

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on April 27, 2022, at 2:00 p.m. Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from April 20, 2022.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Ned Gallaway, Ms. Beatrice (Bea) LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Mr. Jim Andrews, and Ms. Donna P. Price.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeffrey B. Richardson; Interim County Attorney, Cynthia Hudson; Clerk, Claudette K. Borgersen; and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. Donna Price. She announced that the opportunities for the public to access and participate in the hybrid meeting are posted on the Albemarle County website on the Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar. Participation will include the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public will be received. Ms. Price announced the following in attendance: Jeff Richardson, County Executive; Cynthia Hudson, County Attorney; and Board Clerk Claudette Borgersen. She thanked Albemarle County Police Officers Quillen and George for being present at the meeting today.

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session: FY 2023 Operating and Capital Budget.

Item No. 2.1 Athletic Fields

Mr. Trevor Henry, Assistant County Executive, said they had a two-hour work session for two main agenda items today and had listed approximate time frames for those. He said one was athletic fields, which would be led by himself, Parks and Recreation staff, Facilities and Environmental Services staff, along with their consultant who was on Zoom remotely. He said the second discussion would be led by Andy Bowman regarding potential budget adjustments, primarily a one-time use of funds that had been discussed throughout the prior work sessions over the past six weeks, along with a potential operating cost adjustment in social services, and finally any other Board discussion items. He said the approximate times were 90 minutes and 30 minutes, and they would do their best to stay on schedule.

Ms. Price pointed out that they would have a hard stop at 4:00 p. m. and would reconvene at 6:00 p.m. to finish their meeting for the day.

Mr. Henry said if the first topic pushed into the second topic, they were prepared to pick that up at the onset of the 6:00 p.m. meeting.

Ms. Price thanked Mr. Henry.

Mr. Henry said thanked the Board for continuing the conversation about the first item, athletic fields, regarding strategies and options around meeting athletic field needs in their community. He said they were hoping today to pick up from where they left off at the work session on March 23, with a focus today around decisions for Darden Towe and Biscuit Run specific to the type of fields to be built or upgraded to help meet the noted deficit in overall athletic field needs in their community. He said they captured many of the great questions that came up during the prior Board work session along with the subsequent communications from individual Board members specific to today's topic, working with staff and their engineer, they provided responses to the aggregated questions and attached them as part of the Executive Summary today along with CIP scenarios for the Board to have some reaction to.

Mr. Henry said they had representatives from the Department of Parks and Recreation; Facilities & Environmental Services; and their consultant to participate and answer questions from the Board. He said the objectives they laid out were with the hope of guiding the discussion with quick summaries from Parks on some operational questions and from Facilities on some more technical questions that came up, but not to repeat everything that had been in the material prior and to instead highlight it. He said they had thirteen total slides and they wanted to work through them at a pace to provide summary information. He said it would come back to himself and they would talk about the options related to what was sent for CIP, and to get it back to the Board for discussion as quickly as they could. He said their goal was to be done in any kind of presentation mode in 20 minutes or less and it be available for Board discussion.

Mr. Henry noted that in parallel with this work, he had already talked to the school's Chief Operation Officer after the last work session and had a confirmation discussion this morning that one of the things, unless directed otherwise, staff in Parks and Recreation leadership and schools would do was meet and work through the creation of an overall field use policy. He said this field use policy would include higher levels of maintenance, definition of what fields would be game fields versus practice fields, how they would manage those fields in a best practice way, would work with sports organizations that would be impacted by this policy that would have scheduling impacts, conditions, maintenance standards, and other work.

Mr. Henry said they intended to do that work over the next few months, and it would be something they would bring back to the Board in a future work session. He said they were really targeting next fiscal year because they would need some time to do that work before coming back with any kind of

impacts for FY24. He said things like changes in fee structures would be part of that overall policy, which was work they would do regardless of the direction that came from the Board today on any specific fields, at Darden Towe or Biscuit Run. He asked if there were any questions on the objectives or the process for that day.

Ms. Price said there were none.

Mr. Henry said the first presenter was the Director of Parks and Recreation, Bob Crickenberger.

Mr. Bob Crickenberger, Director of Parks and Recreation, thanked Mr. Henry and introduced himself. He said he thought it was important to review the information shown on the current slide and said they had provided more detail than what the Board had last seen. He said there were findings and recommendations from their consultant for the 2018 Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment. He said the findings were identified by that consultant and as they could see in the first bullet on the slide, the consultant ranked Darden Towe synthetic fields and lights as the second-highest need. He said they also identified Albemarle County as having a 99-acre deficit in sports complexes. He said that finding was based on current populations and projected that the population in 2032 could result in a 145-acre deficit.

Mr. Crickenberger said there were some questions as to what a sports complex actually was. He said that briefly, the primary focus on a sports complex was active programming for recreational and competitive sports. He said while they were going through this, they should think of Darden Towe as an example, because that was what they would call a standalone sports complex. He said sports complexes, however, could come in a variety of sizes. He said 20 acres or more would constitute a standalone sports complex. He said also included on the slide were some of the typical amenities found in a complex. He said athletic fields, which could range from 4 to 16, courts for basketball, tennis, and pickleball, lighting for all the fields, spectator seating, etcetera,

Mr. Crickenberger said there was also a question regarding the 99-acre deficit. He said what they had done was look at the active play area identified in the master plan at Biscuit Run and circled the actual perimeter of that area. He with the supporting infrastructure and 6 to 8 potential athletic fields, the potential 99-acre deficit could be reduced by 30 acres, bringing it to 69 acres. He said there was a more in-depth description of sports complexes that could be found on Page 57 of their needs assessment. He showed a slide that identified strategies and options to reduce that field deficit and potential options in doing so. He said if they were to replace the existing and natural grass fields at Darden Towe with four lighted synthetic turf fields and built four natural grass fields at Biscuit Run, it would eliminate that field deficit.

Mr. Crickenberger said he would like to share with the Board that there was a more aggressive, enhanced annual maintenance plan that was currently being performed. He said Mr. Henry had also mentioned that this would be shared and discussed with the Albemarle County Public School System. He said the maintenance plan took about five to six months of an aggressive nutrient plan and other things. He said it was important to understand the key to a successful program were soil samples. He said soil samples would drive the nutrient plan and allowing fields to rest would be a part of the plan. He said if the Board were supportive of this strategy and the cost related to the work, it would also include an additional FTE to assist with the maintenance and implementation of this proposed maintenance program.

Mr. Crickenberger said a few more details of the maintenance strategy included work on a common maintenance and care policy that would be shared and discussed with the schools and coordinated with their assistance. He said to expand a bit more on this maintenance strategy, schools and parks would perform an assessment of all fields, and in doing so would determine the level of renovation needed, then those fields ranked would develop a maintenance renovation schedule, which would ultimately end up in the closing of some fields, but that was to be determined for the renovation and required rest.

Mr. Crickenberger said they would again be developing an athletic field policy as Mr. Henry stated, shared with the public school system and the organizations. He said part of that athletic plan would address the field usage and overall schedule, field conditions, field cancellations, and identify the fields to be taken offline or not eligible for renovations because of the required rest. He said this would take some time as Mr. Henry had mentioned, with the number of fields. He said they knew and felt comfortable in saying that the school system was on board with this maintenance proposal. He reiterated that it would take some time but would be something they would soon begin work on. He said Mr. Lance Stewart would share some of the more technical data in regard to this discussion.

Mr. Stewart introduced himself as Lance Stewart, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services. He said the slides he was presenting were directed at how they were going to implement renovations of fields, installations of new fields, whether they would be grass or turf, at the Board's direction. He said first was an overview of the principles they would follow. He said for any of the selection types, they would have a focus on player safety and be careful that they selected products or systems that ensured the greatest level of player safety.

Mr. Stewart said whatever environmental impacts associated with any type of system would again be addressed through careful design and product selection. He said they would be very mindful as they developed field specific maintenance practices that they planned for those to be done well so that they could extend as much as possible the lifecycle of those fields and playability of those fields. He said this was a framework and that he would walk through examples of grass fields, turf fields, and discuss lighting.

Mr. Stewart said in the case of natural grass fields, one of the keys was protecting it from overuse so that there were no bare spots. He said the resizing of fields was something Mr. Crickenberger mentioned earlier, and an example would be moving the goal posts around, so that as they got to the areas where the goalie might protect that were high-traffic where it tended to get bare, they reoriented how those were laid out on the field so that they could allow those areas that had been abused to rest while the whole field still remained active.

Mr. Stewart said from an environmental mitigation standpoint, he thought that was just a continuance of their good chemical use policies. He said they were very careful about what they used when they cared for their fields or grounds, and again, good lifecycle use management and replacement cycle they were advised was 20-30 years before renovation would likely be necessary for a grass field, so they wanted to make sure they took care of it very well to extend that life and playability as long as possible.

Mr. Stewart said for turf field player safety, there were a few elements related to injuries and heat. He said there had been advancements in products over the years and in the strategies and ways that turf systems were built, shock pads as a rubber layer underneath, the grass blade system itself that helped to absorb impacts for head injuries, some of the turf grass material could be very specific to the sports that were played on it to help reduce that, and of course regular, consistent inspections and maintenance were a key part of maintaining that safe level.

Mr. Stewart said in terms of heat, it was acknowledged that turf systems were hotter than grass systems, so there were infill selections that helped mitigate that, and the natural ones would do that, such as the BrockFILL product they discussed recently which had been proven to reduce temperatures as much as 30 degrees, particularly when there had been some moisture. He said that was part of it, and the other part of it was just making sure that leagues and coaches understood when to not play on hot days when temperatures warranted cancellation of practices and games.

Mr. Stewart said from an environmental standpoint, the BrockFILL product was an infill selection that seemed to be the best that was available in terms of cradle-to-cradle product availability made from pine.

Mr. Stewart said from a design standpoint, they wanted to be mindful as they always were in their capital projects to manage to water quality and water quantity as it impacted their waterways, and in this specific instance, to make sure they designed fields to limit the migration of that infill. He said lifecycle management came back to consistency in maintenance and repairs, and at the end of the life, recycling the turf. He said they were very pleased to learn that a European-based company was opening a facility in Pennsylvania. He said Blake Abplanalp, Chief of Facilities and Environmental Services had had a couple of conversations with the founder of that company to confirm the timeline, so that was something they could look forward to in a few years to be able to rely on.

Mr. Stewart said he would finally discuss lighting. He said again that player safety was a factor there and there were minimum lighting requirements for safe play, and depending on the type of sport, it may require some uplighting. He said it had been determined for the sports they were playing, the uplighting would not be required, so that helped them with the environmental mitigation around the Dark Skies compliance and light pollution in general. He said they would of course select the most energy-efficient fixtures they could, to limit their climate impact.

Mr. Stewart said of the implementation strategy that they would do a careful design, bid, build process with a qualified engineering firm. He said the procurement would include a prequalification process that would require that, absent of price before bids or issues, that they would set standards for performance of the contractors in terms of certain numbers of fields of this type, whatever type was selected, and that they were qualified to do the work and were a quality firm. He said then only those firms would be able to provide bids. He said a version of the table shown on the slide was included in their packets. He said Mr. Henry would present this information and stay present for any questions that Mr. Henry could not answer.

Mr. Henry thanked Mr. Stewart and Mr. Crickenberger. He said the chart shown corresponded with the information provided in the Executive Summary for different capital improvement options. He said it should be noted that during Mr. Stewart's technical description, the synthetic turf option in both cases would assume BrockFILL would be the infill type, and the corresponding costs associated with that were factored into this data. He said they would also note that there was a question a Board member had about where those sites were in Virginia, so they sent that information out on Tuesday. He said they believed there were five fields at three different locations in Virginia, and in the east coast region across three or four states there were about 30 facilities that had that technology. He said the assumptions that they used for the synthetic turf were the BrockFILL infill component.

Mr. Henry said he would work top-to-bottom, and Darden Towe at the top, natural grass would be basically a refurbishing of the four fields. He said that was less expensive than the other three options, and that was because those fields existed, the infrastructure existed, and they were relatively flat, so the process of design and the other work necessary was essentially a skimming of the grass, inspection, leveling, compaction, and then resodding. He said that was the basic process. He said a synthetic turf project would be more invasive in that they would have to build that infrastructure, and the \$5.1 million he rounded to was the same number the Board had seen back in March when they provided cost estimates. He said it would be replacing four existing regulation fields with synthetic turf using BrockFILL, and they

could see the costs were broken out with lighting for the turf.

Mr. Henry said if the Board chose to also consider Biscuit Run, natural grass was in the original CIP request. He said it was a significant delta or difference in cost from the grass fields at Darden Towe, and the reason for that was that it was an undeveloped site. He said there was a cost component to get to where the fields were located on the Master Plan, and there was the cost of that work that needed to happen regardless of whether it was synthetic turf or natural grass to put the infrastructure in, to get to the field, and then to build the fields, so that cost was carried into the Biscuit Run options.

Mr. Henry said again, the natural grass four regulation fields or synthetic turf. He said they confirmed with DCR that they could consider synthetic turf and lights at Biscuit Run and showed that in their information to the Board. He said staff would recommend that if that were the Board's direction to do synthetic turf and lights at Biscuit Run that they get some engagement on that, because it was a change from their Master Plan, and they would want to do that work in conjunction with the Board. He said that was a summary, and there was a lot of detail in the documents provided, and they had staff who could go through detailed questions if they needed to.

Mr. Henry said the CIP options included the possibility of proceeding with the grass field upgrades at Darden Towe, and no lights would be involved with that, as written in the proposal. He said that could be a direction from the Board. He said they could proceed with the conversion of the four synthetic turf fields and lights at Darden Towe, which was an approved project back in 2019. He said they walked through that history at the last Board meeting. He said they could consider moving forward with the four regulation natural grass fields at Biscuit Run. He said both Biscuit Run and Darden Towe would be at an upgraded level, which would require upgraded maintenance and management. He said finally, if directed to do so, they could consider synthetic turf and lights at Biscuit Run, but they would recommend a community engagement Master Plan update process if that were the direction.

Mr. Henry said finally, something they did not talk much about, but if it were the will of the Board, they could consider synthetic turf at Darden Towe without lights. He said that in a normal week, they averaged about 30 hours of playtime at Darden Towe based on their daylight profile and when the fields were in use. He said with lights, it was believed that would extend potentially another 20 hours per week. He said the difference between lights and non-lit fields theoretically was about 20 hours. He said they also recognized and acknowledged that grass fields were often limited in play because of the conditions.

Mr. Henry said staff did believe a synthetic turf option without lights, while perhaps not being a 2:1 ratio, but perhaps closer to 1.5:1 of the synthetic turf being playable after harsher weather events. He said they had about 100 days of rain or wet days, and unless it was lightning conditions, the synthetic turf would be playable. He said again they were just not gaining the full value of having the lights, so they put that as a fifth option for consideration of the Board. He said the sixth was a combination of above or other that may come out of the discussion today. He said all of these options were billed on the assumption of the work he and Mr. Crickenberger talked about with schools to have a programmatic approach to all 43 grass fields throughout the County and the synthetic turf fields at the schools. He said he was available to answer any questions and said again that staff and the consultant were present as well.

Mr. Gallaway said Mr. Henry theorized the best practices moving forward with grass fields. He asked what that did to the field deficiency and how it was impacted.

Mr. Crickenberger asked for clarification.

Mr. Henry said if they implemented the best practices, that would result in resting fields. He said the question was what they thought the resulting deficiency would be, if they thought it was 6 to 8 today, the next year, that number would be something else.

Mr. Crickenberger thanked him. He addressed Supervisor Gallaway and said they had not landed on an exact number of fields that would be rested on an annual basis. He said that would be part of that field assessment. He said they were assuming perhaps 20%, which could be as many as four fields per year, or four fields every six months. He said again it was something they had not landed. He said he would estimate if they were to take four fields offline for a period of a year, the leagues and such would have to adjust their schedules, or they would have to in turn find additional field space for them, and it could be back to four.

Mr. Gallaway said thank you. He said on the 23rd, he had asked if there was any way to theorize or talk about return on investment. He said they invested this much money, when they thought of playability and time, and the economic development pieces, he would like to know if there was a way to think about what their return would be for it to make sense as a good investment. He said he did not see that information anywhere, and he assumed that three weeks was not enough time to get at that, because it was complex.

Mr. Henry said yes, it was complex and they did not answer that question specifically. He said part of the return on investment would be what they valued as the return, such as increased playability, quality of play, availability of fields, or cost and true economic development. He said he thought they could get there but understanding what the metrics were by which they would calculate that would be helpful.

Mr. Gallaway said he understood. He said if they put new windows in the County Office Building, they had a way to see energy savings over time. He said if they built a school building or put an addition

on a school building, they started thinking about how many more students it could hold and a cost analysis. He said there had to be a way in playability, maintenance, and ongoing operational costs to have that all factored in so that if they were going to have a system of fields, they should have a system of how to make really good decisions on how that money could be used. He said he thought there was a decision that was clear to help with that return. He said he was just curious and wanted to make sure he did not miss that if it was out there.

Mr. Henry said no. He apologized.

Mr. Gallaway said not to worry. He said originally when this was paused, it was around the procurement procedures in December of 2019. He asked if they were satisfied that the issues and concerns they had with procurement measures had been addressed and that the County would be fine moving forward. He asked if they no longer had that original concern.

Mr. Henry said Mr. Stuart had talked at a high level about that procurement methodology, which was one of the issues raised back in 2019. He said in the engineer's report, there were other elements of what they would want to build into their procurement specifications from a testing and quality control perspective that he believed would address that concern that was specifically asked and answered in the engineer's report. He said in the meeting on the 23rd, they ran out of time to do any kind of deep dive into that. He said if Mr. Jason Kanak was on Zoom, they could talk more about that.

Mr. Gallaway said as the Deputy County Executive, Mr. Henry knew that concern had come up, and it seemed to him that that was not really being discussed anymore because they had probably already been satisfied that the process they followed would be legitimate.

Mr. Henry said staff would recommend following what the engineer had provided as a recommendation as to mitigate risk and ensure quality.

Mr. Andrews said while he was not present for the 2019 meeting, he tried to watch it online. He said he wanted to confirm that at that meeting that there was clear consensus to go with synthetic turf versus natural fields.

Mr. Gallaway said the vote was 3-3, so it could be said there was no consensus to rehash the turf versus grass debate, yet they were with a 3-3 sentiment. He said one continued with 3-3, and while it was not clearly going in one direction, they were here now.

Mr. Andrews said his other question was about the Biscuit Run options. He said he recognized there was nothing there right now.

Mr. Henry said that was correct.

Mr. Andrews said he was trying to understand how the costs came in. He said the Darden Towe fields were sufficiently flat at this point and the cost to turn them into grass fields was fairly small, but the cost to make them synthetic turf required digging down more and became comparable to Biscuit Run. He asked if the Biscuit Run cost included the preliminary grading. He said he had seen the topology in the Biscuit Run area where these fields were proposed for was right now very uneven.

Mr. Henry said Biscuit Run certainly had elevation in it, which was captured in that cost. He asked Mr. Stewart to show the CIP slides. He said the Darden Towe natural grass would consist of them basically skimming the upper layer to make sure they had good soils, compacting, grading, leveling, and basically resodding. He said the rest of the existing infrastructure was there. He said to do the synthetic turf, Mr. Jason Kanak from Kimley-Horn went through the layers of construction, and that work had to happen at both sites for the field infrastructure for synthetic turf. He said the cost was what it was at those two sites.

Mr. Andrews asked if the Biscuit Run synthetic turf cost take into account the initial slope.

Mr. Henry said it did. He said within the CIP, it was about \$750,000, which was to get them to the fields themselves, and very similar work would have to be done in both cases to build the grass fields or synthetic turf fields.

Mr. Andrews said he would like to understand the comments about the sports complex consultant and that process.

Mr. Henry said in 2017 and 2018, Parks and Recreation contracted with Pros Consulting, which was well-renowned for Parks and Recreation planning and did engagement with the community, the Board, and the sports leagues, did surveys and generated a document that provided an assessment of where they stood presently as a community for their sports and recreational needs. He said these were not only active needs, but passive needs. He said greenfields, passive play areas, hiking trails, and those kind of things. He said he believed there were at least two or three work sessions with the Board where the consultant worked through the study, results, and recommendation. He said the recommendation that ultimately came into the Capital Program had three elements. He asked Mr. Crickenberger if he knew those that were brought into the CIP recommendations out of the 2018.

Mr. Crickenberger said obviously Darden Towe, Western Park, and –

Mr. Henry said he believed the third was enhancing their trails and blue ways, which was the number one recommendation.

Mr. Crickenberger said yes, that was number one.

Mr. Henry said that was a plan that looked at circa 2018 and projected out 15 or 20 years, looked at their population, and looked at standard amenities for communities of their size. He said the nature of their community was that it had an urban and rural dichotomy and this plan made recommendations with that in mind. He said they had gone back through this process and reread the report, and there was work they had started that was shelved with the pandemic, as many things did as far as trying to implement some of those recommendations. He said they had made some staff changes that came out of that assessment to better support their facilities, as an example.

Mr. Andrews thanked Mr. Henry.

Ms. McKeel said staff had worked on this project for a long time and answered lots of questions. She said it would be interesting for the public to listen to their previous work session and read the report they had in the packet today, because they were very informative. She said she needed a few clarifications. She asked Mr. Stewart if he was the one who discussed the lighting and if he could clarify whether they could meet the County's Dark Skies Ordinance with the new, better lighting.

Mr. Stewart said they could. He said Musco Lightings was the company that was the gold standard that they would likely utilize. He said the image shown on the screen was of one of their complexes in Harrisonburg that was fully dark sky compliant. He said in their first meeting, he talked a bit about some growing concerns around light pollution other than the visual impacts to the sky and more about the natural impacts to flora and fauna as light impacted their circadian cycles. He said the extended light in the blue spectrum had scientific evidence of problematic to circadian rhythms, and if it was in the red spectrum, and lower wattage and lower poles could be in LEDs and in the red spectrum, it seemed to be okay. He said it would be something they would look at very hard to see if they could achieve that with these projects, but it would be atypical to accommodate a field that would have poles that were low enough that the power could be low enough that the light could be in the red spectrum.

Ms. McKeel asked if he was saying that dark skies compliance could be achieved.

Mr. Stewart said absolutely.

Ms. McKeel said he had talked in a circle, and she was confused by what he was saying. She said part of the problem was that their lighting ordinance was old. She said they were doing a lot more with dark skies and good lighting than one would think if they looked at the old ordinance, and there was lots of new technology. She said what she was hearing was that they could have dark skies compliance with Darden Towe.

Mr. Stewart said yes.

Ms. McKeel said the area around Darden Towe had lots of light pollution, which she thought many of them wanted to address. She said it was important to get UVA to the table, because that was the only way they would address that. She said having said that, another question she had was related to Supervisor Gallaway's comments. She said when they were talking about the Crozet Plaza, they had good economic development data on what that would provide to the County, so she was looking for something similar, because these projects could certainly provide economic development money and they knew that. She said she would like to discuss that at some point. She said they had received a strong email from the City and Ned Michie, the keeper of the fund, and her guess was that the City would be contributing \$1 million to this project, but they were requiring for that \$1 million lighting and synthetic turf fields, because that was the expectation they had for that \$1 million.

Mr. Henry said the current funding modeled was \$928,000.

Ms. McKeel said that was about \$1 million, but more like \$900,000.

Mr. Henry said the City had that appropriated and designated for use. He said when this project was first approved three years ago, it was based on the assumption of synthetic turf and lights. He knew staff and he had confirmed with the City Manager's Office that the funding was still there, but they were looking at that funding and if they did not take action on its use in this budget cycle, from what he had been told, the City would reallocate it to other needs, of which they had many.

Ms. McKeel said that was what Mr. Michie told her in a conversation they had about this.

Mr. Henry said he did pose a question about a change of scope, and the City Manager's Office was noncommittal, but said they would consider anything coming out of today's meeting that he would follow up with him on.

Ms. McKeel said Mr. Michie was not that generous in their conversations.

Mr. Henry said he would be talking to the City Manager.

Ms. McKeel said she was not sure that is who the money was with, but that they did not have to

go any further on it than that.

Ms. McKeel said her understanding was that at Biscuit Run, they would have to deal with the slopes, which meant they would have to move a lot more dirt and flatten the property. She said that got to what the extra expense was for.

Mr. Henry said part of the cost of implementing the Master Plan had always assumed that. He said yes.

Ms. McKeel said she did not have any further questions.

Mr. Henry said that was in part because of how they located those fields specifically off of the entrance as the best location in proximity to Route 20. He said there was a lot of work done in the Master Plan, and proximity-wise, that was the best place for them to go. He said there was the associated cost with building that there, but they believed overall it was the best place for concentrating the more active use areas at the entrances, and then there were acres and miles of passive use throughout the rest of the 1,200 acres.

Ms. McKeel said she did not want to speak for everyone but believed they would all agree with that. She believed they were limited on how much pavement they could actually put in Biscuit Run.

Mr. Henry said they were limited on pervious and impervious surfaces.

Ms. McKeel said having it near the entrance would help with that.

Mr. Henry said that was correct.

Ms. Mallek said it had been an interesting iteration, because she thought she was making lots of progress with the matrices, but when she got to the Kimley-Horn letter that said these were only estimates on the cost and to not take it seriously, she was taken aback. She said that was the state of life nowadays. She said she was glad to hear Mr. Crickenberger mention the needs assessment, which she got a copy of and reread. She said having lived through all of the public engagement meetings that were had, there was a dramatic shift at the very end of the process, and she printed out the charts to help remind herself. She said up until the very last week, the walking, hiking, biking, and equestrian trails, and general passive recreation conservation items were the highest, and then all of a sudden, when it came forward after the analysis in private, the fields seemed to jump up to number two. She said she had never been able to understand or get an answer as to why that happened.

Ms. Mallek said the example they saw during the pandemic was that 2 million people were walking and enjoying passive recreation in their parks, and that bore out the conclusions up until the last week of the needs assessment that were done with the context of hundreds and hundreds of people. She said one chart that was particularly helpful was walking, biking, hiking with 34,000 families, and the youth fields was 3,000 families. She said she did not know what to do with that and how that information got changed to the conclusions that were now being reported, so she was glad to be able to ask that. She said she was glad to hear staff's analysis about the fee schedule, but she thought that all of that was really important to understand the affordability of their maintenance of operation that they had been kicking the can down the road for decades in investments in their parks situation. She said that was how she came to this discussion today, and she was glad they were finally considering making serious investments in recreation, because it was something they had needed to do for a very long time.

Ms. Mallek said fifteen years ago, the majority of the Board at the time would not consider any investment in recreation unless it was a moneymaker, which was how they got sucked into this tunnel of economic development, when to her, recreation facilities were something that should not be an enterprise, should be something they were providing for all of their citizens regardless of their income, and certainly many of their citizens did not have the thousands of dollars to pay to these private groups for the competitive training they were doing. She said she was still confused about the math and annual maintenance. She said she supposed \$24,000 per field was how they got the \$100,000 maintenance for the group of four fields.

Ms. Mallek said she also did not understand the math of the size of the fields, because they were talking about four 200 by 300 regulation fields, and yet there were only two that were shown on the plan that were supposed to be played sideways, and she did not see how that was possible. She said they were really looking at two regulation fields that were of this size.

Mr. Henry said Supervisor Mallek had a great memory in referring to an early concept back in 2019. He said what they were proposing and what they worked through in their concepts here would be four regulation fields at Darden Towe.

Ms. Mallek said that was a different layout they just had not seen the plan for.

Mr. Henry said that was because they had not done the work on it yet.

Ms. Mallek said all they had was the green plan, and what he was saying was that it was no longer the case.

Mr. Henry said that was correct. He said it was a fall 2019 work in progress.

Ms. Mallek said that was a huge thing. She said that was all they had to work with, and she was very glad to know that was not what he was proposing here, because that had led to a lot of confusion. She said she appreciated the greater balance in many things here, but there had not been any discussion about the risks of turf. She said there was a big discussion in the packet about the risks of grass and how it may be lumpy and how people may fall down. She said she had a discussion with some family people while she was watching her grandchildren play recently, and they were talking about how at Monticello High School, every place there was a number on the field, it was two inches lower on the grass. She said her point was that nothing was perfect, and she would like to be able to have some more analysis to continue to balance information. She said she hoped they could avoid trying to grab the first door that gave them something when they should be trying hard to do it right and do the whole effort.

Ms. Mallek said there was some discussion about some changes in hours that could be expected on the fields. She said she guessed the 30 hours a week for a cluster of fields was pretty standard from the places she had been, but at the same time, if they had synthetic turf fields, they had to not have people playing on them in times of the heat of the day. She said the heat of the day used to be around noontime when she was young, but now it seemed to be around 3 p.m. to dusk. She said she needed to understand better how those balanced with the lost time they might have with the sort of standard grass fields they had now.

Ms. Mallek said a gap in the information she would still like to know about, and perhaps the person online could help with that, was the information about how the cost for the better-drained, or sometimes referred to as rain-out proof grass fields, that were being used in many places now and could be played on during a thunderstorm or rain for many sports. She said that was a question that was asked about quite specifically a number of weeks ago, and she would still like to have an answer to that.

Mr. Henry said answer 29 in Ms. Mallek's packet addressed that question specifically on page 12. He said it was "Is there a grass field that is similar to a synthetic field in regard to drainage issues?." He said the answer was yes, they could build that infrastructure and cost was comparable to the synthetic turf infrastructure, but a consideration would be that it still did not allow them to significantly... He said he would just read the answer. He said "a USDA sand-based root zone with a stone base under the root zone layer would drain similarly to a synthetic turf field, moderately increasing the amount of playtime by limiting the playtime that must be delayed after heavy rains. The durability of these fields, however, was not significantly improved beyond normal grass fields. Installation costs of these systems was comparable to synthetic turf installation." He said that was specifically the question about the higher end grass field. He said that level of field and infrastructure was not what was proposed in the CIP.

Ms. Mallek said then to mow it, set it out right, put better turf, and take care of it better, and that was what the \$400,000 per field was getting. She said she was glad to get that straightened out. She said she was interested to hear the discussion about the economic investment. She said she hoped a question the Board would really focus on was who they were serving. She said if they were serving their general population, then they needed to provide fields that were going to be useful for many different activities, so that was an important side of that they should focus on before there was a decision.

Ms. Mallek said there was a discussion about, and perhaps the person online could answer, the hundred fields the consultants had installed that were natural grass. She asked if any of those were the better-drained fields that were asked about, and if they consulted with people who had actually installed these better-quality grass fields to provide real information. She said she saw information in here, and when she went to the website of the company, it was just right on the website, so she was looking for people who had their best interest in mind, not just selling them something, and she was trying to separate where those concerns were.

Mr. Henry said some of those fields that were designed, and they could ask Mr. Jason Kanak, but he believed they were PGA level grass turf, so they had the experience with the drainage and the infrastructure that he just read a minute ago. He asked if Mr. Jason Kanak could answer the question.

Mr. Kanak said his experience was extensive in designing USGA sand-based root zone fields. He said the majority of the fields that were of that level and equivalent installation cost at around \$10 per square foot, as a rule of thumb. He said the majority of those were for NFL, major league soccer, major league baseball, and training facilities such as those. He said those were very high-profile fields that would be taken care of daily and not weekly. He said their maintenance was probably 4 or 5 times more than a typical grass field would be. He said the Pittsburgh Steelers were an example of one of the USGA sand-based three zone fields he had done. He said he had extensive experience with it and it was on par with the installation cost of synthetic turf, but again, the intensity of play, if equal to 30 hours of week, would not hold up over time.

Ms. Mallek asked if that was experience he had in real life as far as having to refurbish them more frequently, somewhat on the same interval as they would have to change the synthetic turf out at the 10-year interval.

Mr. Kanak said on aging out the whole system, generally if there was a groundskeeper kept up on the maintenance yearly and did a lot of care to that field, he could maintain that root zone for 10 to 20 years. He said he had also seen USGA sand-based root zone fields that could turn bad in 8 years. He said what happened with that was that the root zone was a very fine sand, and that was the growing medium that the natural turf would grow up on. He said when the top of that was resodded, which could be quite frequent due to wear, if they brought in too many silts and clays, it would clog the root zone

profile that was 10 inches deep.

Mr. Kanak said that groundskeeper must keep that root zone clean and keep the silts and clays out of it as best as possible, which was done through buying the best sod they could possibly buy and would be equivalent to the root zone profile. He said secondly, if silts and clays were brought in, they would have to come back in and remove that material from that in order to extend the life of the playing field. He asked if that answered the question.

Ms. Mallek said yes. She thanked him. She asked where in their matrices or their estimates were they incorporating the cost of replacement for the synthetic turf fields.

Mr. Henry said in the CIP that was provided, that was a five-year look, so a replacement cost would be at the earliest ten years out. He said that would not be reflected in the documentation provided.

Ms. Mallek said they would need to be aware of what was coming. She said she would be very distressed if they made a choice without pre-saving for that, because she knew for one field, Monticello, at \$670,000, and there were two other fields coming. She said when the vote was taken in 2009, the Board of Supervisors was promised at the time that there would be savings in management from the school department to cover this, so it was a rather rude surprise to find that that had not happened.

Ms. Mallek said when they were comparing costs of these two types of facilities, she thought that the longevity, in addition to all the other things they would talk about later, that they needed to have real information about the cost to annually maintain, which seemed to be pretty similar at around \$100,000 for the four fields, and the big bolus of expense at the intervals to do the replacement. She said then there was the disposal, which was not shown anywhere, so they had no idea other than the 199 tons removed from the Whitehall dump and taken to the landfill. She said that was far different than what was quoted in here, and that was something that would have to go somewhere.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if they were limited to 6 to 8 fields at Biscuit Run. She asked if eight fields were the maximum they could have according to their contract with the state.

Mr. Henry said 6 to 8 fields was reflected in what was the approved master plan, which was part of that whole process to bring in different uses. He said it worked within the framework of their contractual requirements with the state for pervious and impervious areas.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said okay.

Mr. Henry said there were 6 to 8 and they were trying to locate those within proximity to the entrance.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said just as they would have to get permission from the state and amend the contract to be able to put synthetic fields in there and lighting, they could also perhaps amend it to increase the fields in the future.

Mr. Henry said theoretically, yes. He said they would have to look at the other elements of the Master Plan, the overall equation of impervious and pervious.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that was correct.

Mr. Henry said that would take work, and it was not amending the contract. He said they would have to stay within the agreement, but in any change they would want to update their master plan, which would come back to the Board since the Board approved what was there now.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was just trying to find out if there was any wiggle room as to whether in the future they could increase the number of fields as their population increased either there at Biscuit Run or other County areas where that was a possibility.

Mr. Henry said the County owned property, and there were possibilities with the County and schools. He said they had not looked at it at that level.

Mr. Crickenberger said they had not. He said the Biscuit Run Master Plan process was very unique, because they had a lot of public engagement and public desires. He said with the facility of 1,200 acres and where it was located was located partially in the development area. He said the design concepts took in amenities that would be found at an urban, community, or regional park with some of the fields. He said about the question of wiggle room that the approved Master Plan would not be. He said it would encroach into the open space areas that had been designed and designated and approved in that Master Plan, which were some of the driving ideas from the community. He said they wanted to see open spaces, trails, and pavilions with some athletic fields. He said it would take much more analysis to really be able to give a solid answer on that.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was not trying to go anywhere with that but was asking if they wanted in the future to build additional fields, they would have to go elsewhere. She said he had brought up a 99-acre deficit in sports complexes, but a sports complex also included spectator seating and lighting, and the only place they had that would be at the high schools.

Mr. Crickenberger said when they said spectator seating, they referred to bleachers, but not

permanent stadium seating.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if there were only bleachers at the high school.

Mr. Henry said they had portable bleachers at multiple fields.

Mr. Crickenberger said they were not permanent, and that was key.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if they were at Darden Towe.

Mr. Henry said yes. He said not stadiums, but portable seating.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if they were portable bleachers.

Mr. Henry said yes, they were portable bleachers.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked him for that answer. She said she understood that in either case for turf or natural fields at Darden Towe, they would need a full-time equivalent person there.

Mr. Crickenberger said that was what they were proposing and recommending.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said regarding the lighting and such, what would not harm any kind of animal and insect life would be the red spectrum light, but it would need more study.

Mr. Stewart said yes, to see if it could be done and still maintain the minimal lighting requirements for safe play.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if they were not sure about the lighting.

Mr. Stewart said that was correct.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said according to what she had read, she understood the natural turf had the lifespan of between 20 and 30 years when properly done, and the synthetic fields had a lifespan of 8 to 10 years depending on playtime and such. She said she did a quick calculation based upon what she had seen there that they could have 12 fields with all-natural grass for \$11.3 million, and 12 synthetic at \$16.5 million, so it seemed to her that they would actually be saving a lot of money and that would not need to be repeated. She said someone also mentioned specific types of turf for specific sports. She asked if there was an example of knowing what type of turf to go in.

Mr. Stewart asked Mr. Kanak to answer Supervisor LaPisto-Kirtley's question.

Mr. Kanak asked if she could repeat the last part of her question.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said when they were discussing turf, it was mentioned there were specific types of turf for specific sports.

Mr. Kanak said that was correct.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if they would put in four different types of turf for the four different fields.

Mr. Kanak said if they were looking at multiple sports and had four fields, he would recommend a synthetic turf blend that had both the slit-fill and mono-fill fibers. He said the split-film would give the durability they were looking for, and the mono-fill fibers would help with the overall look of the field and the ball-roll for sports like soccer. He said football really needed slit-fill, and soccer liked the mono-filament style. He said with multiple sports, he would recommend a blend. He said if there was one sport, they could get it to each recipe for the turf carpet specific to that sport, but he did not believe that was what they were looking for here.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said no. She asked what the material composition of the two in the blend were.

Mr. Kanak said they were made of polypropylene.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if both were made of polypropylene.

Mr. Kanak said that was correct.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she liked that they were doing game versus practice fields and new policy studying that this next year, and also the fee structure. She said she was very much in support of that.

Ms. Price thanked staff. She said Mr. Henry's familiarity with the material was impressive. She said she had no further questions but did have comments. She said staff was looking for guidance from the Board, so she did not know if they would take a formal vote, but they did need to express themselves to give staff guidance.

Mr. Henry said he would return to his seat, but he would come back as comments turned to questions. He said they would like guidance if possible.

Ms. Price asked if there was a slide with specific information on the guidance.

Mr. Henry said it really would be direction around one of these options or item 6, which was a combination or other option.

Mr. Gallaway said he would offer a few comments based on the questions he had heard. He asked who dumped the material that was redirected to the landfill that they kept hearing about in the plans.

Ms. Mallek said it was individual contractors working under subcontracts with UVA.

Mr. Gallaway said it was UVA's fields.

Ms. Mallek said it was the park field that had been mentioned in emails.

Mr. Gallaway said if they were in charge of their fields, they would police that better and would not allow those materials to be illegally dumped. He said his point was that the reuse of these materials in their plans under their control, and he assumed they would be a good actor on that and handle that. He said he was frustrated with extra things being put in that would not be factors here because they would be under their control when they did this as a way to somehow switch their views on what should be a good decision. He said that was a misdirect. He said the cost of the grass fields versus the costs of the turf fields and time had only one issue of it not being a 1:1 ratio. He said they said it was a 2:1 ratio and at worst was a 1.5:1 ratio. He said when they talked about investment of dollars and looked at timeframes, it was not as easy as saying they got this many fields at this cost for this time, and they had to factor in that multiplier. He said if that would be continued to be discussed, they needed to get down into these.

Mr. Gallaway said they were at the point at where anything that was not a legitimate fact could not be thrown out there as something that should suggest changing their minds on something. He said CIP plans did not work based on saving for replacement costs down the road. He said they did not save for the next window replacement, and instead factored in a replacement cycle, made sure they had maintenance monies available to hit the cycle. He said they did not save for rooves, HVACs, and all of that. He said that a Capital Improvement Plan put an installation in if it was the first time, then the maintenance got factored in on a cycle, which was why things then got done on that cycle so they did not get behind.

Mr. Gallaway said he thought the choice was very clear on this matter. He said a prior Board voted to approve. He said they hashed out the grass versus turf debate. He said they continued with this debate even though it was a split 3-3 Board, and the consensus was to revisit the procurement procedures, which at this point sounded to be that they would be satisfied if they moved forward with this process. He said when they made decisions, whether it was on land use policies, development of new facilities, buildings, or what have you, they looked to their climate action plan to mitigate as much as possible any environmental concerns that could come up.

Mr. Gallaway said the last work session on the 23rd, the environmental concerns were mitigated based on the increased technologies they had available to them and the decisions and choices they could make installing the artificial turf that most of, if not all, could satisfactorily be addressed in his opinion. He said that included runoff, how it could be recycled, what it could be recycled into, for example even into their own shock pads at their own facility based on how those things got worked out with the installer.

Mr. Gallaway said for putting the turf in, they had a system of fields, and it was made very clear on the 23rd that they had 23 high quality fields, the best of which were the four fields at Darden Towe. He said if those were their best quality, he did not know how to speak to the quality of fields that were in their system. He said they did not need to look any further than Deb Tyson's presentation of how to use a system to approach a high capacity and provide high playability with a turf field in a system of grass fields. He said putting turf fields in at Darden Towe would allow them to immediately enhance the quality of other grass fields, which their community deserved. He said they could start resting those on the new maintenance plan that was there, and in the short term, redirect that play to the turf fields for playability.

Mr. Gallaway said not the least of which was what they got out of weather, the lighting, and the increased hours there, but putting turf at Darden Towe immediately allowed them to start improving the quality of their other fields. He said putting grass in at Darden Towe did the reverse. He said with the new maintenance structure, why would they put more money in and more effort in to create a larger deficiency for their own community in play? He said that was what it would do. He said they did not know to what extent, but it was said in the question he asked earlier that it would create an increased deficiency because they would have to take fields offline. He said he was not saying that all their fields needed to be turf, but it allowed their fields to be put into rest.

Mr. Gallaway said he thought that Darden Towe being a centralized area of the community obviously saw the playability it did because it was easy for the County and City to get to in a very centralized spot. He said thinking about putting that somewhere else did not make a lot of sense to him. He said in the long-term return on investment, they would have better play surfaces, more volume, more playable conditions, and would allow them to have events for just their own community members.

Mr. Gallaway said he was thrilled that this would be for Albemarle County's people who lived here to play on. He said the economic development advantages of sporting events started to happen here would be a bonus. He said that was something that when that revenue came into their community, their community would benefit, which helped them meet and do what they did with Project ENABLE. He said he did not make this decision based on economic development reasons. He said he used the economic development reasons as part of a rationale to say it was a good idea, but it was a good idea without those economic development pieces.

Mr. Gallaway said putting these fields in play would allow their whole system of athletic fields and for sports recreation in Albemarle County to improve significantly. He said he would quote former Supervisor Randolph. He said, "Not all synthetic is bad and not all natural was good." He said that was true, and if they had a system of both materials and both types of fields it would allow them to have a better system in play that they could manage, but they could even allow people who were against playing on turf to play on grass and allow those who wanted to play only on turf the option to do so. He said the three turf fields that were in the high school system could not meet the community demand, because it must meet the demand of the students at those three individual schools.

Mr. Gallaway said when he stepped back and made any decision as a Supervisor, especially when funds were done, he asked what made the most sense to get the most out of each dollar they spent on the project. He said he did not see how they could come to any other conclusion that the turf being introduced into their system would improve all their facilities around the County for the better, give people the choice they needed to, and allow them to plan appropriately to continue to make the choices or use the materials to offset the environmental impacts that this County did on all the other decisions they made.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Gallaway if he had a recommendation for one of the six options.

Mr. Gallaway said he supported the synthetic turf fields and lights at Darden Towe, the second option.

Mr. Andrews said the weight of the plastic was an issue for him—philosophically and physically. He said he was looking at maps and trying to understand the size of plastic fields that would be put in Darden Towe if four turf fields would be built. He said at each of the high schools was one turf field. He said Darden Towe was a big area with a lot of soccer fields. He said four turf fields would take up most of the available playable area. He suggested trying the synthetic turf fields at a smaller scale rather than build all four fields at once. He said he supported improving the quality of fields at Darden Towe. He said to construct all four fields was out of scale with the area.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Andrews where he stood.

Ms. McKeel asked if Mr. Andrews was suggesting two fields instead of the proposal. She said she wanted Mr. Andrews to explain.

Mr. Andrews said he was suggesting that he would be open to one or two fields potentially at one location to try artificial turf. He said he did not know if he could support turning Darden Towe into all turf.

Ms. Price asked if Mr. Andrews supported the sixth option of the displayed options.

Mr. Andrews said he supported the sixth option.

Ms. McKeel said the fields served Albemarle County. She said economic development was considered in the discussion when they were talking about the Three Notched Trail, a path from the City to Ivy to Crozet and to the Blue Ridge Tunnel in Afton. She said the trail was proposed as serving the community and being an economic driver. She said it was hard for her to support one project like the trail and the Crozet Downtown Plaza and then say they could not look at the installation of artificial turf fields. She said there was a disconnect, and that what was good for one was good for the other.

Ms. McKeel said she was supportive of the second option. She said there were 13 parks totaling 3,255 acres. She said if Biscuit Run was included, then there were 14 parks totaling 4,455 acres. She said the vast majority of those acres, with the exception of four parks (two acres at Scottsville, 13 acres at Simpson Park, and some acreage at the Crozet Park) were all passive parks. She said the parks supported passive, low-impact recreational activities: walking and hiking trails, water amenities, and equestrian trails.

Ms. McKeel said taking the four fields at Darden Towe did not diminish the community's investment in natural and environmentally sustainable efforts. She noted the land use policies. She said Albemarle County was one of the leaders in the state. She said to have a system of parks that met the functional requirements of the community, there had to be the four synthetic turf fields at Darden Towe. She said the products had changed.

Ms. McKeel noted the shoes she wore were made out of recycled plastic. She said she could put them in the washing machine. She said she occasionally used a pair of leather shoes, but the world had changed with regards to recycling and plastics—there were different options and products. She said she supported four synthetic turf fields at Darden Towe. She said the lights were critically important to get the most out of the fields. She said they could be constructed in a way that did not add to the impacts to the neighbors surrounding the park.

Ms. Mallek said she wanted to bring her Christmas t-shirt that said 'There Was No Planet B.' She said she voted against the turf fields in 2009 based on the information then available. She said since then, so much more had been learned about the impacts of plastic having a greater impact than coal by 2030. She noted the Board supported a plastic bag tax at a recent meeting. She said she was criticized by many of her constituents that the tax was a burden on small stores and low-income users.

Ms. Mallek said they were discussing 60,000 square feet multiplied by four fields – 240,000 square feet—multiple layers, inches, and tons of plastic material that was considered to be put into one location which would then have to be disposed of within 10 to 12 years. She said the burden on decomposing plastic was shocking. She said the talking point for the plastic bag tax stated when plastic degraded in the environment, it produced microplastics that polluted air, water, and soil and entered into the food chain. She said the fields were an exponentially greater impact than the plastic bag tax.

Ms. Mallek said other communities had shorter rehabilitation times, and the original research and documents had been shared with the Board over many months. She said she tried to share the original documents when she received them to share information. She said the disposal of the material should be considered. She said it was different than maintaining brick buildings. She noted the regulation landscape regarding how the materials would be allowed to be disposed of was unknown even two years out.

Ms. Mallek said plastic recycling involved dumping material in a field. She said it was the way the various plastic, lead, cadmium, and zinc components drained into the soil during rains. She said it was a concern of hers. She said she forwarded an email on "BrockFILL." She said it was a new element, and she noted it had been installed in Maryland. She said recent photographs were taken of the temperature on the field with BrockFILL on a 95-degree Fahrenheit day and it was 147 degrees Fahrenheit. She said that was within 10 degrees of the crumb rubber. She said they had to be analytical and ensure they were receiving complete information about the consequences.

Ms. Mallek said the temperatures were a problem. She said the migration was a problem. She noted a photograph of the plastic material all over people who were leaving Monticello High School. She said it was the field decomposing and getting all over people. She said it was a real concern because the plastic ended up in the septic fields and sewer system. She said it was another way for all the material and components to be widely distributed throughout the world. She said the equity issue was real.

Ms. Mallek said there had been vocal supporters for many years of the fields. She noted people did not want to drive to other places for sports tournaments. She said in her experience with sports tournaments, the facilities had 20 to 25 fields, not just four fields. She said there might be new local tournaments at the four-field complex. She said she was pushing back against the expectation the fields would be a money maker because she preferred to call recreation a community investment. She said the community did not want to invest in recreation or solid waste previously. She said the quality of life created by those investments was important. She said she supported the first option.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she supported the first option. She said she was against the lighting at Darden Towe. She said the neighbors who lived in the area made it clear. She said the original agreement stipulated no lighting. She said the dark skies lighting had been discussed. She said she was concerned about the red spectrum. She said she was not in favor of any kind of lighting at Darden Towe. She said sports should not go until 10 or 11 p.m. She said the County's concern and goal was to fully support a climate action plan.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said they were the environmental stewards of the land, and using synthetic turf was not going to help. She said they could have the playing fields they wanted by using natural turf. She said Darden Towe was adjacent to a river, there were walking trails and other amenities. She said it was not the correct location for synthetic turf. She said emails had noted synthetic turf was approved in the 2019 CIP, but she noted that Darden Towe rated last in the 2020 CIP. She said each board prioritized different items in different manners. She said she was concerned about the heat and humidity associated with synthetic turf. She said it was not as healthy.

Ms. Price said she was present at the December 4, 2019 meeting. She said the conversation was animated, to put it politely. She said for 30 months the Board had been addressing the issue. She said she was not aware of another item the Board had on its agenda for as long, other than the Southwood redevelopment. She said she had received about 350 emails on the topic. She said as she reviewed the data, she felt like they were drowning in data from all the questions they had asked of staff.

Ms. Price said the competing data reminded her of Benjamin Israeli's comment that there were "lies, damn lies, and statistics." She said the Board was unable to make a decision. She said she disagreed with Mr. McGuire's comments regarding plastics. She noted all the plastics in the room. She said she found it difficult to narrow the concerns to four fields at one park. She concurred with Mr. Gallaway. She said she agreed with Ms. McKeel. She said the Board was discussing four fields at one park. She said unlike the high school with one team, the area would have multiple teams playing.

Ms. Price said if they were to provide for and support the community with high quality fields, it would not be with grass fields. She said they had heard from experts. She said they did not have professional landscaping crews that would work on the fields. She said the Parks and Recreation budget was 3% of the total County budget. She said the community was not ready to fund the landscaping and grounds crew necessary to have grass fields that met the needs of the community.

Ms. Price said she did not like plastic. She said she began the process opposed to the synthetic turf fields. She said over the months, as she received more information and talked with more people, she was convinced the only way the County would be able to provide a sufficient facility for the community was the second option. She said she supported the second option. She noted there were three supervisors in support of the second option, two for the first, and one for the sixth. She asked if there were further comments.

Mr. Gallaway said he appreciated Mr. Andrews' intent behind wanting compromise at Darden Towe. He said he had thought of that as a solution as well. He said all four fields were appropriate at Darden Towe as a means to keep synthetic turf outside of Biscuit Run. He said people did not want Biscuit Run to turn into a big athletic park.

Mr. Gallaway said if they only built two synthetic turf fields at Darden Towe, then they would have to do a similar approach at other facilities. He said two fields did not create the needed system. He said it would be more of an investment to do two synthetic fields and two grass fields at Darden Towe. He said four synthetic fields at Darden Towe and six grass fields at Biscuit Run would allow the grass fields to rest when needed.

Mr. Andrews said they were at an impasse. He said he was not against the first option, but he would prefer the sixth option.

Ms. McKeel said she would be happy to approve the four synthetic fields and lights at Darden Towe. She agreed that the fields at Biscuit Run should be grass. She said it would give them a system of fields where some could rest. She said she liked the idea of a field policy and maintenance study with the schools.

Ms. Mallek noted the extra FTE to take care of the synthetic turf fields or the grass fields. She asked if it was correct that the FTE would apply to both types of fields.

Mr. Crickenberger said the FTE would apply to both field types.

Ms. Mallek said the FTE was a given regardless of the choice the Board made.

Mr. Crickenberger said the FTE would help manage and execute the renovations of all grass fields, including the school's grass fields.

Ms. Mallek asked if the position would provide training.

Mr. Crickenberger said they could provide training but they hoped to hire someone already with the expertise.

Ms. Mallek said there were specialists at many other places. She said the County could train their own or hire someone from another area. She asked if there would be a second individual to do the grass fields and synthetic fields at Darden Towe.

Mr. Crickenberger said it was envisioned the FTE would do it all.

Ms. Mallek said they would be one busy person.

Mr. Crickenberger said yes.

Ms. Mallek said Albemarle County was alone in the region for not charging teams to use its fields. She said there had been research about the topic. She wanted to know the timetable for the discussion. She said she was worried it would disappear again because people were so busy. She wanted to settle on a return date.

Mr. Henry said it would be part of the County's ongoing work with the schools and the FY24 program. He said they did not intend to return for a discussion on fees in the coming months because there was no planned change. He said the schools charged for the turf and grass fields, and Parks and Recreation did not. He said it was part of the program that had been developed with their co-sponsored leagues. He said they would work with the schools on a program on overall play and management and, with that, the fees would be addressed. He said staff would return for a discussion at the appropriate time once they had done the work. He said if Board members wanted a sooner return date, it would be in absence of a comprehensive discussion with the schools. He said the discussion was needed because it was the program that needed to be managed.

Ms. Mallek noted the school system already had a fee structure, so nothing would be imposed on the schools that they did not already have.

Mr. Henry said the fee structure was for some of the school fields. He noted half of the school fields were managed by Parks and Recreation and were not subject to fees.

Ms. Mallek said when people went to the schools because the partners were using the Parks fields, they had to pay. She said frequently, smaller groups did not have access to the big lottery. She said it was difficult—her granddaughter's team was told to speak to SOCA, and SOCA denied them the

use of the field. She said if a model similar to other localities was used, they were looking at hundreds of thousands of dollars per year.

Ms. Mallek said a fee structure was beneficial because the money would offset maintenance costs and they would be able to verify the number of users. She said in Arlington, the teams had to supply the names and addresses of the users and pay \$10 per child for County residents and \$20 for non-County residents. She encouraged others to think about the issue of fees as important. She said the teams who had been playing without fees could get their time together. She said most teams had to pay all the time to use fields.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she still supported the first option. She said she was against lights at Darden Towe because she promised it to the residents. She said it was in the original contract. She said if they were to build one synthetic field at Darden Towe, why would they not construct a synthetic field and lights and Biscuit Run. She said Biscuit Run was a more rural area than Darden Towe. She said she supported the first option. She said she agreed with Mr. Andrews. She said she would be willing to try one synthetic field at Darden Towe to test it out and with the fields at Biscuit Run they could be rotated and assigned to different teams.

Ms. Price said she supported the first option. She said the light situation had been resolved to her satisfaction. She said she agreed with Mr. Gallaway that if the County were to have a park system, the four fields at Darden Towe would let the County not build similar infrastructure at Biscuit Run and they could leave it as more natural spaces. She said the Board remained at three in support of the second option, two in support of the first, and one in support the sixth option.

Mr. Henry said, given the feedback, the FY23 budget would move forward without any modification to the plans for the fields. He said reiterated that was the decision as of the day.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked where they stood.

Ms. Price said they were at a point where nothing would change because there was not a majority.

Mr. Andrews said there was a majority of people who wanted to see improvements to playing surfaces at Darden Towe. He said the problem was the Board could not agree on how to improve the fields.

Ms. Price said that meant there would be no change to the park policy because there was no majority for a single option.

Non-Agenda Item. Recess.

The Board recessed its meeting at 3:59 p.m. and reconvened at 6:00 p.m.

Item No. 2.2 Board-identified Potential Budget Adjustments from Prior Meetings.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Chief of Budget, introduced himself.

Ms. Price thanked ACPD Officers Miller and Proffitt who were present at the meeting.

Mr. Bowman said the Board would be requested to adopt and appropriate the FY23 budget on May 4. He said he would discuss a list of items the Board had identified to resolve any lingering issues and questions. He said the Board reserved the right to amend the budget before it was adopted.

Mr. Bowman said the Biscuit Run project would be included in the FY23 budget for the scope that did not include athletic fields. He said the staff recommended taking the money for athletic fields and appropriating it to the placeholder for comprehensive plan and strategic plan update projects. He said the placeholder was a reserve of about \$24 million in the second and third years of the plan that was put in place to allow future projects to be funded. He said any project utilizing the \$24 million could be revisited as part of the following year's CIP process if the Board were to reconsider the discussion. He said absent the Board's direction, that was how it was proposed to be included in the budget adoption.

Mr. Bowman said items two and three were grouped together since they were both other one-time funding requests. He said the Board identified support for additional one-time funding for the housing fund and the Boy's and Girl's Club of Central Virginia's (BGCCV) request from the March 30 work session. He said there was the ability to address both, though neither in full, in terms of the community need would be. He said there existed, as part of the County's ARPA funding of \$21.2 million, about \$1.7 million that was unallocated. He said staff recommended allocating portions of the remaining \$1.7 million to both initiatives. He said the funding would not fulfill the entire community need, but it was a proposal for the Board to respond.

Mr. Bowman said the housing fund had a reserve prior to the previous week's action, assuming the Board approved \$3.1 million to be transferred in that fiscal year, of about \$4.59 million. If all the items were approved, the housing fund balance would be reduced to about \$350,000. He said a way the Board could be positioned in the housing fund to address more of that was to take the \$698,000 and add it so

that the Board could start FY23 with a balance of about \$1 million. He said the use of the fund would be considered at a later time as housing requests were brought forward but would allow the Board to do more over the next fiscal year than was initially presented at the prior work session.

Mr. Bowman said the BGCCV request would not be discussed in detail but the Director, Mr. James Pierce, was available and present if there were further questions. He said the BGCCV had a \$2 million request for one-time funding. He said \$1 million could be provided from the undesignated ARPA reserve. He said both the proposals could be modified. He said the purpose was to provide the Board with something to respond to. He said it did not impact other aspects of the proposed budget.

Mr. Gallaway said moving the \$698,000 to the housing fund would be a good use. He said that would leave \$1 million available to use in FY23 if needed. He asked Ms. Stacy Pethia about the trust fund conversation and when it would happen.

Ms. Pethia said she anticipated the conversation would happen in the fall at the earliest. She noted there would be a work session the following week on developer incentives which would need more time to resolve.

Mr. Andrews said the move to the housing reserve fund was helpful, and he thought it was a good idea.

Ms. McKeel asked if they were to respond to both requests or just the housing.

Ms. Price said both.

Ms. McKeel said she supported both recommendations. She said they did not want to enter the new fiscal year with no money in the housing fund. She said the BGCCV recommendation was an amount that would make a difference and she was also supportive of the recommendation.

Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Bowman to repeat what he said regarding the athletic fields. She noted the scope of Biscuit Run would remain the same for FY23. She asked about the funding that would be returned to a reserve.

Mr. Bowman said when the budget was presented on February 23, the initial recommendation included a portion of funding for athletic fields as one of the scopes of the Biscuit Run project. He said it had been discussed with the Board back in the March work sessions, for clarity, to break it apart from Biscuit Run and treat the athletic fields at Biscuit Run as a standalone project. He said the proposal the following week was to take the remainder of the project funding and put it into the placeholder for the Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan update.

Ms. Mallek said the budget proposal included funding for the parking lot and entrance road. She said she did not know if this was the appropriate time to ask her next question but that there seemed to be a desire to do something to improve and renovate some of the fields. She said she wanted to know if there was interest in funding the renovation with the money that was being put back into the reserve to make some progress on the condition of the fields at Biscuit Run. She said she would leave her comments there and asked for others to weigh in.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she did not have a problem with the \$1 million for the BGCCV. She said she had a question for Ms. Pethia regarding the housing trust fund. She asked if the incentives would come back before the Board in the fall before that.

Ms. Pethia said the housing trust fund structure would return in the fall, but the developer incentives would be addressed before.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the housing trust fund would be permanent.

Ms. Pethia said it would be a fund that could be accessed for other needs, but the primary use would be for housing.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said regarding the fields at Darden Towe, would Mr. Henry know how much would be needed.

Ms. Price said the topic of Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley's question was out of order. She said they had spent two hours discussing fields. She said the Board could discuss fields later at a different meeting.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was discussing what would be done with funding from the CIP. She said her question was relevant. She said she wanted to know what funding would be necessary to maintain something at Darden Towe, not to bring it to a higher level but for maintenance and repairs.

Ms. Price said they were discussing the housing fund and the BGCCV.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she could bring up the item later in the CIP discussion.

Ms. Price said Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley could try to bring up the topic later on, but they were currently discussing the housing fund and the BGCCV.

Ms. Price said she supported both of the staff proposals.

Mr. Bowman said he had consensus on both of the proposals. He said when they brought the budget back for adoption, it would reflect the consensus. He said there would be materials online that did not reflect the current discussion. He said he would make it clear during his presentation the following week what had been changed after that day's Board meeting and the following day's School Board Meeting.

Mr. Bowman said there was an item for ongoing support to the Department of Social Services (DSS). He said the Board has some questions about what additional support for DSS would look like and four options had been identified. He said the options were not mutually exclusive and could be done in combination or all of the above. He said the net local costs for the changes were displayed for each option. He said if the Board wanted to move forward with all of the options, staff recommended that funding be provided from the FY23 ongoing reserve contingencies. He said the reserve had a balance of \$382,000. He said if all were approved, the reserve would be reduced to \$265,000.

Mr. Bowman said option A was a recommended change from staff and did not have any local cost. He said staff had made the effort to look at those positions that were temporary or part time and try to convert the positions to regular or fulltime positions that did not have a budget impact. He said it was recommended that a DSS specialist position be increased from a part-time position (0.75 FTE) to a full FTE.

Mr. Bowman said options B and C were the positions that were included in the DSS budget that did not start on July 1. He said the Board may recall that some of the positions were staggered throughout the year. He said the values displayed were the amounts required to accelerate the start date of the staggered positions to July 1. He said option D would be to add an additional eligibility worker, the next priority of DSS, effective on July 1. He said the position would have a net local cost of \$44,300. He said the total cost would be greater, but funding would come from state and federal revenue.

Ms. Price said staff was looking for questions from supervisors as well as where they stood on each of the options.

Mr. Gallaway said targeting the reserve for contingencies was excellent. He said he presumed it did not put anyone in critical worry about leaving only \$265,000 there. He directed his next comments to Ms. Kaki Dimock and said he had a conversation with Mr. Walker and asked if the department would have trouble filling the positions if the start dates were accelerated. He said he did not want to accelerate the positions if DSS could not fill them.

Ms. Kaki Dimock, Director of Social Services, said the positions could be used. She said there had been difficulty recruiting for positions in child welfare and traditional social services, but not in eligibility. She said the eligibility positions were able to be filled quickly. She said she was uncertain about the financial analysis position, but there were some people they had considered recruiting. She said if both people declined, then she was unsure when the position would be filled. She said the department needed the position.

Mr. Gallaway said if there was difficulty hiring, then it would be better to start sooner rather than later.

Ms. Price if Mr. Gallaway had a recommendation.

Mr. Gallaway said he supported all four options.

Mr. Andrews said he was supportive of all four options.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Bowman to discuss how the positions would be accelerated.

Mr. Bowman said the positions would begin mid-year, accelerated from January 1 as they had been budgeted for. He said the funding would allow the positions to begin on July 1.

Ms. McKeel said both positions would begin mid-year, in January, which would have allowed the market study to be completed.

Mr. Bowman said the timing of the positions did not so much rely on the compensation study, but it was about the reality as they set up a new HR system and addressed its own challenges funding positions.

Ms. McKeel said she was trying to remember when the compensation study would be released.

Mr. Richardson said he had received an update from HR. He said the goal was to have enough information from the study back to coincide with the budget process for the following year. He said they looked to Finance and Budget to determine the deadlines, but he would not say what they were. He said they were in late November and early December. He said Ms. Coltrane would work to ensure Mr. Bowman received the necessary information to do the early work needed regarding the recommended strategies. He said the study was typically seven or eight months, and they had their first meeting the week prior.

Ms. McKeel said the turnaround was good. She said she had concerns regarding the \$265,000 reserve being so low. She said she supported all four options.

Ms. Mallek said she supported all four options. She said the case load was higher than state benchmarks.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was in favor of all four options.

Ms. Price said she supported all four options.

Mr. Bowman said those were all the items identified by the Board on the list. He said the Board had every right to change the budget until it was adopted. He said beyond adoption, the budget was amended throughout the year. He asked if there were further questions or comments from the Board.

Ms. Price confirmed the presentation was concluded and Mr. Bowman was requesting for any further topics from the Board.

Mr. Bowman said he had a slide regarding next steps—the adoption of the budget and related ordinances and resolutions.

Ms. McKeel asked if the \$1 million for the BGCCV would be allocated in one lump sum or divided up.

Mr. Bowman said they would first look for the policy decision from the Board then they would work to ensure the right balance between providing funding and fiscal stewardship was provided. He said they would work to structure the funding to meet all of the needs.

Ms. Price said now was the time to bring up any additional budgetary items.

Mr. Andrews said there should be some renovation of the fields.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Andrews if he wanted to discuss the topic.

Mr. Andrews said the Board needed to consider funding renovations for the soccer fields in the FY23 budget.

Ms. Price asked if Mr. Andrews had any proposals.

Mr. Andrews said he needed guidance as to what the Board could do short of the options that were previously discussed.

Mr. Henry said he wanted to know if there were additional comments or questions before he responded.

Ms. Price said the item had been brought up.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she would like to discuss the condition of the Darden Towe fields and maintaining them to a playable level.

Ms. Price said she was not interested in just maintaining the fields at their current condition. She said if they were to discuss bringing them up to a playable condition, then they were discussing bringing them up to a professional level and what it would really cost.

Mr. Henry said there was a range of the questions there. He said one option was to bring the fields up to a much higher quality. He said he would not call the level professional—it did not have all of the infrastructure as discussed by the consultant. He said one of the options was a significant investment in upgrading the fields, the first option. He said something less than the first option would be similar to what Mr. Crickenberger presented on best management practices.

Mr. Henry said the cost was \$24,000 per field annually, totaling \$96,000 for four fields. He said that cost would be a minimum, and if some level of improvement was desired, then staff would have to have a plan to come back before the Board. He said he was not comfortable telling the Board what improvements would take. He said \$24,000 annually per field was a solid number if enhancements were made to the fields. He said a professional assessment of the fields was needed to determine what it would take to upgrade them to a standard. He said what was presented in the first option would get them there, but if the Board wanted a different level of improvement, it would have to be assessed and defined.

Ms. Price said it was not a one-for-one tradeoff between grass and artificial turf. She said the artificial turf was a two-to-one comparison. She said in order to have the variability of field usage, they would be looking at no less than eight to ten grass fields to provide the same playing gained from artificial fields.

Mr. Henry said he thought he was answering the question regarding what could be done at Darden Towe to improve the current condition of the fields.

Ms. Price said she wanted to make sure it was understood that the four grass fields would not be

the same as four turf fields in terms of accessibility.

Ms. Nelsie Birch, Chief Financial Officer, said she wanted to make sure the Board was aware that the option provided by Mr. Henry was related to operating costs and was no longer capital costs. She said they were more limited on the operating side to come up with a solution on the fly than on the capital side where the funding was secured in the outyears to be able to pay for capital infrastructure needs.

Ms. Birch said two completely different funding sources were being discussed. She said the reserve for contingencies would be the funding source if the Board decided to add additional funding to the maintenance of the fields. She said the positions in addition to the maintenance would both be needed. She said it was more work and a greater cost than what was displayed.

Ms. Price said it was clear the Board would not be able to reach any further decision other than expressing a desire for more information.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the information would be provided in time for the next meeting.

Ms. Price said she doubted it would be.

Mr. Henry said he did not have full clarity on what information was requested given they spent two hours on the topic. He said the Board needed to suggest the scope in order to manage expectations.

Ms. Price said there would be no decision on the topic by May 4.

Agenda Item No. 3. **Public Hearing: FY2023 Proposed Operating and Capital Budgets.**

Ms. Price asked if there were speakers signed up for the topic.

Ms. Borgersen said there was one speaker virtually.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley read the rules and procedure for public comment.

Ms. Price said she forgot to open the floor for Ms. Birch's presentation.

Ms. Birch said there were two separate public hearings. She said the first was on the proposed FY23 operating and capital budgets. She said the second was on the proposed tax rate for real estate over calendar year 2022. She said both public hearings would have to be opened and closed to meet state standards.

Ms. Birch provided an overview of the all funds budget. She said it was a \$565 million budget. She said she wanted to ensure that all the decisions made to date did not change the value of the budget because they were using reserve funds, such as ARPA. She said the only change to be expected between the presentation the following week were changes in the value of state and federal funding based on DSS workers and other items. She said from the local funding, the numbers would not change from what was proposed and what the Board had requested to what would be approved and appropriated on May 4.

Ms. Birch provided an overview of the real estate tax rate. She said the tax rate for real estate did not change, and it was \$0.854. She said if the revenue was kept neutral, then the tax rate would be lowered to \$0.788. She said that value would be advertised to the public based on state code.

Ms. Birch said the budget made considerable investment for the public. She said the County was making capital investments into three new schools, Biscuit Run, and the courts' expansion. She said the community response team was one of the biggest, cross-collaborative efforts produced by the budget in working with DSS, police, and fire rescue to respond to critical calls for individuals in crisis. She said a lot of recommendations had been made to the Board that had been supported related to ARPA funding. She said there was a piece in the sewer connection program.

Ms. Birch said there would be 24/7 staffing at Pantops with Engine 161. She said there were other micro transit, economic development, and tourism funding that was put into the programming related to urban service delivery.

Ms. Birch said in addition to the class and compensation study, starting on July 1 for all eligible employees, there was a 4% increase provided in addition to what the study provided in terms of workforce stabilization. She said the systems and organizations would be updated and the public would benefit from the investments.

Ms. Birch said the Board had approved additional funding into the housing fund, a little less than \$700,000. She said \$1 million would be provided to the BGCCV using ARPA funding. She said a portion of the reserve for contingencies would be used to support the hiring of two positions that were included in the budget and adding an additional position and converting a position to a full FTE in DSS. She said there were two public hearings. She said next week, both the approval and appropriation of the FY23 budget would be brought before the Board.

Ms. Price said they would open the hearing up for public comment.

Mr. Kirk Bowers said he lived in the Rivanna district. He said he represented the Piedmont Group Sierra Club. He said he expressed opposition to the use of artificial turf for soccer fields. He said artificial turf was a plastic rug—it was hard and hurt to fall on and got hot. He said it was simply not environmentally friendly. He said he supported continued development of soccer fields in the County. He said improvements should be made in an environmental manner. He said he was a resident of the Key West subdivision.

Mr. Bowers said he moved there 34 years ago to enjoy the natural beauty and local culture. He said development of the soccer park did not fit into a residential area. He said he did not recall engagement with local residents in the adjacent subdivisions. He said there were over 200 homes in Key West alone. He said he had seen Route 24 grow noisy with lots of traffic and more light pollution because of the development of more subdivisions. He said economic development was not appropriate at the expense of the neighborhoods. He said a tournament area should not be built in a developed residential area.

Mr. Bowers pointed out that there was a soccer complex 60 miles from the County in Short Pump—Striker Park. He asked who the Board was serving. He said he passed by Darden Towe almost every day. He said he saw people walking dogs and enjoying the atmosphere. He said artificial turf would be intrusive for the local residents who already enjoy the park. He said when Darden Towe was built, it was rolling terrain that was graded expensively to flatten areas and provide playing fields. He said the same could be done for Biscuit Run.

Mr. Bowers said he was a licensed professional engineer. He said the Board should consider a simple underdrainage system that could be used to dewater grass fields. He said per his estimate, it would take over 30 years for operating costs to maintain grass fields to exceed the additional costs of constructing turf fields.

Ms. Price said if Mr. Bowers had not completed his remarks, he was welcome to email them to the clerk for inclusion in the record.

Mr. Don Long said he was a resident of the White Hall district. He said he was speaking on behalf of SOCA and his own. He said he disagreed with the last caller. He said he was disappointed the Board did not decide to move forward with synthetic turf at Darden Towe. He said there were thousands of soccer players in the community along with a shortage of fields.

Mr. Long said some of the arguments against synthetic turf that were brought up were not valid. He said the players who played on sub-par fields were losing out. He said by adding synthetic fields, the number of available fields would be increased. He said if the number of fields available were increased through synthetic turf, it reduced the strain on other fields. He said it gave people everywhere better fields.

Mr. Long said he heard a lot of criticism of SOCA and travel soccer players and their families trying to take advantage of the situation. He said ultimately, the travel players would find places to place. He said improving the facilities benefited everyone and allowed all the soccer players to have better facilities. He urged the Board to invest money to bring the park complex up to the level of other peer communities and said that he thought Darden Towe was the perfect location to do that at.

Agenda Item No. 4. **Public Hearing: Calendar Year 2022 Tax Rates.**

Ms. Price opened the public hearing on the calendar year 2022 tax rate. She asked the clerk if there were speakers signed up for comment. She noted there were none and closed the public hearing.

Ms. Price noted there was no action to be taken that meeting.

Agenda Item No. 5. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. Price said they were not out of the pandemic. She said they had exceeded 990,000 deaths in the United States. She said the new variant had an increased infection rate with a lower fatality rate. She said Western Albemarle's High School's production of "Mama Mia" had to be cancelled due to students and staff being infected with COVID-19. She said encouraged people to get vaccinated and to wear their masks when they felt appropriate.

Agenda Item No. 6. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn to May 4, 2022, 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium

At 6:48 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to May 4, 2022 at 1:00 p.m. which will be held in Lane Auditorium. Information on how to participate in the meeting will be posted on the Albemarle County website Board of Supervisors home page.

Approved by Board
Date 01/10/2024
Initials CKB

Chair