects or projects that are being modified from what is in the existing 5 year CIP**, as well as provide guidance to the Project Scoring Criteria portion of the FY 2014 – 2018 CIP request process.

CIP Project Application Explanation

(1) Project Title – For all new projects list the name of the project as you want it to appear in SAP. For existing projects please give the name of the project as it appears in SAP for the current and/or prior fiscal year(s).

(2) Project WBS Number – For all existing projects please give the project WBS number. For all new requests leave this cell blank, and a new WBS number will be provided for you by the Budget Office.

(3) Project Manager – List the name of the person that will be responsible for the daily management / administration of the project.

(4) Requesting Department Head – List the name of the Department Head who is responsible for this project.

(5) Estimated Project Start Date – Provide the date on which it is estimated the project will begin either construction or incurring expenditures – whichever comes first.

(6) Estimated Project Completion Date – Provide the date on which it is estimated that project construction will be completed and no new expenditures incurred. If the project is a recurring yearly project you should list the completion date as "Ongoing".

(7) Requested Project Funding – For all projects list the amount requested from the City for each fiscal year from FY 2014 through FY 2018. For any projects that were approved in Fiscal Years 2009 – 2013, please list the total appropriated budget for all years between FY 2009 – 2013. The column titled Requested 5 Year Total will calculate automatically so please do not insert data in this cell. In the cell titled Request Status, which is highlighted in yellow, please select the appropriate status of the requested project from the drop down menu provided.

(8) Project Expenditures – In the column labeled *Approved FY 09-13*, insert the total amount of project funds already expended between FY 2009 and FY 2013. In the columns labeled *Projected FY 14* through *Projected FY18*, insert the projected amount of

funds that will actually be expended in each fiscal year during 5 years of the upcoming CIP (FY 2014 – 2018). In the column labeled *Projected Beyond FY18*, please insert any known or estimated project expenditures that will be incurred after FY 2018 – for ongoing projects provide an estimate of the next five fiscal years outside of the current CIP timeframe (FY 2019 – FY 2023).

(9) Project Phase – For each fiscal year in which there are projected expenditures, please provide the phase of the project that will incur these expenses during that fiscal year. In the row of cells highlighted in yellow there is a drop down menu with three options, please select the appropriate phase for each fiscal year. If only design and/or planning is expected to occur in the fiscal year select the Design/Planning option, if both Design and Construction are anticipated to occur in that fiscal year select the Design and Construction option, and if only construction will be occurring in the fiscal year select the Construction option.

(10) Revenue Sources – In the column labeled *Approved FY 09-13*, insert the total amount of project revenues approved between FY 2009 and FY 2013 from each applicable source. In the column labeled *Projected Revenue FY 14 – 18*, insert the projected total revenue for the project during 5 years of the upcoming CIP (FY 2014 – 2018). In the column labeled *Projected Revenue Beyond FY18*, insert any known or estimated project revenue that will be collected after FY 2018 (for ongoing projects do not include estimates past FY 2023). Place the amounts of revenue from each different source in the appropriate row so that all sources of revenue are properly identified. If the project will not receive any outside revenue place the entire amount revenue required in the row labeled City. The row labeled *Revenue Total* and the column labeled *Known Project Revenue* will calculate automatically so do not fill in those rows. The amounts in these rows and columns should balance with the total amounts input in *#8 Project Expenditures*.

(11) Departmental Priority – If your department submits multiple new and/or modified capital project requests, please provide a departmental priority ranking, by level of importance to your department. If applicable you should provide the justification behind the ranking - i.e. Project essential to department business operations, Council requested project, etc.   Rankings should not be duplicated – i.e. if a department submits 15 new/modified projects then each project will receive a ranking of 1-15 based upon the level of importance to that department.

 (12) Project Description – Provide a detailed description of the project that is being requested, including any history or background information on the project.

(13) Project Changes – For any project that has changed since the submission of the original request, list all changes to the project since the submission of the original request including changes to scope, timing, funding, etc.

(14) Legal Mandate - In this box you need to answer the question of whether or not the **entire requested project** is required under a State or Federal mandate, City Code, or Court order. If so you must cite specific laws and/or ordinance numbers, or the specific court order requiring project.

(15) Comprehensive Plan Goal/Chapter – In this text box you need to answer the question of whether or not the project is related to a Comprehensive Plan goal or chapter. If yes then identify what item in the City of Charlottesville's Comprehensive Plan that this project addresses or is related to. If not justification must be provided as to why the request is to be included in the City's CIP. To view the City's current Comprehensive Plan please go to http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=1745.

(16) Criteria #1 – City Council Adopted Strategic Vision – Please identify what item on the Strategic Vision statement, or the Council Priorities list, that this project addresses or is related to. In order to receive credit for this criteria the requesting department must also provide details on how the requested project meets either the vision are or the Priority area. A complete listing of the Council Strategic Vision areas and the City Council Priority areas is provided in a separate document attached to these instructions.

(17) Criteria #2 – Public Health and Safety – Please state what the public health or safety risk is that this project will correct or help to correct. In order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must also provide how the requested project will remedy the public health or safety condition.

(18) Criteria #3 – Infrastructure Investment / Protection – Please specify what part of the City's infrastructure that the requested project will help to maintain, protect, or preserve and in order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must also provide details as to how the requested project will maintain, protect, or preserve the City's infrastructure.

(19) Criteria #4 – Impact on City Operational Finances / Revenue Generation – Please identify whether the requested project will have a positive impact on the City's operational finances (i.e. revenue generation or cost savings), a neutral impact (i.e. no impact on the City's operational budget), or negative impact on the City's operational finances (i.e. costing the City money through increase personnel or maintenance costs). In order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must provide details to explain the financial impact that the requested project will have on City operational finances (i.e. specific personnel costs, maintenance costs, utility costs, office space, revenue generation, etc.).

(20) Criteria #5 – Leverages Outside Funding – In order to receive credit for this criteria the requesting department needs to explain how additional outside funding will be leveraged to facilitate the completion of the project, how much additional funding is anticipated to be leveraged, and the sources of the additional outside funding.

(21) Criteria #6 – Ties Into Other Projects / Organizations – In order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must provide details as to how this project ties into another existing City project(s) or if the project will be done in partnership with another non-City organization(s).

(22) Criteria #7 – Improves and/or Increases the Level of Service Provided by the City – In order to receive credit for this criteria, the requesting department must provide details as to what City service this project will improve, or what increase in service this project will result in, **and** how this project will either improve or increase the level of service provided by the City.

(23) Alternate Scope(s) to Project – List any and all alternative methods for completing the project, such as, spreading the project over more than one fiscal year, using different materials, or only completing a portion of the original project request.

(24) Picture and/or Map Attachments – Attach pictures and/or maps that illustrate or better emphasize the need for the project.

Attachment V

Project Request Form Instructions–
Existing Projects

City of Charlottesville
FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program
Request Form Instructions
<u>Existing Projects</u>

The information presented below will help guide you through the completion of the CIP Request Form for **existing projects currently included in the 5 year CIP (FY2013 – 2017) that have no changes in funding or scope**.

<u>**CIP Project Application Explanation**</u>

<u>*(1) Project Title*</u> – For all new projects list the name of the project as you want it to appear in SAP. For existing projects please give the name of the project as it appears in SAP for the current and/or prior fiscal year(s).

<u>*(2) Project WBS Number*</u> – For all existing projects please give the project WBS number. For all new requests leave this cell blank, and a new WBS number will be provided for you by the Budget Office.

<u>*(3) Project Manager*</u> – List the name of the person that will be responsible for the daily management / administration of the project.

<u>*(4) Requesting Department Head*</u> – List the name of the Department Head who is responsible for this project.

<u>*(5) Estimated Project Start Date*</u> – Provide the date on which it is estimated the project will begin either construction or incurring expenditures – whichever comes first.

<u>*(6) Estimated Project Completion Date*</u> – Provide the date on which it is estimated that project construction will be completed and no new expenditures incurred. If the project is a recurring yearly project you should list the completion date as "Ongoing".

<u>*(7) Requested Project Funding*</u> – For all projects list the amount requested from the City for each fiscal year from FY 2014 through FY 2018. For any projects that were approved in Fiscal Years 2009 – 2013, please list the total appropriated budget for all years between FY 2009 – 2013. The column titled Requested 5 Year Total will calculate automatically so please do not insert data in this cell. In the cell titled Request Status, which is highlighted in yellow, please select the appropriate status of the requested project from the drop down menu provided.

<u>*(8) Project Expenditures*</u> – In the column labeled *Approved FY 09-13*, insert the total amount of project funds already expended between FY 2009 and FY 2013. In the columns labeled *Projected FY 14* through *Projected FY18*, insert the projected amount of funds that will actually be expended in each fiscal year during 5 years of the upcoming

CIP (FY 2014 – 2018). In the column labeled *Projected Beyond FY18*, please insert any known or estimated project expenditures that will be incurred after FY 2018 – for ongoing projects provide an estimate of the next five fiscal years outside of the current CIP timeframe (FY 2019 – FY 2023).

(9) Project Phase – For each fiscal year in which there are projected expenditures, please provide the phase of the project that will incur these expenses during that fiscal year. In the row of cells highlighted in yellow there is a drop down menu with three options, please select the appropriate phase for each fiscal year. If only design and/or planning is expected to occur in the fiscal year select the Design/Planning option, if both Design and Construction are anticipated to occur in that fiscal year select the Design and Construction option, and if only construction will be occurring in the fiscal year select the Construction option.

(10) Revenue Sources – In the column labeled *Approved FY 09-13*, insert the total amount of project revenues approved between FY 2009 and FY 2013 from each applicable source. In the column labeled *Projected Revenue FY 14 – 18*, insert the projected total revenue for the project during 5 years of the upcoming CIP (FY 2014 – 2018). In the column labeled *Projected Revenue Beyond FY18*, insert any known or estimated project revenue that will be collected after FY 2018 (for ongoing projects do not include estimates past FY 2023). Place the amounts of revenue from each different source in the appropriate row so that all sources of revenue are properly identified. If the project will not receive any outside revenue place the entire amount revenue required in the row labeled City. The row labeled *Revenue Total* and the column labeled *Known Project Revenue* will calculate automatically so do not fill in those rows. The amounts in these rows and columns should balance with the total amounts input in *#8 Project Expenditures*.

(11) Project Description – Provide a detailed description of the project that is being requested, including any history or background information on the project.

(12) Project Changes – For any project that has changed since the submission of the original request, list all changes to the project since the submission of the original request including changes to scope, timing, funding, etc.

(13) Alternate Scope(s) to Project – List any and all alternative methods for completing the project, such as, spreading the project over more than one fiscal year, using different materials, completing the project in different phases, or only completing a portion of the original project request.

(14) Picture and/or Map Attachments – Attach pictures and/or maps that illustrate or better emphasize the need for the project.