VIRGINIA TOBACCO REGION REVITALIZATION COMMISSION

701 East Franklin Street, Suite 501 Richmond, Virginia 23219

IN RE: SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA COMMITTEE

January 8, 2024

2:02 p.m.

HEARD BEFORE: The Honorable James Morefield,

Vice-Chair

Delta Hotels by Marriott, Richmond

Kanawha Ballroom

555 East Canal Street

Richmond, Virginia 23219

COMMONWEALTH REPORTERS, LLC
P. O. Box 13227
Richmond, VA 23225
804-859-2051 (ofc.) 804-291-9460 (fax)

```
APPEARANCES:
  1
         Delegate James 'Will' Morefield, Vice Chair,
  2
         Presiding
  3
         Edward Blevins
         Gretchen Clark
  4
  5
         Amanda Cox
         Delegate Terry G. Kilgore
  6
         Charles Green
         William Pace
 12
 13
         Sandy Ratliff
14
         Sarah Wilson
15
     ABSENT
         Julie Hensley
16
         Senator John Edwards
         Delegate William Wampler
17
    COMMISSION STAFF
18
         James E. Campos
19
         Stephen Versen
2.0
         Vicki Humphreys
21
         Stephanie Kim
2.2
         Sara Williams
2.3
         Sarah Capps
24
         Jordan Butler
 25
```

```
COMMISSION STAFF (con't.):
2
        Jerry Silva
3
        Suzette Patterson
        Emily Van Pelt
5
        Adrian Counts
6
        Hannah Franke-Fuller
7
        Joyce Knight
8
9
   COUNSEL FOR COMMISSION
10
        Elizabeth Myers
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

1	A G E N D A
2	AGENDA ITEM PAGE
3	Welcome and Call to Order8
4	Roll Call8
5	Approval of October 12, 2023 Minutes10
6	Public Comment Period11
7	Grant Projects11
8	AGRIBUSINESS
9	No. 4190, Appalachian Sustainable Development
10	Staff Recommendation
11	No. 4195, Gold Hill Farm
12	Cidery 13
13	Staff Recommendation
14	No. 4192, Forage Production Initiative
15	Staff Recommendation
16	No. 4201, Tazewell County
14	IDA
15	Staff Recommendation
16	Committee Vote
20	
21	BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
22	No. 4193, Project Light Community Center & Business Incubator 25
23	
24	Staff Recommendation
25	

1	AGENDA (con't.)
2	AGENDA ITEM PAGE
3	
4	No. 4184, Renovations & Improvements at the CAM
5	Staff Recommendation
6	Committee Vote
7	OTHER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
8	
9	No. 4188, Appalachian Highlands Community Dental Center 31
10	Staff Recommendation
11	SITES AND INFRASTRUCTURE
12	
13	No. 4196, Mount Rogers Regional Site Identification and Evaluation Process40
14	Staff Recommendation
15	No. 4189, LENOWISCO Planning District
16	Commission, Speculative Data Center Building at Project Intersection 44
17	Staff Recommendation
18	
19	No. 4185, LENOWISCO Planning District Commission, 20K Square-Foot Building
20	at Project Intersection
21	Staff Recommendation
22	No. 4197, Russell County Industrial Complex Due Diligence Project 47
23	Staff Recommendation
2425	No. 4200, Scott County Regional Business and Technology Park

1	AGENDA (con't.)	
2	AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
3	Staff Recommendation49	
4	No. 4198, Westside Development, Phase	
5	II	
6	Staff Recommendation	
7	Committee Vote51	
8	TOURISM	
9 10	NO. 4191, Birthplace of Country Music Museum Expansion: New Core Exhibit Development and Design	
11	Staff Recommendation54	
12 13	No. 4183, Bristol Downtown Connector for Mendota Trail, Feasibility Study54	
14	Staff Recommendation	
15 16	No. 4187, Gateway to Southwest Virginia: An Outdoor Economy Recreation Plan 56	
17	Staff Recommendation	
18	No. 4194, Carter Fold 50th	
19	Anniversary Celebration, Scott County Economic Authority58	
20	Staff Recommendation59	
21	No. 4199, The Crooked Road: Musical Milestones, Virginia's Heritage	
22	Music Trail	
23	Staff Recommendation	
24	Committee Vote	
25		

1	AGENDA (con't.)
2	AGENDA ITEM PAGE
3	Extensions and Modifications
4	No. 3602, Committee Vote on Blue Ridge
5	Public Television, Inc
6	Committee Vote
7	
8	OTHER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
9	No. 4188, Appalachian Highlands Community Dental Center
10	Community Defical Centeel
11	Committee Vote
12	TOTICIO COD
13	Adjournment
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

(The Southwest Virginia Committee meeting 1 commenced at 2:02 p.m., and the agenda commenced as 2 follows:) 3 4 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Good afternoon 5 and welcome. I now call the Southwest 6 7 Committee meeting to order. Now we will take roll call. 8 9 10 MR. VERSEN: Good afternoon, everyone. Just a note, please announce 11 yourself before speaking so the Court 12 Reporter knows and use the microphone up so 13 14 she can hear you. And when you're done speaking, 15 make sure to turn the microphone off so we 16 don't hear unintended parts of the 17 conversation. Thank you. Time to call the 18 roll. Delegate Morefield. 19 20 21 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Here. 22 MR. VERSEN: Julie Hensley. No. response. Edward Blevins. 23 24 25

1	MR. BLEVINS: Here.
2	
3	MR. VERSEN: Gretchen Clark.
4	
5	MS. CLARK: Here.
6	
7	MR. VERSEN: Amanda Cox.
8	
9	MS. COX: Here.
10	
11	MR. VERSEN: Senator Edwards.
12	EDTIFIED COD
13	SENATOR EDWARDS: No response.
14	
15	MR. VERSEN: Delegate Kilgore.
16	
17	DELEGATE KILGORE: Here.
18	
19	MR. VERSEN: Charles Green,
20	representing Secretary Lohr.
21	
22	MR. GREEN: Here.
23	MR. VERSEN: William Pace.
25	

_	
1	MR. PACE: Here.
2	
3	MR. VERSEN: Sandy Ratliff.
4	
5	MS. RATLIFF: Here.
6	
7	MR. VERSEN: Delegate Wampler.
8	No. Response. Sarah Wilson.
9	
10	MS. WILSON: Here.
11	
12	MR. VERSEN: We have a quorum.
13	
14	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay, thank
15	you. Now, do I have a motion for the
16	approval of the October 12th, 2023 minutes?
17	
18	DELEGATE KILGORE: Terry Kilgore,
19	so move.
20	
21	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: We have a
22	motion. Do I have a second?
23	
24	MR. BLEVINS: I'll second.
25	

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: We have a 1 motion and a second. All in favor, say aye. 2 3 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: 4 Aye. 5 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Aye. All 6 7 opposed? Okay, now on to public comment. Do we have any members from the public that 8 would like to make a comment? 9 10 Do we have any members online that want to make a comment? Okay, there is 11 no public comment. Now, on to the grant 12 13 projects. Ms. Sara Williams. 14 15 MS. WILLIAMS: Hey. Good afternoon. The Commission received 18 16 applications by the October 10th deadline. 17 We did receive one additional application 18 that was submitted at this Committee's 19 invitation. 20 And then we had one 21 application that ended up withdrawing during 22 the review process. So if it's okay, I 23 thought we could go through these by 24

investment categories. Does that work?

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Go ahead.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. So the first project is No. 4190, Appalachian Sustainable Development, ASD Agricultural Campus site development plan requesting \$39,000.00.

Commission funds will be used for planning documents, A&E-type stuff, preliminary engineering reports, development of an operating plan.

The -- the facility, when it's constructed, will be a 17-acre campus located in Bristol. They purchased the property in September 2022.

It will eventually host a number of -- of AG-related things, food hub, greenhouses, workforce development facilities -- all sorts of things.

In addition to the amount requested for the planning activities, they have requested support for three existing staff positions. That was the CEO, the marketing lead and director of communications, as well as travel and

supplies. Commission policy states that

operational expenses, such as salaries, can

only be supported for new activities or new

positions in the start-up period.

And we consider that start-up period to be no more than three years. So for that reason, only the contractual portion of the request can be recommended for funding.

And so staff recommends an award of \$29,435.00 or 50% of third party contractual expenses, contingent on securing full matching funds for the project.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. Do we have any questions from the Committee?
Okay.

MS. WILLIAMS: Next is No. 4195, that's Grayson County. Gold Hill Farm Cidery requesting \$50,000.00. The funding requested support the purchase of equipment to establish a cidery in Grayson County. The -- the owners are currently producing cider. And this will give them the

opportunity to establish a permanent location in the county. They plan to buy fruit from a variety of regional growers. They have some large orchards they're going to be buying from. They have some smaller family farms and then they have --

MS. HUMPHREYS: Push the button and -- there you go. Push the button and hit talk.

MS. WILLIAMS: I think I -- I think I hit it. It's back on now. And then they have just hobby growers and such that they can buy for. And the amount of revenue earned by each of those growers really depends on the size of their operation.

Some, you know, can earn as much as \$14,000.00, while your hobby -- you know -- growers will certainly earn much less.

So the equipment, they've requested 25% of the cost of equipment such as an apple press, tanks, pumps, cold storage, fork lift, tractor. Under

Commission's agribusiness investment
category, privately owned value-added
processing facilities are eligible to
receive funding to support 25% of total
equipment costs.

And so, the staff recommends an award of \$50,000.00 to support up to 25% of approved equipment purchases contingent on the executive director's approval of final third party performance agreements.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay, thank you. Do we have any questions from the Committee? All right. Go ahead.

MS. WILLIAMS: Number 4192, Lee
County Livestock Association Forage
Production Initiative for Southwest Virginia
requesting \$525,000.00. This is a request
for a cost-share program to serve 13
southwest counties.

The proposed program will support the purchase of eligible production equipment, construction of hay storage structures and permanent and temporary

fencing to facilitate rotational grazing opportunities. Let's see -- the program that was described in the application requested 33% cost-share up to a \$10,000.00 limit.

2.2.

That \$10,000.00 limit is extremely high relative to the limits of other cost-share programs that we have funded over the years.

For example, there is a similar program currently underway in southern Virginia with a limit of \$5,000.00. So we really do try to keep the cost-share opportunities as equal as we can across the regions.

And so one of the suggestions we had was that that cost-share limit be reduced to \$5,000.00. Additionally, you'll see that the overall request, the recommended amount has been cut in half.

And that is because what we have found over the years is that some cost-share programs prove to be extremely popular and the funds are allocated very, very quickly, and there is a waiting list. Or

you may have a program where, for whatever reason, there isn't a lot of interest.

There's not a lot of participation. And those funds can sit there, you know, for up to three years -- the grant period.

And they're really just not

And they're really just not being put to use. So you know, for example, we just closed a grant -- a cost-share grant that -- that de-obligated about \$500,000.00 of their award, which is -- was like 570.

So we thought it was best to award initially a smaller amount, but then determine the amount of interest. If there is a great deal of interest and they quickly allocate the funding and have a waiting list, they are welcome to submit for a Phase II application to continue the program.

\$262,500.00 to support cost-share payments for 33% of total expenditures up to a \$5,000.00 limit for each participant.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay, thank

you. Any questions from the Committee?

5.

MR. BLEVINS: Mr. Chairman. 1 2 3 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Yes, sir. 4 MR. BLEVINS: I have a question. 5 6 7 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Yes, sir. 8 9 MR. BLEVINS: I was just curious 10 what are the eligibility guidelines that were used. Do you know if -- will the 11 extension regulate and administer that or ... 12 13 MS. WILLIAMS: They will. Thev 14 So the Feeder Cow Association is the 15 applicant, but all of those cost-share 16 programs are actually administered through 17 the extension offices in the counties. 18 I believe one thing that was 19 20 noted was that the extension agent would 21 have to approve the fencing plan, which was 22 important to us. We wanted to understand that 23 the fencing was actually being used for the 24 purposes it was intended to by the program. 25

And so, we were comfortable having that additional level of oversight. Those agents -- some of them have administered every cost-share program we've done in Southwest Virginia. They are well qualified to help with this.

MR. BLEVINS: Well, one reason I bring that up is, you know, I noticed your comments about the lack of participation for some of these programs, and you're right.

But I think one thing that might be effecting that is the eligibility guidance. I know one particular program comes to mind that was put in place in the past.

And the parameters were similar to this program, but it was based on land ownership and not the size and scale of the farming operation.

So I -- I think it's important to know what the eligibility guidelines are for the project.

MS. WILLIAMS: So the eligibility

guidelines, they do send us a draft of what
those program guidelines are. For the most
part, those guidelines are created by the -you know, usually the head agent that's
going to be administering it. There's a lot

MR. BLEVINS: Yeah.

of overlap, though, between programs --

MS. WILLIAMS: -- and things. I would say if -- if you see something that you think is, you know, maybe a little too prohibitive or maybe opens it up too much, you know, certainly let us know so we can communicate that to the program. We like to help finalize those guidelines before -- before they go out.

MR. BLEVINS: I certainly wouldn't want to make the requirements so easy or set the bar too low. But by the same token, we had a lack of participation in last

December's growers because we may have -the bar may have been set too high in the eligibility guidelines. So if you think we

will have the opportunity to -- through 1 this? 2 3 MS. WILLIAMS: Today --4 5 MS. HUMPHREYS: We can make a 6 contingency at the review. 7 8 MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah. We can create 9 a contingency that we review the guidelines 10 before they proceed. 11 12 MR. BLEVINS: Okay. 13 MS. WILLIAMS: And then, you know, 14 we do have the draft in the application. If you haven't had a chance to look at that, we 15 can make sure you see it and, you know, help 16 17 us to identify anything that might be an issue. 18 19 MR. BLEVINS: Thank you. 20 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay, thank 21 you. Any further questions? All right. Ms. Williams. 9 23 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Next is 4201, 24

Tazewell County IDA, Ponderosa 2 requesting
 \$100,668.00. This project is one that
 should be familiar to most of you.

4.

the -- this committee approved a \$979,000.00 grant to the county to support 50% of the cost to construct the meat processing facility.

You may remember in October,

This application assists Blue Ridge Butchery who is the private operator that will move into that facility, with the costs of purchasing the equipment.

The lease agreement between the operator and the county requires that the operator purchase all of the equipment. So this is a way that we can also support the project on the operator's side.

Private operators are eligible for up to 25% of equipment costs. The applicant identified a little over \$400,000.00 of equipment. And so the recommendation is for 25% of that. The

1	staff recommends an award of \$100,668.00 to
2	support 25% of equipment purchases,
3	contingent on securing the necessary
4	matching funds and the TRRC Executive
5	Director's approval of the final third-party
6	performance agreement.
7	
8	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. Any
9	questions from the Committee? No questions.
10	
11	DELEGATE KILGORE: I don't have a
12	question. But I want to ask a quick a
13	general question.
14	
15	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Yes. Yes,
16	sir. DELEGATE KILGORE: Are we going to
17	DEDEGATE KILGOKE. Are we going to
18	
19	go ahead and vote on these first or are we
20	going to wait to get them all, you know,
21	assessment for the general
22	
23	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: For the sake
24	of time, I was just going to make a
25	recommendation that we accept them all, as

1	long as there are no objections from anyone.
2	Then we accept the Committee recommendations
3	in a block.
4	
5	DELEGATE KILGORE: All right.
6	
7	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay.
8	
9	DELEGATE KILGORE: That's fine.
10	
11	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: That's if
12	there's if there's
13	-RIFIFI)((()P)
14	MR. PACE: Mr. Chairman?
15	
16	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Yes, sir.
17	
18	MR. PACE: Will Pace. I'm going to
19	make that motion. I move we approve all
20	four projects under Agribusiness projects as
21	written in staff in block.
22	
23	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. We have
24	a motion. Do we have a second?
25	

1	DELEGATE KILGORE: Second.
2	
3	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: second?
4	
5	DELEGATE KILGORE: Second.
6	
7	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: We have a
8	motion and a second. All in favor, say aye.
9	
10	COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.
11	
12	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: All opposed?
13	Okay. Now on to Business Development.
14	
15	MS. WILLIAMS: Business
16	development. The first application is No.
17	4193. It's from the City of Galax for a
18	Project Light Community Center and Business
19	Incubator. They've requested \$74,000.00.
20	The funding requested here is
21	to support last dollar expenses for the
22	redevelopment of a building located in
23	downtown Galax. This project is extremely
24	well leveraged. There is \$1M DHCD
25	industrial revitalization fund award and

\$500,000.00 grant from ARC that is committed to the project. The City of Galax and the Galax IDA have also invested significantly in this project. Like many projects, the bids came in just a little bit higher than expected.

2.2.

And so, the Commission funds would be used to add back a few of those items that initially had to be removed because the bids were higher.

Those were some window replacements, some new sidewalk and paving improvements. We recently learned from the applicant that there may be portions of the road that need to be replaced.

And so the Commission funds would be able to help meet the needs for those activities. When the project is complete, it will -- it'll have a commercial kitchen primarily to be used, it seems, for a soup kitchen that is located there.

The God's Storehouse Soup

Kitchen leases -- will lease that facility.

They will also do literacy education,

addiction recovery services, a whole variety

of things which are not really an investment category for us. But the portion we were really interested in is the 10 business incubator office spaces that will be created here.

The application did a great job of documenting the huge need for additional office space, incubator-type office space in the Galax community.

In particular, Crossroads

Institute -- there were letters from there saying they are full. They get, you know, requests all the time.

They have to turn them away because the office space just simply doesn't exist. So that was the piece of the project we were especially interested in.

Staff recommends an award of \$74,000.00 to support property improvements for Project Light conditioned upon the Grant Director's approval of a final project scope, identifying the use of Commission funds and God's Storehouse Soup Kitchen achieving good standing with the State Corporation Commission.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay, thank
you. Any questions from the Committee?
Okay, no questions.

MS. WILLIAMS: Number 4184, Theatre Guild of Buchanan County, renovations and improvements at the CAM requesting \$485,000.00.

Commission funds are requested for property improvements for the Community Arts Main Stage, the CAM, Theatre in Grundy, Virginia. The grant will help the CAM continue to develop into a fully functioning theatre.

It opened in 2021 and it had a very positive impact on the Grundy community. There were multiple letters of support provided from businesses who had benefited from the shows and the activity at the CAM.

You know, restaurants, food trucks, caterers -- businesses that have been able to supply, you know, costumes and shirts and lighting and electronics and all the things that go into operating a theatre,

and -- and offering amenities to those who attend the shows there. What we found particularly interesting is that the marketing plan has a whole section focused on partnering with tourism businesses.

Tourism businesses in Buchanan County are expected to double in the next three years.

That's largely due -- from the outdoor recreation opportunities, Spearhead Trails in particular. The CAM already has a partnership in place with Southern Gap Outdoor Adventures where their visitors will have a chance to purchase tickets to the show.

Which I felt was a really clever idea to -- to get those visitors out of the camp and into the community to -- to enjoy the shows.

But also to eat in the restaurants and to do all those things that allow them a chance to spend money while they're in Grundy.

You will notice that the recommended amount is less, and that is because a large part of the match that was

presented in the original application represented the value of the recently donated building. Unfortunately, a building donation is -- is considered in-kind match. And the Commission's match policy limits that to no more than 25% of the total match. So we had to take a look at all the match that had been presented to us. And we determined that \$317,000.00 was the

And we determined that \$317,000.00 was the appropriate combination of cash match and the allowable in-kind. So staff recommends

an award of \$317,000.00.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay, thank you. Do we have any questions from the Committee? Okay, that completes --

DELEGATE KILGORE: I'll make a -make a motion that we approve the -- this is
Terry Kilgore. I make a motion that we
approve, in the Business Development, 4193
and 4184 according to staff recommendations.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Do we have a second?

MR. PACE: Second. 1 2 3 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: We have a motion and a second. All in favor, say aye. 4 5 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye. 6 7 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: All opposed? 8 Okay, now on to other economic development. 9 10 MS. WILLIAMS: There is one 11 application submitted under economic 12 development. This is number 4188, 13 Appalachian Highlands Community Dental 14 Center. 15 Appalachian Highlands 16 Community Dental Center clinic expansion 2, 17 they have amended the request to request 18 \$178,070.00. 19 20 The reason for that amendment is that they would like to use Commission 21 funds to purchase a piece of equipment that 2.2. allows them to produce dentures and dental 23 veneers at a much reduced cost over other 24

methods.

25

The original budget asked us for

1 100% of that. The match was to be
2 construction funding for the recently
3 completed facility expansion there.
4 Unfortunately, construction is complete so
5 those -- those funds are no longer eligible

22.

We require that matching funds be spent concurrently with Commission funds. So when we notified the applicant of that issue, they chose to reduce the request amount.

to match the Commission request.

They do have money from private foundations for the other 50%. The bigger issue for this one is that despite the wonderful work that the clinic does — and there is absolutely no doubt that there is a huge need for dental providers, dental services in Southwest Virginia.

The application presented primarily health outcomes, which do not align with any of our investment categories or our current strategic plan.

So it's very hard for us to evaluate this based on that fact, that what they accomplished just doesn't fit our

program. When we communicated this to the applicant, he was able to provide some examples that the clinic -- because it -- if offers residency opportunities -- is a recruitment tool to draw new dental providers to the region.

And -- and he did say there were, I think, two of the last maybe 15 actually ended up staying in the region -- taking over or joining existing practices. And that's very positive information.

That's a great trend, but what we still didn't see was that recruitment was really a -- a set objective of the clinic.

It seems, you know, maybe an indirect benefit.

But we didn't see that direct correlation between the clinic and recruiting dentists to the region. This was a -- this was a tough one. So staff recommends no award.

DELEGATE KILGORE: Can I ask a question? I mean, is --

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Yes.

DELEGATE KILGORE: And I mean,

Senator Pillion this is near and dear to

him. And he -- he contacted me last night

on his way back from an opioid abatement

7 somewhere in New Orleans, I think.

But he was telling -- he said that he basically, and I don't know if they told you this, that they really are -- you know, if you get into a residency program, that's how that you come to like the area.

And -- and a lot of them will stay once they get in. And he says there's a big need there. And I didn't know if they had talked to you about that, that they are trying to recruit a lot of residency.

And -- and if I understand you, they reduced it by half, the number from \$365,000.00 to \$178,000.00?

MS. WILLIAMS: They did. They did, and they have private foundation money to cover that other half. We -- we did get just, you know, some information where they

-- they said, you know, the current 1 residential class, I think, two had already 2 3 had interviews in the region. They told us a little bit about the plans to expand the 4 residency program, which made us wonder if 5 maybe that's something we could support 6 7 under competitive education. We really tried to find a way 8 9 for this to fit. But ultimately, it's 10 primarily the health outcomes -- which are -- their outcomes are wonderful. 11 There's no doubt this is a 12 project that does very good work in 13 Southwest Virginia. We just had to look at 14 15 it that -- you know, you get down to it, those outcomes don't align with our 16 investment categories. 17 18 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Do we have any 19 further questions. 20 21 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman. 22. 23 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Yes, ma'am. 24

MS. CLARK: Sara, could we look at that with competitive education? It could -- I mean, could we look at the outcomes with the residency program and bringing folks into the region.

And maybe some workforce development piece to -- to be supportive on

purchase?

MS. WILLIAMS: That is what we had suggested to him, that he may consider withdrawing from this round, and resubmitting to the education round.

some level if we can't with the equipment

And we could -- we would certainly be happy to work with him on how we could fit that into the program. I don't know -- there may be a timing issue for that.

I don't know when they need this equipment in place. And you know, those projects are approved in the fall -- so that would be September or even October.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Thank you. Do

we have any further questions? 1 2 3 MR. PACE: I'll take a shot, why not? Okay. I've been -- I've been 4 pondering this. But Will Pace, 5 Mr. Chairman. Parliamentary inquiry. 6 7 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Yes, sir. 8 9 MR. PACE: Is it theoretical that 10 we can refer this matter, postpone it, and 11 refer it to the education committee for 12 future reference? 13 14 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: 15 I -- I do believe that we -- we can do that. I'm 16 worried, though, if staff would have enough 17 time to fully vet that with the Education 18 19 Committee beforehand, and the chair of the 20 Education Committee. But I'll leave that to staff. 21 22 MR. PACE: Thank you. 23 24 DELEGATE KILGORE: Are you --25

```
Mr. Pace, are you talking about the one that
1
          meets -- the education -- does that meet
2
          tomorrow?
3
4
                   MR. PACE: No.
5
6
                   MS. WILLIAMS: No.
7
8
                   MR. PACE: I'm talking --
9
10
                   DELEGATE KILGORE: Oh, okay.
11
12
                             No. I'm not talking
13
                   MR. PACE:
          tomorrow, no. I'm --
14
15
                   DELEGATE KILGORE:
                                       Oh.
16
17
                   MR. PACE: Mister -- to Delegate
18
         Kilgore, I'm referring to is -- of course,
19
          there wouldn't be enough time tomorrow to do
20
          it at all.
21
22
                   DELEGATE KILGORE: Right, right.
23
24
```

have our next meeting -- June, I'm assuming, 1 maybe -- so the next meeting possible. I'm 2 3 just -- maybe as an alternative. Because I know, as you've said, Delegate Kilgore, this 4 is near and dear to Senator Pillion's heart. 5 And I don't want to break his heart by any 6 7 means. 8 9 DELEGATE KILGORE: Yeah. Me, 10 either. 11 MR. PACE: So I'm trying to find a 12 solution here that may be amenable to the 13 Commission and the Committee and staff. 14 15 DELEGATE KILGORE: Mr. Chairman, 16 what I'd like to suggest is just go ahead 17 and get through these. And then see -- kind 18 of maybe come back and discuss it here in a 19 little bit. Let's get through what we got. 20 21 MS. RATLIFF: Mr. Chair, I've got 22 23 24 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Yes, ma'am. 25

MS. RATLIFF: I've got one question. Sandy Ratliff. Is there a way that we could -- if we were to approve the \$178,000.00, could we put a contingent that they show us proof of how they are trying to do the residency and to recruit? So that they're not out on a limb, but we're trying to meet their needs.

MR. VERSEN: We -- we can do that. That would be at the discretion of the Committee. And we can certainly give the staff the discretion to make the final decision if the organization is able to prove that.

MR. PACE: Mr. Chairman, we can postpone this matter temporarily until the end of the meeting.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. I don't think that requires a motion, but -- so we can go on to the next application. Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Now we will 1 move on to the sites and infrastructure 2 portion. The first application there is No. 3 4 4196, Mount Rogers Regional Partnership, Mount Rogers Regional Site Identification 5 and -- and Evaluation Process requesting 6 \$140,000.00. This is for 50% of the cost to 7 8 do a regional site study. The study would focus primarily on sites of 100 acres or 9 10 larger. The sites that can be 11

The sites that can be developed in this size range are very limited in Southwest Virginia. There's also a chance that they may not find the -- you know, they want 10 sites.

They may not be able to find

10. They may have to look at some smaller sites. The issue is that their three largest sites -- and that would be Pathway Park in Smyth County, Progress Park in Wythe County and Wildwood in --

22

23

21

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. BLEVINS: Carroll.

24

25

MS. WILLIAMS: -- Carroll County.

They are very popular sites. They get a lot of interest. I think, you know, one of those has an active prospect. Once those sites are -- are filled, there's really nothing else developed behind it.

And so this is the first step for them to start to -- to think, okay, once

for them to start to -- to think, okay, once we've accomplished. But we wanted to keep our existing sites. Where can we go next?

And so staff recommends an award of \$140,000.00 to support 50% of the cost of a regional site study contingent on securing full matching funds for the project.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay, thank you. Any questions from the Commission? Yes, sir.

MR. PACE: Mr. Chairman, one quick question. Regarding the -- this is a curiosity question, though. But the large sites over 100 acres, are those the only three in the MRP region?

MS. WILLIAMS: So those sites --1 not all of them are over 100 acres. 2 don't have many in southwest, period, that 3 are over 100 acres. Although I think, what, 4 maybe Wildwood is one of the closest that we 5 have to 100 acres. 6 7 MR. PACE: Okay. I'm just curious. 8 9 Thank you. 10 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay, thank 11 you. Any further questions? 12 13 14 DELEGATE KILGORE: Mr. Chairman, I 15 -- Terry Kilgore. I move that we approve four -- project No. 4196, Mount Rogers 16 Regional Partnership for \$140,000.00. 17 18 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. And I 19 20 -- I apologize, but I believe there may have been a misprint. This is listed under 21 Economic Development, but it should be 22 listed under site --23 24 DELEGATE KILGORE: Oh. Sorry. 25

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Do you 1 withdraw --2 3 DELEGATE KILGORE: I withdraw that. 4 I was trying to help you out. 5 Sorry. 6 7 MS. WILLIAMS: We are moving along. Okay, the next one under sites and 8 infrastructure is No. 4189. It's LENOWISCO 9 10 Planning District Commission speculative data center building at Project 11 Intersection, requesting \$656,416.00. 12 Commission support will be 13 used to construct a 40,000 square-foot shell 14 15 building designed to support a data center operation at Project Intersection. It will 16 be constructed, as I understand it, as a 17 cold, dark shell. 18 But what that means is that --19 20 is that it could also be used for other 21 purposes, such as light manufacturing 2.2. depending on what the prospect, you know, at 23 the time was looking for. The matching funds for this project are \$1.2M AMLER grant 24

That application -- a decision

application.

on it is likely several months away. And
so, those met -- those funds from AMLER are
going to include the money to do the
engineering and other tasks and things that
have to be completed before construction can
take place.

So given that a decision on AMLER is quite aways off and that that money has to be there before our money really can be used, we thought a better approach would be to table this until that decision is known. And so staff recommends that this request be tabled.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Any questions from the Committee? No questions, thank you.

2.2.

MS. WILLIAMS: Next we have 4185, LENOWISCO Planning District Commission, 20,000 square-foot building at Project Intersection requesting \$800,000.00.

So this project develops Pad

1A at Project Intersection. The project we
just talked about was Pad 1B. So on Pad 1A,

they would like to use our funds to do some
site work related to then building a 20,000
square-foot building.
The building will be paid for

The building will be paid for -- the majority of the project, really, will be paid for with \$1.36M loan from the -- from VCEDA.

Commission funds will be used for site development such as grading, asphalt, concrete. This project -- the building that is proposed here is needed to serve an active prospect for the site.

That prospect has given them a deadline of January 2025 to be able to move into that building. And so, it is quite time-sensitive.

And I believe a decision is expected very soon for that prospect. Staff recommends an award of \$800,000.00 contingent upon -- yes, acquisition of full matching funds to support the project.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. Do we have any questions from the Committee?

Okay, no questions. If the Committee's in

COMMONWEALTH REPORTERS, LLC 804-859-2051

agreement, we'll go into recess for a few minutes. We're getting some messages that the online viewers have no audio. We'll go into recess for just a few minutes.

(The Southwest Virginia Committee went into recess at 2:41 p.m., and resumed at 2:51 p.m. The Committee's agenda resumed as follows:)

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Ms. Williams,

I believe you were about to present the next
project.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, okay. The next

project is 4197, Russell County Industrial
Development Authority, Russell County
Industrial Complex Due Diligence project
requesting \$112,750.00 for 50% -- we did the
-- we didn't. Sorry.

So the Russell County project is requesting 50% of due diligent -- the design costs for the Russell County
Industrial Complex. They're submitting an application to VEDP. This is Virginia business-ready site program for the matching

funds. VEDP currently classifies this site 1 as a Tier II. Completion of the due 2 3 diligence will result in reclassification to Tier III. 4 This is the type of work that 5 we've done for numerous other industrial 6 7 sites throughout southwest and southern region. 8 It's -- you know, it's a lot 9 10 of engineering reports and plans and all the things that they need to do to -- to 11 continue development. It's a pretty 12 standard request. 13 And staff recommends an award 14 of \$112,750.00 for 50% of contractual 15 expenses contingent upon acquisition of full 16 matching funds to support the project. 17 18 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. 19 20 questions from the Committee? Ms. Williams. 21 The next project is 2.2. MS. WILLIAMS:

MS. WILLIAMS: The next project is 4200, Scott County Economic Development Authority, Scott County Regional Business and Technology Park requesting \$97,780.00.

23

24

This is very similar to the previous 1 They are asking for 50% of due 2 request. diligence costs for the Scott County 3 Regional Business and Technology Park. 4 It's a 64-acre site located in 5 Duffield. It is currently classified as 6 7 Tier II. Completion of due diligence will allow the site to advance to Tier 4+. 8 Matching funds are intended 9 from VEDP Business Ready Sites program for 10 the remaining 50%. And the staff recommends 11 12 an award of \$97,870.00 or 50% of contractual 13 expenses -- actually, that's a typo. \$97,780.00 for 50% of 14 15 contractual expenses contingent upon acquisition of full matching funds to 16 17 support the project. 18 19 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. Any questions from the Committee? Ms. Williams. 20 21 MS. WILLIAMS: 4198, Virginia 22 Highlands Airport, Westside Development 23 24 Phase II requesting \$225,000.00. Commission

funds will be used for 50% of engineering

design services related to an expansion project for the airport. Completing design will allow the project to proceed to the construction phase, which is estimated to cost around \$10M.

2.2.

The airport requires the additional taxiways and hangars so they can accommodate larger business and corporate aircraft. So the Commission, historically, has classified airports as low priorities.

However, this airport -- which has received funding for a similar type of project in the past -- has been able to document that the airport has a significant indirect economic impact on Washington County.

They gave us some numbers of the aircraft that's based there and the associated tax revenues. So there are currently 67 aircraft based at the airport.

This includes eight jets which contribute \$371,000.00 in annual property tax revenue. By developing larger hangar and hangar sites will allow the airport to serve larger business and corporate

aircraft, which will also result in higher 1 2 property tax revenues and other related spending. 3 Each new corporate aircraft 4 generates a minimum of \$120,000.00 in annual 5 sales revenues and \$50,000.00 in annual 6 property tax revenue. And staff recommends 7 an award of \$225,000.00 to support 50% of 8 contracted design services. 9 10 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Do we have any 11 questions from the Committee? All right, no 12 13 questions. I'll entertain a motion under sites and infrastructure projects. Yes, 14 sir. 15 16 MR. PACE: Mr. Chair, I move the 17 staff recommendations for the six projects 18 under sites and infrastructure. 19 20 21 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. We have a motion. Do we have a second? 22 23 24 MS. RATLIFF: Second. 25

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: We have a 1 motion and a second. All in favor, say aye. 2 3 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: 4 Aye. 5 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: All opposed? 6 7 Okay, now on to -- oh, I'm sorry. 8 DELEGATE KILGORE: Can the record 9 reflect that I abstain on 4197? 10 11 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Oh, okay. 12 13 Thank you. Okay. Now on to Tourism. 14 15 MS. WILLIAMS: The first project under Tourism is 4191, Birthplace of Country 16 Music, Birthplace of Country Music Museum 17 expansion, a new core exhibit development 18 and design requesting \$100,000.00. 19 Commission funds are requested 20 to support the content, development and 21 design of the new core exhibit to be 22 installed in the Birthplace of Country Music 23 expansion, which will add 3,000 square feet 24

of new core exhibit space to the museum.

This project may be familiar to a lot of you. A year ago, we provided \$500,000.00 grant to support renovation expenses in what was then called the annex.

And that is the -- the building directly adjacent to the current museum that was purchased several years ago, and will eventually house the expanded museum space.

The application noted that it's important to complete exhibit design prior to beginning renovation because you have to make sure that those spaces are constructed in a way that can accommodate the exhibits.

Exhibit design is expected to take about a year to complete. And this -- this does seem like a logical approach. Staff's concern was about the \$500,000.00 that was committed last year.

All of our grants are awarded for a three-year period. Anything beyond that, we have to start doing extensions for. So given that this new grant would have to be used to complete design and that would

have to take place prior to renovations, we 1 were a little bit concerned that our 2 3 existing grant would not be used within the three-year grant period. 4 What seemed to be more logical 5 was to allow the applicant to re-purpose up 6 7 to \$100,000.00 of the existing grant for the exhibit design. 8 And this will -- it'll allow 9 10 the project to move forward in a tangible way while they continue to work on their 11 final fundraising. 12 The majority of the large 13 money for this is coming from a variety of 14 new market and historic tax credits. 15 16 were approved, some are still pending. But hopefully by the end of 17 the year, they will be much closer to moving 18 forward with renovation. So staff 19 recommends no award. 20 21 2.2. DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. Any questions from the Committee? Ms. Williams. 23

Next is 4183, City

MS. WILLIAMS:

24

of Bristol, Bristol Downtown Connector for Mendota Trail feasibility study requesting \$70,000.00. Funding is requested for approximately 50% of the cost of the feasibility study for the Bristol Connector project to connect the Mendota Trail to downtown Bristol.

2.2.

The applicant will then use the information to pursue funding for the implementation and construction phase. The total cost of this phase, the feasibility study, is approximately \$160,000.00.

These types of projects very often serve primarily a local population, although it is possible that tourists could choose to use the trail while they're already in Bristol or any other reason.

You know, we like to see documentation, though, that this project -- in and of itself -- would result in the recruitment of new visitors from national and international markets. And we just -- we didn't really see that in what was proposed. Additionally, the matching funds are from an ARC application, which is to be

submitted this spring. It looks like a decision for the ARC application could be several months away. Without that funding, the 1:1 match has not been -- been met.

And so, given the uncertain outcome of this application, it is premature to commit Commission resources to the project. And so, staff recommends no award.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay. Do you have -- does the Committee have any questions? Liz Myers. I was just kidding. All right. We'll do the next one.

2.2.

MS. WILLIAMS: 4187, Friends of Southwest Virginia, Gateways to Southwest Virginia: An Outdoor Economy Recreation Plan requesting \$100,000.00.

The application requests

funding to develop the LENOWISCO Outdoor

Recreation Master Plan, the initiative built

upon other outdoor recreation development

that's been occurring in the region. But

this one will focus specifically on

communities near the Tennessee and Kentucky

state lines. The Counties of Lee, Wise,

Scott -- the City of Lorton in particular.

Although the grant is focused on multi-state initiatives, because it's matched with an already approved ARC award focused on multi-state initiatives, the scope of the Commission-funded project will only be within our region.

The remainder of the request is budgeted to support three existing staff positions — the director of marketing, the director of finance and administration and the director of partnership over a 15-month period.

Commission policy limits

salary support to only new positions and for no more than a three-year start-up period.

Two of the three positions have already been supported through previous Commission grants.

as matching funds for those projects. At this point, it's no longer appropriate for our grant funds to continue to cover those positions. And so, the Commission support

for this application really should be 1 limited to that third-party contractual 2 3 expense for a study. 4 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Does the 5 Committee have any questions? 6 7 MS. WILLIAMS: Oh. 8 9 10 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Sorry. 11 MS. WILLIAMS: Staff recommends an 12 award of \$55,000.00 to support third-party 13 contractual expenses related to the 14 15 development, marketing and publication of the LENOWISCO Outdoor Recreation Master 16 Plan. 17 18 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Any questions? 19 20 No questions. I quess we'll continue. 21 MS. WILLIAMS: 4194, Scott County 2.2. Economic Development Authority, Carter Fold 23 50th Anniversary Celebration, requesting 24 \$80,000.00. The applicant requests support 25

on behalf of the Carter County Fold to help
them celebrate their 50th anniversary -which is a huge milestone in one of the best
known venues along the Crooked Road.

It existed before the Crooked Road. Commission funds will be used for performance fees to do special performances over 2024. I think it's a performance each month.

The remainder of the request, \$40,000.00, will be used for marketing.

Marketing will be coordinated with Friends of Southwest Virginia and Virginia Tourism Corporation.

Additionally, they want to use the 50th anniversary celebration as a way to attract new visitors, but also re-attract former visitors back to the Carter Fold.

Like a lot of performance venues, their attendance suffered greatly during the pandemic, which also had very negative financial impacts on the organization as they were not able to sell tickets, and therefore, had no revenues from that. So they really look at this as a

chance to celebrate the past 50 years, but also to re-energize everyone to want to attend for the next 50 years. So staff recommends an award of \$80,000.00 contingent upon the acquisition of full matching funds to support the project, provision of cost estimates and quotes, and the grant's director's approval of a detailed marketing plan.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Any questions from the Committee? Ms. Williams.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Then finally we have 4199, Virginia's Heritage Music Trail, the Crooked Road, the Crooked Road Musical Milestones requesting \$30,000.00. So this project would celebrate three milestones in the region.

The first is the Crooked
Road's 20th anniversary is this year. The
Floyd Country Store Friday night jamboree -it's their 40th anniversary. And as we just
heard, the Crooked Road -- it's their 50th
anniversary. And so the Crooked Road would

like to use this opportunity to host one-day celebrations at the Carter Fold and the Country Store to celebrate these milestones.

2.2.

This is the type of event that

-- to be honest -- is very difficult to

support through the grant program because we

are looking for, you know, long-term

projects that will have a sustained impact

on the region.

This type of project is really more suited as a sponsorship. But however, the Commission does not have a policy or a procedure in place for how we could handle sponsoring events such as this.

This was a -- this was a tough one for us to evaluate because we also looked at the significance of the Crooked Road, the significance of the Commission's funding from the various early stages of the Crooked Road.

You know, and -- and the funding we have invested over the years that helped sustain it to grow that organization. It's really one of our signature tourism investments. You know, we also looked at

everything that's happened over the past 20 years. And this was really the starting point to a different type of regional tourism view for Southwest Virginia.

And now we have, you know, regional groups like Friends of Southwest Virginia. And we have Spearhead Trails and. 'Round the Mountain and all these other coordinated regional tourism initiatives that simply didn't exist before the Crooked Road.

So we thought this was a significant event that we wanted to be able to help with. We would like, you know, we would like our names to be included in some of the marketing materials as you would a sponsor.

But we -- you know, we acknowledge that it's really a better fit for sponsorship funding rather than a committed grant.

But staff recommends an award of \$30,000.00 contingent upon acquisition of full matching funds to support the project.

2.2.

DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Any questions 1 from the Committee? Yes, sir. 2 3 MR. PACE: Not a question I just 4 want to say -- I want to say this out loud, 5 though, in just plain English. But if ARC 6 funds are not granted, nothing from the 7 Tobacco Commission, correct, straight up? 8 9 MS. WILLIAMS: Unless they find a 10 match somewhere else. 11 12 MR. PACE: Unless they find a match 13 somewhere else. 14 15 MS. WILLIAMS: Right. 16 17 MR. PACE: Okay. So it's not 18 19 dependent -- just ARC alone. Okay. 20 MS. WILLIAMS: Right, yeah. 21 22 MR. PACE: All right, thank you. 23 24

1	further questions. I'll entertain a motion
2	for the projects listed under Tourism.
3	
4	DELEGATE KILGORE: I want to make
5	I make a motion that we accept the staff
6	recommendations under the Tourism Committee.
7	I also this is Terry Kilgore, sorry.
8	
9	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: We have a
10	motion to accept the staff recommendations.
11	Do I have a second?
12	
13	MR. BLEVINS: Second.
14	
15	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: We have a
16	motion and a second. All in favor, say aye.
17	
18	COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.
19	
20	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: All opposed?
21	Okay. Now I believe we can go back
22	
23	DELEGATE KILGORE: We can go back

MR. PACE: We got extension, we got 1 extension. 2 3 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Oh. 4 5 MR. PACE: Blue Ridge. 6 7 DELEGATE KILGORE: Yeah. I would 8 move that we extend approval of the final 9 extension through July of 2024 for item No. 10 3602, Blue Ridge Public Television, Inc. 11 12 I'll second that. 13 MR. PACE: 14 DELEGATE KILGORE: Okay, we have a 15 motion and a second. All in favor, say aye. 16 17 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: 18 Aye. 19 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: All opposed? 20 Okay, now we'll go back to page four under 21 other economic development, item No. 4188, 22 the Appalachian Highlands Community Dental 23

24 Center.

DELEGATE KILGORE: Mr. Chairman, I 1 have a motion. 2 3 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Yes, sir. 4 5 DELEGATE KILGORE: I would move 6 that we -- I believe the -- the requested 7 amount was \$178,000.00. 8 9 MS. WILLIAMS: And \$70.00. 10 11 DELEGATE KILGORE: \$178,070.00? 12 13 14 MS. WILLIAMS: Mm-hmm. 15 DELEGATE KILGORE: \$178,000.00, I 16 would move that we award that request with a 17 contingency that the clinic provide a 18 recruitment plan to keep more of their 19 20 residents in the region and report on those outcomes on a annual basis. 21 22 DELEGATE MOREFIELD: Okay, there's 23 a motion. Do we have a second? 24 25

1	MS. CLARK: Second.
2	
3	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: We have a
4	motion and a second. All in favor, say aye.
5	
6	COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.
7	
8	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: All opposed?
9	Okay. I do believe that completes the
10	business of the Southwest Virginia Committee
11	
12	
	-RIHI)(((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((
13	DELEGATE KILGORE: We better head
14	out.
15	
16	DELEGATE MOREFIELD: The Southern
17	Committee will meet at 4:00 p.m. We're
18	adjourned.
19	
20	(The Southwest Virginia Committee meeting
21	concluded at 3:12 p.m.)
22	
23	
25	

Page 72

1 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER 2 I, Debroah Carter, hereby certify that I was 3 4 the Court Reporter at the SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA COMMITTEE MEETING, heard in Richmond, Virginia, on 5 January 8th, 2024, at the time of the committee 6 7 meeting herein. 8 I further certify that the foregoing 9 transcript is a true and accurate record of the 10 testimony and other incidents of the committee meeting herein. 11 Given under my hand this 13th day of 12 13 January, 2024. 14 15 16 Debroah Carter, CMRS, CCR 17 Virginia Certified Court Reporter 18 19 My certification expires June 30, 2024. 20 21 22 23 24