

Virginia:

AT A CONTINUED MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 4:00 p.m. in the Old Boardroom at the Courthouse in Lovingston, Virginia.

Present: Jesse N. Rutherford, East District Supervisor –Chair
Robert G. “Skip” Barton, South District Supervisor – Vice Chair
Ernie Q. Reed, Central District Supervisor
Candice W. McGarry, Interim County Administrator and Director of Finance & HR
Amanda B. Spivey, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk
Linda K. Staton, Director of Finance & Human Resources
Jerry West, Director of Parks and Recreation
Dr. Amanda Hester, Superintendent of Nelson County Public Schools
Shannon Irvin, Assistant Superintendent of Nelson County Public Schools
Margaret Clair, Central District School Board Trustee

Absent: Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor
J. David Parr, West District Supervisor

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rutherford called the continued meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. with three (3) Supervisors present to establish a quorum and Mr. Harvey and Mr. Parr being absent.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Minutes for Approval – R2022-68

Mr. Reed moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented and Mr. Barton seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by vote of acclamation and the following resolution was approved:

**RESOLUTION R2022-68
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APPROVAL OF MINUTES
(September 7, 2022)**

RESOLVED, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the minutes of said Board meetings conducted on **September 7, 2022** be and hereby are approved and authorized for entry into the official record of the Board of Supervisors meetings.

III. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS WORK SESSION – LARKIN PROPERTY

A. Report on Trip to Danville

Ms. McGarry discussed the visit to Danville which included Jerry West, Maureen Kelley, Mr. Rutherford the Architectural Partners staff. She noted that they did not visit the recreation facilities quite as planned. She reported that they did discuss the development of their waterfront area and trail system, along with some of their ideas for the river. Ms. McGarry noted that a lot of the discussion focused on the rebranding of the river, which had been seen as an industrial byproduct in the past, but Danville had been working to turn it into a recreational asset.

Ms. McGarry also noted that Danville discussed the revitalization of warehouses for housing and how that was being accomplished. Ms. McGarry explained that Danville’s Council had committed to doing certain projects and had kept that commitment with the notion that if they did not invest in themselves, no one else would. She reported that they discussed which was needed first, either housing or economic development. Ms. McGarry and Mr. Rutherford noted the City Manager compared it to the chicken or egg question. Ms. McGarry indicated that the City Manager’s response was that they needed a pregnant chicken. She explained that housing and economic development needed to be worked on at the same time.

Mr. Barton asked if the Dan River was polluted or clean, and whether that was discussed at all. Mr. West noted that Danville promoted a lot of water activities in that area and reported that Danville was adding a cut off in the river for a whitewater rafting trail. Ms. McGarry also reported that Danville had founded a rehousing authority where they were working to redevelop housing out of the old warehouse district. Mr. Barton asked if there was a housing shortage in Danville. Ms. McGarry and Mr. Rutherford confirmed that

they were dealing with a shortage of housing. Mr. Rutherford explained that Danville had a lot of depreciated housing stock.

Mr. Barton referenced Ms. McGarry's comment that Danville had chosen to look at the river and recreation as an asset. He asked whether that meant in terms of being eligible for investment. Ms. McGarry explained that it was more of just changing the ideology that the river was a negative for the city, versus, being a positive. Mr. Barton noted that he would like to switch to the idea that recreation was an investment in economic development and the people. He felt that recreation had always been looked at as a cost and noted that he would like to philosophically switch to the idea that recreation was an investment. Mr. Rutherford felt that was where everyone was at.

Mr. Reed asked about the diversion of the Dan River for whitewater rafting and where the funding would come from. Mr. West noted that was not discussed. Mr. Reed asked if there were any other recreation based initiatives along the river. Mr. Rutherford noted that the visit was good but it was not as recreation centered as they had hoped. He explained that it was more centered on Danville revitalization. He noted that the YMCA was specifically placed on the river. Ms. McGarry thought that the YMCA was mostly funded by the redevelopment entity and the YMCA itself. Mr. Rutherford understood that the City's investment in the YMCA was minimal.

Mr. Reed asked if there were any YMCA activities centralized around the river. Mr. West, Mr. Rutherford and Ms. McGarry noted they were not aware of any activities. Mr. Rutherford noted that they did not get that in depth in details. Mr. Barton commented that the Dan River was very centralized. Ms. McGarry noted that they also had the old warehouses along the river that could be revitalized into housing.

Mr. Rutherford noted that while the visit was not as recreation centered as planned, it was a good visit. Ms. McGarry noted that Danville may be interested in coming to visit Nelson to see the wineries and breweries.

B. Report on YMCA Meeting

Ms. McGarry reported that she, along with Jerry West and Amanda Spivey, met with Jessica Maslaney, Piedmont Family YMCA CEO to tour the Brooks Family YMCA at McIntyre Park in Charlottesville. Ms. McGarry reported the YMCA was a 79,000 square foot building with two indoor pools, a fitness center, gymnasium, walking track, group exercise areas, a play zone and community rooms. Ms. McGarry noted that the building opened in 2017 and cost about \$19 million. She commented on the change in the times in comparison to the costs that the County had been looking at. She explained that in terms of funding, the City of Charlottesville provided a 40-year land lease of \$1 per year for 5 acres at the park and \$1.25 million in cash, while Albemarle County contributed \$2.03 million in cash. Ms. McGarry also pointed out that many private donors were acknowledged on the donor wall and the balance was financed. She noted that there was a shared use agreement in place and both Albemarle and Charlottesville have 2 non-voting Board members. Ms. McGarry was unsure of how much the remaining debt from the project was. Ms. Spivey thought they had about \$12 million in debt remaining from the original \$19 million.

Ms. McGarry reported that the facility was owned and operated by the YMCA. She noted that program and membership fees supported its activities (60% memberships, 25% program fees and 15% scholarships).

Ms. McGarry noted that the aquatics facility served as the Charlottesville high school swim team pool. She indicated that the facility was connected by a walking path from Charlottesville High School. She reported that the pool also served as the home pool for the competitive swim team, Cavalier Aquatics. Ms. McGarry explained that the facility had an online lap lane reservation system and two lanes were open to the public at all times. She pointed out that the pool was Virginia High School League (VHSL) certified and the timing system was certified by USA Swimming.

Ms. McGarry noted discussed with Ms. Maslaney about the use of a bubble dome to cover outdoor pools. Ms. McGarry explained that the Goochland and Fairview YMCAs had dome pools. She reported that the bubble had a 20-year shelf life and a 12x20 ft. shed was needed to store the bubble. Ms. McGarry explained that it took about 40 people to erect the bubble. She noted that the Crozet ACAC pool facility also had a bubble system. She indicated that Ms. Maslaney did not speak highly of the bubble systems as they were a lot of trouble in terms of storage, installation and lifespan.

Ms. McGarry noted that Ms. Maslaney, along with the YMCA Resource Director, Journey Johnson, could come speak to Board about potential partnership scenarios. Ms. McGarry noted that Ms. Maslaney also offered to take the County around to similar facilities once the Board had determined the amenities they were interested in offering. Ms. McGarry reported that Ms. Maslaney recommended visiting the new Botetourt facility which was located in a more rural setting than the Charlottesville facility. She noted that Ms. Maslaney indicated that while the Piedmont YMCA was working to pay off their current capital debt, they would be more likely interested in a scenario where the capital investment was from other sources and the YMCA could provide the operational management of the facility in partnership with Nelson's Parks and Recreation department. Ms. McGarry reported that an example of that type of partnership was the

Princess Anne YMCA in Virginia Beach. She explained that the City of Virginia Beach built the facility and the YMCA operated and managed it for them. Ms. McGarry noted several attachments with her report on the visit to the YMCA: the Brooks Family (Piedmont) YMCA Brochure, a list of Virginia Municipalities Support for YMCA's, the Piedmont Family YMCA 2021 Annual Report, and The Y Collaboration and Bringing the Best to Your Community Guide.

Mr. Barton asked about the partnership opportunities that the YMCA may be able to do. Ms. McGarry noted that Ms. Maslaney had a variety of scenarios in which the YMCA could work with localities and municipalities to bring their services to a community. Mr. Reed referenced the list of Virginia Municipalities Support, which showed the relationships between the municipalities and the YMCAs. Mr. West noted that the Brooks Family YMCA was the facility name and that along with their other sites (i.e. afterschool childcare locations at the schools) were under the umbrella of the Piedmont YMCA. He also noted that Nelson fell under the Piedmont YMCA, which was how the conversations got started. Ms. Irvin noted that the Lynchburg Y was in a different region. She reported that they had stepped out of their region to help Nelson's schools.

Mr. Barton asked what the next steps could look like if they wanted to partner with the YMCA. Ms. McGarry and Mr. Rutherford suggested that if the County wanted to work with the YMCA, they needed to start having conversations with them on what that partnership might look like. Ms. McGarry noted that the YMCA had a lengthy process for needs assessment that could be utilized.

Mr. Barton noted the gymnasium at the Heritage Center and the fact that people were willing to contribute donations. Ms. McGarry thought that a fundraising component could be possible for the County's facility. She felt like there would be people in the community willing to support the project and that was something that should be explored.

Dr. Hester asked to what extent would there be a YMCA partnership. Mr. Rutherford noted that currently, it looked like a County built and operated facility. He pointed out that having the Y as a partner could offset operational costs, and possibly capital improvement costs. Ms. McGarry indicated that it seemed the YMCA was more interested in an operational/management role.

Mr. Barton noted the need to determine which areas of the property would be most suitable for development and the type of development. Ms. McGarry noted that the development of a master plan for the property would begin soon after the meeting. Mr. Barton felt that they needed to start working on the plan immediately. Ms. McGarry indicated that Architectural Partners could help determine a master plan for the property based on the interests of the County.

Mr. Reed asked about the needs assessment that the YMCA typically conducted and noted that the County was essentially conducting their own assessment. Ms. McGarry indicated that was correct, but the County could use the YMCA's assessment as a guide if they wanted to. Ms. McGarry noted that the Board would need to identify what they wanted to put on the property and then work with Architectural Partners to determine the best suited locations on the site. She suggested having a master plan and then deciding how to phase it. Mr. Reed felt that having the YMCA involved could simplify things for the County, which would make things happen faster. Ms. McGarry indicated that the YMCA seemed excited about the possibility. She suggested that the Board could have the YMCA present at a future meeting to discuss the potential opportunities.

Mr. Reed asked if the YMCA also ran outside facilities. Mr. West indicated that the Brooks Family YMCA was only an indoor facility, located within McIntyre Park, which was a city owned and operated park. He noted that the Y got 5 acres out of the park for the facility. He explained that most YMCAs operated an indoor facility. Mr. Reed suggested looking into whether the Y might have options for outdoor facilities. He felt that having the Y and Parks and Recreation as a team was something great. Ms. McGarry noted that childcare was offered for up to 2.5 hours at the center while parents worked out. She pointed out that they did have sites at the schools for afterschool childcare. Mr. Barton noted that the need for childcare went beyond just a couple of hours at a time. Ms. McGarry agreed, but noted she was highlighting what was offered at that facility. Mr. Reed noted that the Y may or may not want to partner with the childcare part of a facility.

Mr. Rutherford asked if there had been a discussion regarding the outdoor facilities for the schools and Parks and Recreation. Mr. West indicated that the sports committee had not met and he was looking to get that going. He noted that he had a couple of conversations with Greg Mullins, Athletic Director at Nelson County High School. He also noted that the survey would provide great feedback also.

Ms. McGarry asked about the YMCA folks visiting for a meeting. Mr. Rutherford suggested a work session would be a good option, noting that a site visit may be helpful. Mr. Barton felt that the recreational priorities were a playground, a park-like facility, and playing fields, noting that those would not cost as much as a building. He noted that he was fine with the needs assessment taking place, but he wanted to make sure

they started taking steps towards getting things going. Mr. Rutherford noted that the master plan was to help develop the areas of the property. Ms. McGarry felt that recreation facility was a longer term goal, while the fields should be easier to accomplish sooner. Mr. Reed noted that the master plan would help to show which items were easier to accomplish. Mr. Rutherford pointed out that the water and sewer needs were a critical part of developing the property.

C. Draft Public Engagement Survey

Ms. McGarry reported that Mr. West put together the Recreation Facility Needs Survey. She asked if everyone would review the survey and provide input on any changes. Mr. Rutherford asked if the survey would be only in a digital format. Mr. West indicated that the draft survey was currently in a digital format on Survey Monkey, but they put it in any other desired formats. Mr. Rutherford felt that a digital format circulated by the County and School Division would pretty much cover the target audience. Dr. Hester suggested having a Spanish translation of the survey. She also felt that paper copies needed to be available for completion also. Mr. West noted he was not opposed to determining logistics of paper surveys. He indicated that Parks and Recreation could collect the paper responses and input the data manually. Dr. Hester suggested having surveys available at a public event so that they could be completed and returned on site.

Dr. Hester referenced question #5 on the survey and asked what was meant by special events.

- 5. In the past 12 months, which of the following activities have you or anyone in your household participated in, in Nelson County or elsewhere. By participation, we mean situations where you or a member of your household actively participate, either at home or in public.**

Attending Special Events
Walking or Hiking for Leisure
Use of Playground Equipment
Organized Youth Sports (Basketball, Soccer, Football, etc.)
Organized Adult Sports (Kickball, Basketball, Pickleball, Tennis, Volleyball etc.)
Running/Jogging
Cycling or Mountain Biking
Organized Youth Programs (e.g. summer camps, youth club, etc.)
Equestrian Activities
Organized Older Adult Programs (Ex. billiards, guest speakers, gentle fitness, cards, etc.)
Visual/Creative Arts
None of the above
Other (please specify)

Mr. West explained that they did not want to be specifically sports oriented, they wanted to look at the whole aspect of recreation to see what people were already utilizing in the county and find out what they would like to have in Nelson. Dr. Hester suggested providing examples in the answer listed as "Other." She pointed out that people may skip over a question if they have to take extra time to think about it. Ms. Clair explained that when Rockfish Valley Community Center was working on a master plan, they sat at the Rockfish Collection Center and had people complete brief surveys. She noted that they also held focus groups and were able to participate in design charrettes at UVA.

Mr. Rutherford and Ms. McGarry pointed out that they had received a lot of feedback from the Comprehensive Plan survey as well, noting it could be very useful.

Mr. Barton suggested adding outdoor aquatic facility as an option to question #11. Mr. Rutherford and Ms. McGarry noted that they could include indoor and outdoor aquatic facility as options.

Ms. Staton had concerns regarding the length of the survey. Mr. Rutherford noted he was more along the lines of a five to ten question survey. Mr. West noted he was looking for feedback from the group and some questions may be able to be combined. Mr. Rutherford suggested that Mr. West could make edits and send to the Board for feedback. Ms. Clair suggested making sure that the survey was designed to receive the feedback desired. Ms. McGarry suggested having the important questions first. Mr. Barton suggested that the word aquatic facility may be simplified to swimming. Mr. West noted that question #18 was a direct question about swimming. Ms. McGarry confirmed that Mr. West would fine tune the survey and send it to the Board for final approval. Mr. Rutherford suggested speaking further with the YMCA on what working together might look like. Mr. West asked if the survey should be provided to YMCA for input or to see if they had a better solution. Mr. Rutherford commented that it may be a good idea to see if it would be more beneficial to use the YMCA's needs assessment. Ms. Irvin suggested gathering input from the YMCA on the pros and cons of being in close proximity to schools. Ms. McGarry noted there was no negative feedback from YMCA. Mr. West suggested that Charlottesville High School could provide their perspective. Dr. Hester noted she could reach out to Charlottesville's superintendent.

Mr. Rutherford asked if everyone was in agreement to narrow down the ideas to determine what they wanted to do and then engage with Architectural Partners to work on a master plan. Dr. Hester noted that the school had plans for their property and it would be good to coordinate ideas so that they were thoughtful about placement. She noted that the schools may want to have a livestock area. Mr. Rutherford agreed and noted that the schools needed to have a few select people at the table. He didn't want to have the group too large that they may not be able to get anything done. He suggested having Dr. Hester, along with the Athletic Director and a School Board member included in the work group. Mr. Reed suggested that there could be some combined facilities that could be shared by the schools and the County.

Dr. Hester asked if a perk test had been done. Mr. Rutherford noted that would not be a concern if public utilities were being used for water and sewer. Ms. McGarry noted that she did not think a perk test had been done. Mr. Barton suggested that if the schools had a use for the property near the school, it should be a priority. Ms. McGarry noted that it should be considered but reminded Mr. Barton that the Board had not determined their priorities yet.

Mr. Reed wanted to make sure that the Service Authority was engaged in looking at Dillard Creek. Ms. McGarry agreed that the Service Authority would need to be included when looking at water and sewer. Mr. Rutherford indicated that Mr. Parr was supportive of doing a master plan even though he was not present. Ms. McGarry noted she would engage with Architectural Partners for a proposal to bring back for approval.

Mr. Reed noted his concern that the range of possibilities for the Larkin property was much larger. He felt it was important to consider prioritization of the items they wanted to include on the property. Mr. Rutherford noted if he had to pick the top three items to focus on, they would be recreation, housing and economic development. Mr. Barton felt they should focus as much as possible on recreation facilities. Mr. Rutherford felt that recreation was generally the number one priority. Mr. Reed felt that water, infrastructure, energy and natural share areas, should also be priorities. Mr. Rutherford noted that he and Mr. Barton felt a recreation facility was the number one priority. Mr. Rutherford asked Mr. Reed to help explain what he was looking for in terms of infrastructure and energy. Mr. Reed explained that he wanted to consider specific locations for solar panels and electric vehicle charging stations that could be jointly used by the Schools and the County for their vehicles, and possibly JAUNT. Mr. Rutherford suggested considering solar panels or charging stations while working on the top three priorities. He indicated that staff should let Architectural Partners know there is interest in solar panels for the property and suggested that Central Virginia Electric Cooperative could provide some input on solar panels.

Mr. Rutherford asked if they could go ahead and put a sports facility as priority number one. The Board was in consensus to have a sports facility as priority number one. Mr. Rutherford asked whether housing could be priority number two. Ms. McGarry suggested that while two Board members were absent, they may want to wait for their input. She noted that they could discuss further priorities in a work session with Architectural Partners. Mr. Rutherford confirmed with the rest of the Board that the first priority was sports and recreation focused with a facility and outdoor spaces. Ms. McGarry noted she had enough information to get started.

D. Sports Committee Meeting Dates

Mr. West reviewed the list of sports committee members, noting that he, Dr. Hester, Mr. Greg Mullins, Mr. Harvey and Ms. Maureen Kelley were selected to serve on the committee. Mr. Reed suggested having an alternate for Mr. Harvey and Mr. Barton was selected as the alternate. Mr. West asked for clarification on the recreation survey. Mr. Rutherford and Ms. McGarry confirmed that Mr. West would fine tune the survey and send it out to the Board for feedback, noting that they would wait to reach back out to the YMCA group. Mr. Reed then asked to know when the sports committee meeting dates would take place. Mr. West suggested working to select a date prior to holidays. Mr. Reed noted he would like to attend if two Board of Supervisors members were not already there.

IV. TIMBERSTAND IMPROVEMENT PROPOSAL

Ms. McGarry presented a timbering proposal from Billy Newman of Envirofor LLC, for the Larkin property in conjunction with the schools. She noted that Mr. Newman thought joining with the schools' timber sale could bring a better price. She explained that Mr. Newman could conduct a timber cruise and appraisal at a cost of \$1,250. She also noted the proposal included cataloging trees and saving trees for future growth. She explained that Mr. Newman suggested that the current age range of the trees was perfect for removing the poorest materials while allowing the best trees to remain for further growth and development. Mr. Rutherford indicated that in his experience, select cut could also mean that an entire forest is up for removal. He noted that they had plenty of time to make decisions on where to develop and cut timber. Ms. Clair noted that knowing what tree inventory they had would be helpful. Mr. Reed was not in favor of proceeding and he felt that they should wait on a master plan of the property. The Board was in consensus to wait on evaluating the timber.

V. OTHER BUSINESS (AS PRESENTED)

The Board had no other business to discuss.

VI. CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO 2.2-3711(A)(3)

Mr. Reed moved that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors convene in closed session to discuss the following as permitted by Virginia Code Sections 2.2-3711:

(A)(3) - "Discussion or consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose, or of the disposition of publicly held real property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body."

Mr. Barton seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (3-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

Supervisors conducted the closed session and upon its conclusion, Mr. Reed moved to reconvene in public session. Mr. Barton seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (3-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

Upon reconvening in public session, Mr. Reed moved pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 37, Virginia Freedom of Information Act and Section 2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia, that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors certify that to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under this chapter and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the meeting by the public body. Mr. Barton seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (3-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

At 5:40 p.m., Mr. Reed moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Barton seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by vote of acclamation and the meeting adjourned.