



1    **APPEARANCES:**

2    Mr. Robert Spiers – Chairman

3    Mr. Robert Mills, Jr. – Vice Chairman

4    Ms. Gayle F. Barts

5    The Honorable James E. Edmunds, II

6    The Honorable Franklin D. Harris

7    Ms. Sandy Ratliff

8    The Honorable Bettina Ring

9    Mr. Cecil E. Shell

10   The Honorable William M. Stanley, Jr.

11   Mr. Richard L. Sutherland

12   The Honorable Thomas C. Wright, Jr.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 **APPEARANCES: (cont'd)**

2 COMMISSION STAFF:

3 Mr. Evan Feinman – Executive Director

4 Mr. Andy Sorrell – Deputy Director

5 Mr. Timothy S. Pfohl – Grants Director

6 Ms. Stephanie S. Kim – Director of Finance

7 Ms. Sarah K. Capps – Grants Program Administrator,  
8 Southside Virginia

9 Ms. Michele Faircloth – Grants Assistant, Southside Virginia

10 Ms. Jessica Stamper – Grants Assistant,  
11 Southwest Virginia

12

13 COUNSEL FOR THE COMMISSION:

14 Ms. Elizabeth Myers, Assistant Attorney General  
15 Richmond, Virginia.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. SPIERS: Good afternoon everyone,  
2 I'm going to call the Agribusiness Committee to order and ask  
3 Evan to call the roll.

4 MR. FEINMAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.  
5 Ms. Barts?

6 MS. BARTS: Here.

7 MR. FEINMAN: Delegate Edmunds?

8 DELEGATE EDMONDS: Here.

9 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Harris?

10 MR. HARRIS: Here.

11 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Mills?

12 MR. MILLS: Here.

13 MR. FEINMAN: Ms. Ratliff?

14 MS. RATLIFF: Here.

15 MR. FEINMAN: Secretary Ring?

16 SECRETARY RING: Here.

17 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Shell?

18 MR. SHELL: Here.

19 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Spiers?

20 MR. SPIERS: Here.

21 MR. FEINMAN: Senator Stanley?

22 SENATOR STANLEY: Here.

23 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Sutherland?

24 MR. SUTHERLAND: Here.

25 MR. FEINMAN: Delegate Wright?

1 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Here.

2 MR. FEINMAN: You have a quorum.

3 MR. SPIERS: The first matter is approval  
4 of our minutes.

5 MR. MILLS: So moved.

6 MR. SPIERS: We have a motion and a  
7 second to approve the minutes. All those in favor say aye.  
8 (Ayes.) Opposed? (No response.) All right, that takes care of  
9 that.

10 We have a number of proposals and we'll  
11 go through them. This was mailed out and you should have  
12 had enough time to read through this and review them. I  
13 guess Tim you can give the short version and then we'll  
14 entertain questions.

15 MR. PFOHL: I'll do my best, Mr.  
16 Chairman. We had seventeen proposals in the funding cycle  
17 and that includes three that your Committee tabled a year ago  
18 and one item of other business and I will attempt to be  
19 extremely brief.

20 The first item is the Abingdon Feeder  
21 Cattle Association requesting \$75,539. This is for the  
22 purchase of a forage harvester to do research on management  
23 techniques and quality of grasses. It has to do with the  
24 seasonal grasses. The equipment would be housed at the  
25 Glade Springs Southwest Agriculture Research and Extension

1 Center in Glade Springs, which has the benefit for more than  
2 7,200 farms in southwest Virginia and the home of 500,000  
3 head of livestock.

4 The request is for the Commission to  
5 support half of the cost of the harvester and matching funds  
6 are available from a variety of sources. Staff is recommending  
7 a grant award of \$75,538.50.

8 The second one is Blue Ridge Plateau  
9 Initiative and this project was tabled a year ago. It was  
10 submitted for some initial site preparation, meat processing.  
11 The request has been revised to \$500,000 and the total facility  
12 is expected to be in the ballpark of \$1.7 million. The  
13 applicants are pursuing GO Virginia and the Appalachian  
14 Regional Commission for funding. Staff is recommending that  
15 we be the first ones to make a commitment to this project  
16 based on a track record of almost a decade of planning and  
17 feasibility studies. So the staff is recommending a grant of  
18 \$500,000 for conditional funding that would allow some of the  
19 design costs, which are estimated to be about \$64,000 to be  
20 available for actual construction funding and be committed  
21 but not available until complete project financing for the  
22 structure and the equipment is committed. That's the  
23 recommendation for \$500,000 for design and site process and  
24 construction.

25 The next project is Campbell County

1 Central Virginia Pasture, Crops and Livestock Grant Phase II,  
2 \$532,000 requested and benefiting producers in sixteen  
3 Southside tobacco counties for watering systems and crop  
4 programs and cold storage and livestock. It's a \$3300 cost  
5 share, 33% of eligible expenses. Campbell County has  
6 generously and successfully sponsored regional agribusiness  
7 cost share projects benefiting producers in a majority of the  
8 Southside counties and programs on a regional basis. In  
9 some cases, some of the funds were not spent on projects and  
10 we were able to recapture some unobligated funds and staff is  
11 recommending a twenty percent haircut. That  
12 recommendation would be \$426,000 while including the  
13 addition of the new practice of vegetable production  
14 equipment and contingent on limiting producer participation  
15 to those that would be first-timers and not coming back and  
16 funding folks that previously received funds.

17 The next one up is the Cumberland  
18 Economic Development Authority Hemp Exchange Virginia  
19 LLC, a little over three-quarters of a million dollars to  
20 purchase hemp processing equipment. And on behalf of the  
21 proposed LLC that's formed by a local family that was licensed  
22 as a registered research grower to produce two acres of  
23 industrial hemp in 2018 under an agreement with Virginia  
24 State University. Project leaders indicated that funds are  
25 being sought to fund the cost of constructing the processing





1 positive and measureable benefit for growers in the region,  
2 this is not an alternative use and therefore be contrary to the  
3 Commission's enabling legislation. Therefore, the staff  
4 recommends no award. That's not legal advice from me.

5                   Next up is Halifax County requesting  
6 \$20,000 to conduct a study on the potential role of industrial  
7 hemp in southern Virginia. This was a contract with a  
8 professional firm involving southern Virginia agribusiness  
9 economy. The Institute for Advanced Learning and Research  
10 is a partner with Halifax on this project.

11                   What we typically want to see is a very  
12 thorough study what would be the deliverables and what all  
13 would be included. We're not satisfied we got all that  
14 information, We did receive some extra information from  
15 Halifax that they had identified a consultant potentially and  
16 they'll probably want to speak to you on that but staff  
17 recommends no award.

18                   Next up is the Town of Hillsville Farmer's  
19 Market requesting \$200,000 and that is to develop a  
20 permanent structure for the farmer's market and this is the  
21 second request. A couple of years ago the town and staff as  
22 well as the Virginia Tech feasibility study met and developed a  
23 temporary farmer's market to demonstrate and they've done  
24 that now and they have some results to share with us. So  
25 now they're asking Phase I and II construction costs and that



1 array of safety items eligible for cost share that includes  
2 ranging from calf catchers that cost two to three thousand  
3 down to several smaller items such as helmets, gloves, first  
4 aid kits and fire extinguishers. Staff suggests if this project is  
5 supported, focus should be on major purchases and smaller  
6 items only when total purchases exceed a level of \$1,000 or  
7 more.

8                   The objective of this request is to prevent  
9 farm accidents is not directly aligned with Agribusiness  
10 objectives of increasing farm income although it does align  
11 with the objective of incentivizing private on-farm investment,  
12 which will serve as a two to one match on Commission  
13 incentives. Arguably the project is predicated on the outcome  
14 of cost avoidance by preventing time loss to injuries and  
15 potentially the cost of deadly accidents.

16                   The staff is therefore suggesting a  
17 reduced award of \$151,667. The suggested reduced award  
18 will serve approximately one-third of the proposed producers,  
19 fifty plus and could be considered a pilot phase to assess  
20 demand and results, which should they be compelling could  
21 lead to a subsequent request for additional funding in future  
22 years.

23                   The next project is Mount Rogers  
24 Christmas Tree Growers Association, Genetically Improved  
25 Fraser Fir Seed Orchard. A request for \$19,575.25. This



1 Nottoway County and leased to the Ohio based company FDC  
2 Enterprises. We have previously given funding from  
3 Southside Economic Development Committee that helped and  
4 that was given to essentially establish the initial facility  
5 45,000 square foot steel building. The new request would  
6 support a 15,000 square foot addition to the existing building  
7 to support the construction of a new 45,000 square foot steel  
8 building. Currently FDCE is managing and harvesting the  
9 switch grass and is responsible for all establishment and  
10 harvesting costs.

11                   There are thirteen landowner contracts  
12 valued at \$465,000 in FY18 and payments are on a per ton  
13 yield basis and the average pay for FY18 was estimated at  
14 \$135,000. Another problem is that all of the \$2.55 million of  
15 match is identified as in kind. This includes some equipment  
16 expenditures by FDCE between January and July of 2018 as  
17 well as the cost to establish future growers and 2,000 acres  
18 which would be difficult to document. Staff feels that private  
19 revenues could be sufficient to pay back the loan for  
20 construction and staff considered the project could be referred  
21 to VRA for a low interest loan, which would be the only option  
22 for us funding one hundred percent of the facility. This  
23 request would use 38% of your balance and loan funds would  
24 have to come from that current balance at the expense of  
25 other projects or regional projects. Staff is of the opinion that

1 the county should pursue financing from public or private  
2 lenders such as Virginia Community Capital, USDA or  
3 regional banks for this facility's expansion. The staff  
4 recommends no award.

5                   Next up is the Russell County Board of  
6 Supervisors, Russell County Canneries Revitalization Project  
7 requesting \$131,420. The Cannery project as you will  
8 remember was tabled last year and we worked with Russell  
9 County throughout the year to narrow this down from two  
10 county canneries gaining new equipment for commercial  
11 processing down to one and that's where you come up with  
12 \$131,420. The staff is recommending a grant award for half of  
13 that amount, which would be \$65,710 for one half of new  
14 equipment required for commercial certification of the  
15 canneries.

16                   The second request from Russell County  
17 also tabled last year was the county fairgrounds project. A  
18 revised budget has been submitted for renovations and  
19 additions to an existing building on the county fairgrounds.  
20 The county also discussed establishing a meat processing  
21 facility that might serve as a satellite operation with the one  
22 over in Carroll County that we spoke about before. Matching  
23 funds would be provided by the county for certain aspects of  
24 the fairground building. We have an updated estimate from a  
25 local contractor, which makes the total project costs

1 \$550,000. However, it appears that proposed improvements  
2 could potentially result in an extensive expansion of events at  
3 the fairgrounds building and this could be educational in  
4 nature, which does not align well with the agribusiness  
5 program metrics that directly result in measurably increased  
6 income and private capital investment by farm producers.  
7 Your Committee took action to table this a year ago and staff  
8 is not yet prepared to support funding the budget for the  
9 commercial building improvements in its current form but  
10 supports the request of \$17,500 to serve as a match to a  
11 VDACS space AFID planning grant for meat processing. With  
12 this request, staff recommends the approval of only \$17,500  
13 for the AFID planning grant match.

14                   Next one up is Scott County Career and  
15 Technical Center. This is a request for \$26,559 and change.  
16 People were very accurate this year. This would be to add to  
17 the facility of the Scott County Career and Technical Center.  
18 They have established an agriculture education program four  
19 years ago and they teach courses in veterinary science, equine  
20 management, livestock, agriscience and technology. This  
21 would help to construct a twelve hundred square foot building  
22 that they build using career center staff and they do have a  
23 nine hundred square foot barn so they can do different  
24 training on animals. Now they have to drive fifteen miles or so  
25 to a private farm. The objective is to reduce that travel time







1 adjacent to the Appalachian Agriculture Expo Center in  
2 Wytheville. The Commission has provided a million dollars of  
3 the total ten million development cost of the center facility and  
4 that project is nearly complete. The Multipurpose Agriculture  
5 and Event Building will accommodate agriculture sales,  
6 livestock sales, livestock shows, animal housing and regional  
7 youth events. Part of the vision of the Expo Center and  
8 Multipurpose Agriculture and Event Building is to be a key  
9 site for farmers across the state. When the proposal was  
10 submitted the building was estimated to cost approximately  
11 \$400,000 with Commission funds requested for half. With a  
12 subsequent construction quote of \$321,120 for 120,000  
13 square foot structure was provided from a local contractor.  
14 Staff suggests that given the long-lived facility's ability to  
15 generate significant event driven revenue as indicated in the  
16 UVA economic impact study, this project is a strong candidate  
17 for loan consideration. Our recommendation is referral of this  
18 request to Virginia Resources Authority for consideration of a  
19 Tobacco Commission construction loan of up to \$321,120  
20 estimated cost. That completes my presentation.

21 MR. SPIERS: Thank you, Tim. Since  
22 we've not met since last January, we have a number of grant  
23 proposals. We have a balance of a little over \$3.4 million and  
24 requests for \$5.3. I know we have a number of people that  
25 would like to speak, especially to the grants that were not

1 recommended.

2 So we could start at the top and see if  
3 there is any questions on some of the grants that staff  
4 suggested we approve and then go to some of the others.

5 MR. PFOHL: Just a point of clarification.  
6 We have a mistake on the summary chart. The  
7 recommendation for the Mount Rogers Christmas Tree  
8 Growers, \$19,575.

9 MR. SPIERS: #3498.

10 MR. FEINMAN: I'd like to make a  
11 suggestion given that we, it may make sense to invite a motion  
12 to adopt funding of the staff recommended projects in a block  
13 and then address the remaining balance.

14 MR. SPIERS: Do I have a motion to that  
15 suggestion?

16 MR. MILLS: So moved.

17 MR. SPIERS: We'll have a motion to take  
18 these in a block, do I have a second?

19 DELEGATE EDMONDS: One said it was  
20 approved for a loan, if we pass this by block, does that mean  
21 we're recommending a loan or a grant? If that's the case, I'd  
22 like to pull that one out.

23 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Is it now the time  
24 to pull those out of the block?

25 MR. SPIERS: Yes, I'll read the numbers.

1 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I do have some  
2 questions like #3486.

3 MR. SPIERS: #3486, we'll take that out  
4 of the block.

5 MR. MILLS: There's another one #3370, I  
6 think we need to give them an opportunity to speak and I'll  
7 second the motion.

8 MS. MYERS: Just for clarification and  
9 the record, there was several requests that staff recommended  
10 that was a lesser amount than the requested amount, are  
11 those included in your block?

12 MR. SPIERS: I should clarify, this motion  
13 should approve the ones that I'm going to call out that staff  
14 recommended. We will be voting on #3493 for \$75,000 plus.  
15 We'll be voting on #3368 for \$500,000, with the conditions  
16 that were discussed. We'll be voting on #3491 that was  
17 tabled. #3499, I'm sorry, we will not vote on #3499, #3496  
18 phases one and two, #3492, #3494 for the pilot program and  
19 as I understand it at least a thousand dollars in the  
20 application, #3498 and the conditions of the conflict of  
21 interest being not satisfied, #3371 for the one cannery, #3495,  
22 #3500 for the GAP vegetables. Those would be the ones we  
23 would be voting on. We've had a motion and a second, any  
24 other discussion?

25 MS. RATLIFF: Mr. Chair, I would like to

1 take out #3371. Also, was #3497 in your group?

2 MR. SPIERS: No. #3370 will not be  
3 voted on. Any others to be removed from the ones I  
4 mentioned? If not, then it's been seconded. All in favor say  
5 aye. (Ayes.) Any opposed like sign? (No response.) Then  
6 those will be approved.

7 Now, we'll start #3491.

8 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Anyone here from  
9 Cumberland to address the hemp exchange?

10 MR. SPIERS: All right, do we have a  
11 motion? We have a motion and a second. The motion has  
12 been made and seconded to follow the staff recommendation  
13 on #3491 and we'll table it at this time. All in favor say aye.  
14 (Ayes.) Opposed, like sign? (No response.)

15 All right, the next one is #3499, #3486,  
16 did someone pull #3486?

17 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I'm not opposed to  
18 the amount of the grant but I can see a flaw that we had the  
19 last time we had this item for grant. It appears to limit the  
20 number of farmers that can participate and I think that's a  
21 mistake. The question is the number of farmers that can  
22 participate and I think it's a mistake to do that. The language  
23 that refers to that is on page nine. The last five or six lines  
24 and it says quote, where this application includes practices  
25 supported under multiple previous cost share grants, hay

1 barns, livestock handling equipment, the applicant identifies  
2 ongoing unmet producer demand and staff documented this  
3 same interest during site visits with VCE agents in October.  
4 However, where Commission funding of cost share is intended  
5 as an incentive for producers to see the value in a promoted  
6 best practice, staff suggests approval of applications be limited  
7 to only those proposing to receive cost share to implement a  
8 new practice for the first time. As such, requests by  
9 producers for cost share on a second hay barn, grain bin,  
10 producer handling equipment and so forth who previously  
11 received Commission funding or Commission cost share  
12 funding would not be allowed. And then continues on priority  
13 for funding would be limited to first time practice  
14 implementation and for first time participants. And then it  
15 says recognizing the net amounts paid and the pace of  
16 drawdowns on the three most recent cost share awards to  
17 Campbell County, staff suggests a twenty percent cut to the  
18 request amount reducing available funding at the initial  
19 offering to eight producers per county, which should be  
20 sufficient to cover interest in the program. That's another  
21 issue. But what I'm saying is when you reduce a person's  
22 eligibility just because they participated one time before, I  
23 don't think it's fair. I think it's a good idea but if there is  
24 money there what's to prevent a person to participate in the  
25 second funding for livestock handling equipment and other

1 things to apply again. I don't think that person should be  
2 eliminated because they participated before. The same thing  
3 we ran into before. Basically it's saying that you can't apply if  
4 you've done it one time. If you do this over a period of time,  
5 you'll have nobody left. So I'm saying let's change this to say  
6 that you can apply but the new applicants will have priority  
7 and that theirs will be filled first before the ones that have  
8 previously received grant funding will be eligible. I think  
9 that's perfectly fair and it seems to me you'd want to cover as  
10 many farmers as you could rather than eliminating some just  
11 because they applied once. You want to encourage people to  
12 participate and not say you got the money one time, you're not  
13 eligible. Just because you did, you can't apply anymore.  
14 There will come a time when all farmers that have participated  
15 once and nobody will be eligible. So that's a recommendation.  
16 And I don't think they should be ineligible because they  
17 participated once or previously. Just say the first time  
18 applicants and the ones that had previously participated, they  
19 should be able to apply but let the ones that are doing it for  
20 the first time have priority. I don't think you should  
21 automatically say they can't participate.

22 MR. SPIERS: Thank you, Delegate  
23 Wright. I think we had that wording in the past on some of  
24 the other grants. Do we have a second?

25 MR. FEINMAN: To explain the staff

1 recommendation, unlike some other of our cost sharing  
2 programs, it's not intended to be an ongoing. Rather it was  
3 designed to take some of the potential we had out of adopting  
4 a new practice and cost effective. The idea is we're not sure if  
5 this particular grain storage facility or what have you will  
6 actually lead to economic benefits on your farm rather than  
7 forcing you to lay out all the cost of it, we'll go in on it with you  
8 and you'll see a benefit to you at a lower personal risk  
9 yourself. Having already seen the benefit of it, our expectation  
10 is that they would make the cost efficient investments  
11 themselves rather than us demonstrating to someone for  
12 example if they were a large producer to save you money.  
13 Once that's been demonstrated, we ought not to have to  
14 incentivize that person to do a second expenditure of capital  
15 that will ultimately take the money. That was the idea behind  
16 it or behind our saying it's either going to be cost effective for  
17 you or it's not. You don't get to come back to the well for the  
18 second incentive for the second time. That's the theory  
19 behind the staff's reasoning or recommendation.

20 MR. SPIERS: Cold storage system, is  
21 that one of the newer practices that was added to this one?  
22 Okay, that's best practices.

23 DELEGATE WRIGHT: This is just my  
24 point of view on it. I think if the farmer's find it to be useful,  
25 what's wrong with giving them a second chance and I think we



1 should help our farmers all we can. We have this Committee  
2 but very little is done actually for the farmers and the farming  
3 is very important for our economy and anyway we can help  
4 our farmers, I'm for that. And I think we ought to do it. In my  
5 opinion this program should be opened up and helping to  
6 improve the farms and management of herds and so forth and  
7 pasture lands. I just don't think it's a good idea to limit  
8 something like this that's been successful. If you have  
9 somebody that's been successful, we ought to expand on it.

10 MR. SPIERS: Any other comments?

11 DELEGATE EDMONDS: Mr. Chairman,  
12 the thirteen to sixteen counties.

13 MR. SPIERS: Do you want to know who  
14 they are?

15 DELEGATE EDMONDS: Yes.

16 MR. PFOHL: Amelia, Appomattox,  
17 Bedford, Brunswick, Buckingham, Campbell, Charlotte,  
18 Cumberland, Franklin, Halifax, Henry, Lunenburg, and  
19 Mecklenburg, Nottoway, Pittsylvania, Prince Edward.

20 MR. SPIERS: Any other questions? All  
21 right. To summarize, we have a motion that would not  
22 disallow former applicants because the same type of  
23 equipment but still continue to give priority to the first time  
24 practice, first time participant. Evan mentioned the idea that  
25 once that they had adopted some of these practices, they

1 would understand the, or one of the questions that would be  
2 kind of if they for instance put in a cattle chute one time but  
3 wanted to do a hay barn this time, that still would mean they  
4 are not eligible to participate. If they couldn't get the very  
5 same, that would just be the original recommendation?

6 MR. PFOHL: They could come in for a  
7 different practice for a hay barn or a grain bin.

8 MR. SPIERS: We have that explanation.  
9 A motion and a second, are we ready to vote? In my mind  
10 hearing that, it would mean that if they'd already gotten one  
11 grain bin and they wanted to apply for another grain bin, they  
12 would not be allowed if you voted yes. They wouldn't be  
13 allowed to get the same practices again. The original  
14 recommendation, they could still participate in the program  
15 but it would be under one of the other practices.

16 MS. BARTS: Is this proposal from each  
17 county, is that the way it worked originally? Some counties  
18 are much bigger than others.

19 MR. SPIERS: Tim, is that the way it was  
20 proposed?

21 MR. PFOHL: The proposal suggests and  
22 it was suggested that would be eight per county.

23 MR. SPIERS: If money is left over, is it  
24 moved around?

25 MR. FEINMAN: We at the staff level for

1 example, if one county got twelve and one only had eight, we  
2 could make an administrative alteration.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: Is there a timeframe?  
4 And then on that basis if some of the smaller counties didn't  
5 need it then open up to the larger counties. I believe in the  
6 past that's the way some of these have worked.

7 MR. SPIERS: Everyone understand what  
8 we're voting for? All in favor say aye. (Ayes.) Opposed, no?  
9 (No response.) One abstention.

10 #3490, study to develop markets for  
11 industrial hemp. I understand there are people that want to  
12 speak to that. Staff recommended no award and cited a lack  
13 of data.

14 KIMBERLY: My name is Kimberly and  
15 I'm the director of the institute. I wanted to give the  
16 Commission a small update on this application. At the time of  
17 the application, we did not have the firm identified that the  
18 study is for, just identified as a Virginia firm. I wanted to  
19 make sure you are aware of that. This involves stages and the  
20 first stage of this involves the crop and the research that's  
21 involved for the industrial hemp and what barriers exist in  
22 Virginia that we can remove or certify to get them to change  
23 that and get people to locate in Virginia. The second part and  
24 we want to try to do this at the state or local level and any  
25 changes that we can make and also giving farmers the

1 opportunity to grow hemp and then attract processors. The  
2 second stage would be when you go back out to larger  
3 manufacturers and developing products and trying to get  
4 somebody to come to southern Virginia to locate a  
5 manufacturing facility. We're focusing on developing the  
6 industry and manufacturers that will invest in these  
7 operations and we have to get farmers at the table. As we see  
8 some farmers that are here today, don't do it if you can't sell  
9 it. Just don't grow it if you can't sell it but we need the  
10 processors here for them to sell it. It's kind of a chicken and  
11 an egg thing. This hemp market is moving very fast and if we  
12 don't act quickly, we could lose an opportunity here in  
13 Virginia. North Carolina is moving very quickly so we have to  
14 take steps to catch up.

15 MR. SPIERS: Any other questions? We  
16 know there is federal legislation supporting industrial hemp  
17 now and in Virginia legislation going in place and I think we've  
18 gotten some more information. Any other questions or  
19 comments concerning this application?

20 KIMBERLY: I don't think we have time to  
21 wait another year and I know North Carolina and Kentucky  
22 are already moving in that direction. Twenty thousand is a  
23 good chunk of money but in the context of what we do it is  
24 very small, a small request. In the heart of Southside Halifax  
25 County in the Institute, phones are ringing and questions

1 being asked and the dialog opened. I think there is great  
2 potential. I think it is well worth the amount of this grant. I  
3 think we're making a mistake if we don't move forward.

4 DELEGATE EDMUNDS: I just want to  
5 echo those comments. So I would move that we would grant  
6 #3490.

7 MR. MILLS: Second.

8 MR. SPIERS: We have a motion and a  
9 second. If I may offer a friendly amendment. The reason we  
10 said no here is because we had not seen what the study was  
11 going to be. We don't have any reason to think that IALR but  
12 it might be a nice safety net just to say provided all  
13 documentation relative to the study is submitted to staff and  
14 comports with efficient uses and proper procedures are  
15 followed related to the study. We need to make sure we get all  
16 the documentation we need.

17 MR. SHELL: I'll echo that and second it.

18 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Six weeks or so  
19 ago, Robert James, Secretary and I and two members from the  
20 Farm Bureau and VDACS, we stepped in a room along with  
21 and go through the code and our purpose was to try to make  
22 sure there was no regulations or code that's going to interfere  
23 with production of hemp. Maybe some emergency legislation  
24 so we don't have to wait until next year because that's what's  
25 going to happen in my opinion. It will take about a year and

1 we've got to be in business now. Kentucky and North Carolina  
2 are already moving forward and are way ahead of us.

3 MR. SPIERS: Further comment?

4 UNIDENTIFIED: Mr. Chairman, I believe  
5 we had last year maybe a leadership seminar. Last year the  
6 institute created the first industrial hemp meeting, which was  
7 February of '18, almost a year ago. That event sold out and  
8 we had people from the District of Columbia, China, Mexico,  
9 Canada. This year we capped our attendance at 250 in  
10 February, next month, 25<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup>. We're expecting a sellout.  
11 We had 41 speakers coming from all over the country and  
12 attendance from a wide region. So we really enhance  
13 southern Virginia for this research thing we're doing.  
14 Southern Virginia is poised to take a lead in this emerging  
15 market.

16 MR. SPIERS: Are you ready for the vote?  
17 The motion would be to approve this under the condition that  
18 the proposal meets all the regular standards that would  
19 normally be met from these applications. All in favor say aye.  
20 (Ayes.) Any opposed, like sign? (No response.) All right, that  
21 passes. Thank everyone for their comments.

22 DELEGATE WRIGHT: #3491, it looks  
23 like these hemp growers they want to set up a processing  
24 facility and that's what you're going to need and if they don't  
25 have a place to process it, so I'd ask the staff to see what can

1 be done there and maybe by the next meeting we'll have some  
2 information on that.

3 MR. FEINMAN: Be happy to work with  
4 any of our constituents, particularly a value added facility like  
5 this and we're certainly happy to work with the county.

6 DELEGATE WRIGHT: And maybe we can  
7 get that information before we meet.

8 MR. FEINMAN: We'll reach out to  
9 Cumberland and we'll let you know where we are.

10 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Thank you.

11 MR. SORRELL: Mr. Chairman, I'll be  
12 meeting with the county EDA on January 22<sup>nd</sup>.

13 MR. SPIERS: The next one to discuss is  
14 #3371. Russell County Board of Supervisors involving the  
15 canneries and the staff recommended one cannery.

16 MS. RATLIFF: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to  
17 reconsider that the locations and economic challenges and  
18 there's a lot of community people that use that cannery and  
19 with the new equipment I think it would be used more.  
20 There's a few people from the Russell County Board of  
21 Supervisors here and they might want to make a comment.

22 MR. SPIERS: You're asking to reconsider  
23 which one, just one or both?

24 MS. RATLIFF: I'm talking about  
25 \$131,420 that they requested for project #3371.

1 MR. EATON: I'm David Eaton of the  
2 Russell County Board of Supervisors and the county  
3 administrator is here. We want to thank you for letting us  
4 appear here to give you a little history of how we got to this  
5 point. As far as the canneries are concerned, we are real glad  
6 to have two of those. Three years ago, we took a direction on  
7 the canneries using a commercial basis and as an educational  
8 tool and we wanted to break the cycle and actually help these  
9 kids learn something about agriculture. We put agriculture  
10 back in all three of our stores and we feel very good about  
11 that. With the agriculture processes and programs that I'm  
12 talking about, we feel real good about it. What we want to do  
13 is teach our kids how to preserve the food and meat  
14 processing and growing the vegetables. This is like a double  
15 whammy. This is the ability for the public to use this and as  
16 an educational tool for our kids, teach them how to preserve  
17 and grow. We had a high school that presented a project and  
18 put together apple dough and there was some competition  
19 statewide and that's a little bit how this initiative began. We'd  
20 really ask you to help us fund this project.

21 COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: I want to  
22 echo what Mr. Eaton just said. We're trying to work with  
23 USDA to get these up to commercial. These canneries are  
24 traditional and it's also a tourist attraction and we're also  
25 trying to work with ARC and working with the local co-ops.



1 Everyone knows we are in coal country and trying to do some  
2 diversification, something that has multiple facets and benefit  
3 us by using our agriculture knowledge and also educational  
4 purposes. To sum it up, we would appreciate any assistance  
5 in this project. Thank you.

6 MR. SPIERS: Any other comments? Is  
7 your motion to fully fund their application?

8 MS. RATLIFF: Yes, and restore the  
9 funding of \$131,420 that they originally requested.

10 MR. SPIERS: We're discussing #3371  
11 and we have a motion and I need a second to increase the  
12 funding from \$65,710 to \$131,420. There we have a motion  
13 and we have a second. And we've heard discussion on the  
14 benefits of this project. Staff tabled this before and staff  
15 recommended funding one of the canneries. Any further  
16 comments from staff?

17 MR. FEINMAN: We don't have the  
18 documentation for two canneries and you can go farther for  
19 these cannery facilities and I would suggest this Committee  
20 could fund one and if a year from now we could come back  
21 and fund the second one but if we do two, we're done. And if  
22 you have two half full canneries, we haven't used our funds  
23 wisely.

24 MR. PFOHL: If I could add that with the  
25 matching funds that are proposed with the existing and

1 dedicate some portion of their time to management of the  
2 cannery and we don't know how much time several different  
3 county positions were focusing on the cannery operation but  
4 we do have concerns about matching funds. It would be  
5 helpful to have a little more background. We know the project  
6 cost is \$131,000 and we'd be on better ground if we funded  
7 half of that and try to raise matching funds from other  
8 agencies.

9 MR. SPIERS: We've heard comments and  
10 reasons to do it. If we had unlimited funds we know what we  
11 would do. We don't have unlimited funds. At this time, if  
12 there is no other comments, we will vote to either increase the  
13 funds to \$131,420 or continue at \$65,710 and let them go for  
14 a year like that. At this time, an aye vote would be to increase  
15 funds. All in favor of the motion say aye. (Ayes.) All opposed,  
16 say nay? (No response.) Apparently a lot of people didn't vote.

17 MS. RATLIFF: A roll call vote. I think the  
18 suggestion has been the chair calls for a roll call vote.

19 UNIDENTIFIED: Mr. Chairman, I'm not a  
20 member of this Committee but I understand the Committee  
21 operates by certain rules. You've got it right there and there  
22 was no nays.

23 MR. SPIERS: I don't have a decision to  
24 make. There were no nays, so the motion passes.

25 All right, #3370 was pulled out of the

1 block. That's the Russell County Fair. Anyone want to speak  
2 to that?

3 SENATOR CHAFIN: I live in Russell  
4 County. I'd like to speak to this as a resident of the county  
5 and I've worked with the fair association for many years and I  
6 can tell you just this past weekend that the Virginia  
7 Association of Fairs and since that fair has been held yearly  
8 and that's been voted for overall fairs an attendance of about  
9 30,000 attended that fair. They have quite a record of  
10 accomplishment as the best fair. It's the best fair in the state  
11 and that has gone on for the last twenty years. And people  
12 have worked very hard to maintain this as the best fair in the  
13 state of Virginia for a long, long time. There's a building and it  
14 needs to be renovated that would allow it to be used not just  
15 seasonally and could be used in the summer months and this  
16 could be used throughout the year if this grant is made and it  
17 is the best fair and it has been acknowledged as the best fair  
18 in the Commonwealth of Virginia. But they did miss it two or  
19 three times of the sixteen years I'm talking about. The point is  
20 the 30,000 people that attend this and you consider out in the  
21 coalfields suffering from economic loss, it supports agriculture  
22 in our county. But with all those things being said, I'd like to  
23 speak in favor of this request. Russell County will provide  
24 some in kind money in support of manpower to assist with the  
25 upgrades and some heating and air conditioning work will be

1 done throughout the year. Also, the Russell High School  
2 agriculture programs will be greatly enhanced with the use of  
3 this. Usually it's the first two weeks annually of September  
4 each year that they also use it in June and July. This is  
5 agriculture and it was on the backs of the farmers that this  
6 money was created and those are the people we're talking  
7 about that did it and each generation would have an  
8 opportunity to learn more about agriculture. And it's right  
9 there, all this information with the local fair. So I would ask  
10 you to approve this.

11 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Chairman, Senator  
12 Chafin makes a strong argument for the fair but the concern  
13 the staff has is twofold. This Committee is trying to do many  
14 things but not a Committee for tourism. What we saw when  
15 we looked at this project was it's primarily going to be event  
16 space rather than specifically designed to support farm  
17 income. We did want to support a grant that would help a  
18 processing facility in the footprint of the center or fairgrounds  
19 rather. A half measure maybe would be to fund a portion of  
20 this grant for this Committee and then refer the remainder or  
21 table it and then refer it depending on the application to one of  
22 the committees that does fund tourism projects, Special  
23 Projects or Southwest Economic Development. We only have a  
24 certain amount of funds for this Committee. Increasing farm  
25 income or diversification, and we couldn't get there from this

1 application. The basic grant.

2 UNIDENTIFIED: Could you use your  
3 mike please, we didn't hear your comments.

4 MS. BARTS: I had the same concern  
5 staff did.

6 MR. SPIERS: Is that a motion?

7 MS. RING: I certainly believe in the  
8 importance of county fairs but Evan, with your suggestion, we  
9 did transfer this to Special Projects or if we did, how long  
10 would it take for the grant to move forward and to study it  
11 timing wise for that to be considered?

12 MR. FEINMAN: With Special Projects  
13 meeting tomorrow, I could get with the staff and see whether  
14 or not we felt comfortable making a recommendation with  
15 Special Projects for our meeting tomorrow. The Committee  
16 can act with our without a staff recommendation or we can  
17 wait until May and that's not too long to wait to get a full staff  
18 workup.

19 MR. SPIERS: Is there a motion to do  
20 anything different than the recommendation?

21 MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I move that  
22 we approve the staff's recommendation of \$17,500 and  
23 transfer the other part to Special Projects.

24 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll second that.

25 MR. SPIERS: A motion has been made

1 and seconded that we approve the seventeen five planning  
2 grant for the meat processing and recommend that it be  
3 transferred to the appropriate committee, whether it be  
4 Special Projects or Southwest Economic Development.

5 MR. PFOHL: Special Projects requires  
6 the participation of at least two localities. Southwest would be  
7 more appropriate.

8 MR. MILLER: I'll change my motion to  
9 say Southwest Economic Development.

10 MS. RATLIFF: I'll second.

11 MR. SPIERS: All in favor of the motion  
12 say aye. (Ayes.) All opposed, like sign? (No response.)

13 Now, #3489, multipurpose agriculture  
14 and event building in Wythe County recommending a loan for  
15 the full amount?

16 MR. FEINMAN: That's the staff's  
17 recommendation.

18 MR. REED: I'm Tim Reed, Wythe County  
19 Board of Supervisors and I'd ask the Committee to reconsider  
20 this as a grant and I have the chairman of our authority here.

21 MR. MILLER: Good afternoon, my name  
22 is Matthew Miller. I'm the chairman of the APEX Authority  
23 appointed by the County to operate the structure, facility.  
24 You are aware we've been before you before on the economic  
25 development side. I'll just say that that's moving along nicely

1 and 99% local. But I'd urge you to buy a ticket for any type of  
2 entertainment event that we have there.

3                   With that said, the ancillary building, the  
4 Ag building, more traditional in its role and that can or the  
5 purpose is to generate more Ag revenue for farmers. As  
6 everyone knows, if you want to increase growth, you've got to  
7 be more efficient and more educated and we're trying to do  
8 both of those. Our ability to bring outside participation is a  
9 part of that interest but to allow Southwest and Southside  
10 participants to market exhibits and livestock. We're also  
11 examining ways to bring in more events and sales from  
12 outside the Tobacco Region and we're going to accommodate  
13 that with this proposal that would help us get on our way.

14                   We do have the matching funds. That's  
15 not an issue and there's \$200,000 match available. We're  
16 asking for \$200,000 with today's agenda I thought about how  
17 can the Commission and how can we get the best bang for the  
18 buck. This building, we could argue, would appreciate and  
19 those of you that travel around the country know that these  
20 buildings don't appreciate very fast. We take our job very  
21 seriously with the authority and try to use the Commission's  
22 funds as best that we can and we've done that so far. And  
23 we'd consider this to be a very high class facility and certainly  
24 a plus for Southwest Virginia. We'll be glad to answer any  
25 questions or from any members that are with us today.

1 MR. SPIERS: Any questions?

2 MR. SHELTON: Mr. Chairman, I would  
3 like to speak and referring to being involved with the Old  
4 Dominion Complex in Chatham. I know that if you want to  
5 have an agriculture facility that you can expand through  
6 shows and sales and different events, you must have a facility  
7 to maintain the integrity of your arena. And you cannot house  
8 animals in that arena. I think this facility is off to a  
9 tremendous start. I don't think it was really built to hold  
10 monster truck rallies. I there are several organizations in that  
11 area that are already committed to expand livestock sales and  
12 events that would really facilitate livestock industry in that  
13 area.

14 Traditionally, we have seen in the  
15 Shenandoah Valley kind of had a grip on the state level events  
16 in the livestock industry. I think with what we've been able to  
17 do with the help of this Commission in Southside and Old  
18 Dominion and now Southwest and with this facility, I think  
19 we're beginning to put it on more of a level playing field. I  
20 don't think we should penalize them because they have been  
21 successful. I think this event is off to a great start and shown  
22 that they've done what they said they were going to do and  
23 they've managed it well. And therefore, I don't think we  
24 should say we need to not help them anymore because they're  
25 doing a good job. I think this is a major facility for livestock



1 expansion in Southwest. I think to make this facility a  
2 livestock/agriculture priority facility it's imperative that they  
3 have this. So I'd like to move that we fund in a grant in the  
4 amount of \$200,000 as requested.

5 MR. SUTHERLAND: I'll second it.

6 MR. SPIERS: There is a motion and a  
7 second. The Chair as I recall, we talked about a grant and  
8 then a loan and a loan was suggested and if I remember the  
9 procedure, they made application for a loan and not grant and  
10 they could come back and make application for a grant. Can  
11 we hear from the staff on why they made a recommendation  
12 and we have the motion on the floor?

13 MR. FEINMAN: As you know, the  
14 strategic plan adopted by the full Commission states that for  
15 projects that would generate revenues sufficient to service a  
16 loan, that's the first option the Commission pursues. This is a  
17 facility that will generate sufficient revenue that would be  
18 adequate to serve as a loan. We have to note that a loan from  
19 us is a good deal. You cannot get a loan for the time period or  
20 at the interest rate that we offer. If you find such a bank,  
21 leave it to yourself that's a real find. Someone, you're not  
22 penalized by making a loan. We're saying we will offer what is  
23 in effect a subsidized loan in a recognition that when projects  
24 take that sort of funding, it offers up the ability to make grants  
25 like in a cost share funding situation that we made grants for

1 earlier here. We will at some point if we continue to expend at  
2 the rate we're spending them, cease to be able to offer grants  
3 or loans. The lending is not to penalize someone, it's to  
4 preserve the fiscal sustainability of this organization long term  
5 and that's going to require from time to time sticking to what  
6 we, abide by our rules and make loans rather than grants.

7 UNIDENTIFIED: I appreciate those  
8 comments but being able to service those loans, we have  
9 about a \$330,000 debt service that begins in about three  
10 years and obviously we take it very seriously and if you add  
11 additional debt service, I'm not saying we couldn't service that  
12 but we certainly would benefit greater by having an  
13 opportunity to have a grant.

14 MR. SPIERS: Any comments or  
15 questions? We have a motion on the floor to change the  
16 recommendation to a \$200,000 grant and to go before the VRA  
17 for the loan. Are we prepared to vote? All in favor of the  
18 \$200,000 grant please say say aye. (Ayes.) All opposed, nay?  
19 (Nos.) The motion carries, \$200,000 grant.

20 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I voted no on  
21 #3370 and #3371.

22 MR. SPIERS: #3497, Scott County  
23 Career and Technical Center.

24 DELEGATE KILGORE: We have some  
25 folks here from Scott County Career and Technical Center.

1 DR. JOHNSON: I'm Dr. Johnson. We  
2 appreciate you letting us offer our comments today. As  
3 mentioned earlier, the purpose of the agribusiness is to help  
4 with farm income and that's what we're trying to do by  
5 teaching our students quality agriculture programs. Farming  
6 is very important in Scott County and we're one of the top  
7 counties in the state for farms. I know that you've heard this  
8 before but we're trying to really add to our future farmers and  
9 especially small farms and we want to deal with people early  
10 and to increase our facilities and we'd really appreciate the  
11 help with this project.

12 MR. SPIERS: Is there any type of  
13 certificate that is awarded that students can earn if they do  
14 this program?

15 DR. JOHNSON: Yes, we award a  
16 certificate and have certification. But our students are well  
17 trained and it's very beneficial.

18 MR. SPIERS: Is this equivalent to what  
19 they get at the community college?

20 DR. JOHNSON: Unfortunately, the local  
21 community colleges don't certify and we really don't have that  
22 option currently but the Wytheville Community College has  
23 programs.

24 DELEGATE KILGORE: Mr. Chairman,  
25 this is only \$26,559 and this is our future as far as agriculture

1 is concerned. The enrollment has gone from 30 to 53  
2 students and that's a good number of students and you're  
3 teaching them how to make money on the farm. This is a  
4 relatively small amount. But we have to find another way. I'm  
5 sure they can come up with the 25% match. I think this is a  
6 small amount to pay for people that are really involved in the  
7 agriculture program, which is an economic driver, maybe  
8 number one in the Commonwealth.

9 MS. RATLIFF: I would just note that we  
10 hear about statistics and about farming is increasing in the  
11 numbers and here's a program helping to promote young  
12 farmers coming on board and I think it's something we should  
13 consider.

14 MS. MYERS: Any motion that passes this  
15 grant needs to include the provision that only 25% of the  
16 matching funds can be in kind.

17 DELEGATE KILGORE: That has to be in  
18 the code.

19 MR. FEINMAN: You know, we really have  
20 two issues with this Committee. An educational program and  
21 not an agribusiness but this is the Agribusiness Committee,  
22 not the agriculture committee. It's not a grant for somebody  
23 in the business of agriculture and not properly before us. Our  
24 Education Committee doesn't have a round until the fall.

25 The second concern is it's K through 12

1 and those rules are well known to the staff. We could expend  
2 the entirety of the Commission's funds trying to fix the needs  
3 of K-12 education and not get there. So we can't fund that. I  
4 will say in a situation where somebody is offering what would  
5 be community college credit in a high school and they can't  
6 pursue that within their community college, we might be  
7 willing to make an exception in the competitive Education  
8 Committee, which is properly an education funding vehicle.

9 As to the prior discussion we had, I don't  
10 think this is properly before this Committee. It can be  
11 referred.

12 DELEGATE KILGORE: I think it does  
13 support the outcome. A group of farmers that are going to be  
14 in the farming business, I think that's how you get there. This  
15 is a growing program from 30 to 53 out of a small student  
16 population and I think that's a good percentage. It's  
17 important to keep young people interested. I think it's a good  
18 program.

19 MR. FEINMAN: I agree it's a good  
20 program. I think it would be a good program in competitive  
21 Education.

22 MR. SPIERS: We continue to have a  
23 hybrid situation that's hard to identify.

24 MR. MILLS: I'd like to get some more  
25 clarification around that. If it's not appropriate and doesn't

1 meet the criteria of this one, then it may make sense to  
2 transfer it. Can it be considered under Special Projects or  
3 only Education?

4 MR. FEINMAN: It's really properly an  
5 Education grant. We'll have a competitive Education round  
6 this spring with the decision to be made in May well in  
7 advance of the next school year. I have a feeling this would  
8 receive a good staff recommendation in that setting.

9 DELEGATE KILGORE: Can you table it  
10 or transfer it so it doesn't have to go through the whole  
11 application process?

12 MR. FEINMAN: I think we could.

13 MR. SPIERS: Do I have a motion to that  
14 effect?

15 DELEGATE KILGORE: Yes.

16 MR. SPIERS: I have a motion that we  
17 table and recommend that it go to the competitive Education  
18 Committee. We have a motion and now we have a second. All  
19 in favor say aye. (Ayes.) Opposed, nay? (No response.)

20 We have one more to discuss. #3499 and  
21 I'm going to call for an Executive Session to discuss part of  
22 this project.

23 MR. MILLS: Mr. Chairman, I move that  
24 we go into a closed meeting in accordance with the Virginia  
25 Freedom of Information Act. The purpose of this closed

1 session is to discuss the following projects, project #3499 GAP  
2 Certification Cost Share for Virginia Tobacco Growers. The  
3 subject of this closed session is for consultation with legal  
4 counsel, information submitted for a grant or loan. The  
5 applicable exemption for open meeting requirements Freedom  
6 of Information Act, Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)8 and I  
7 so move.

8 MS. RATLIFF: Second.

9 MR. SPIERS: I have a motion and a  
10 second.

11

12 NOTE: A CLOSED SESSION IS HAD; WHEREUPON THE  
13 COMMITTEE IS RECONVENED IN OPEN SION.

14

15 MR. MILLS: Mr. Chairman, I move that  
16 we vote on and record certification that to the best of each  
17 member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully  
18 exempted from open meeting requirements under this chapter  
19 only public business matters as were identified in the motion  
20 by which the closed meeting was convened were heard,  
21 discussed and considered in the closed meeting and I so  
22 move.

23 MR. SPIERS: Roll call.

24 MR. FEINMAN: Ms. Barts?

25 MS. BARTS: Aye.

1 MR. FEINMAN: Delegate Edmunds?  
2 DELEGATE EDMONDS: Aye.  
3 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Harris?  
4 MR. HARRIS: Aye.  
5 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Mills?  
6 MR. MILLS: Aye.  
7 MR. FEINMAN: Ms. Ratliff?  
8 MS. RATLIFF: Aye.  
9 MR. FEINMAN: Secretary Ring?  
10 SECRETARY RING: Aye.  
11 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Shell?  
12 MR. SHELL: Aye.  
13 MR. FEINMAN: Senator Stanley?  
14 SENATOR STANLEY: Yes.  
15 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Sutherland?  
16 MR. SUTHERLAND: Aye.  
17 MR. FEINMAN: Delegate Wright?  
18 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Aye.  
19 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Spiers?  
20 MR. SPIERS: Aye. We're back in regular  
21 session. We received a legal opinion on grant #3499. I know  
22 some people traveled here to comment on the GAP application  
23 or certification. Our legal opinion is that the Code would  
24 prevent us from funding this at this time. I think we're going  
25 to have a motion at this time to table and have an effort to



1 change the Code so that we possibly could fund something of  
2 this nature. We've had a suggestion that to look for some  
3 alternative funding for a project like this.

4 MR. MILLS: Before that motion, I want to  
5 take an opportunity to recognize Mr. Coleman and Mr. Clary,  
6 who are both members of the Virginia Tobacco Growers  
7 Association and I'd ask you to please stand. Thank you for  
8 what you do for the industry and we'll continue to work  
9 through this project and make sure the tobacco farmers are  
10 looked after and appreciate you all coming. We've had a  
11 lengthy discussion. I'm going to make a motion now that we  
12 try to move this forward so we can get some things  
13 straightened out so this project can go forward and maybe be  
14 funded at a future date. Thank you for coming today. Mr.  
15 Chairman, I make a motion this project be tabled. Any  
16 changes in legislation that would permit this project to be  
17 approved at a later date.

18 MR. SPIERS: Do I have a second?

19 DELEGATE WRIGHT: The motion and  
20 additional funding.

21 MR. MILLS: I'll move that and seek  
22 additional funding.

23 MR. SPIERS: The motion to table this  
24 and seek additional funding. All in favor of that say aye.  
25 (Ayes.) Opposed, nay? (No response.) We have one additional

1 little piece of business.

2 MR. FEINMAN: We have one that the  
3 Committee took no action on, #3488.

4 MR. SPIERS: We have an extension.

5 MS. CAPP: This is Pittsylvania County  
6 Southern Virginia Vineyard Development and Expansion to  
7 Support Virginia's Wine Industry #3102, a request for  
8 extension through December 31, 2020. There has been a  
9 couple of staff changes. This involves grape production in the  
10 Tobacco Region and the shortages in the wine industry. This  
11 funding was allocated to cost sharing on capital cost for  
12 establishing new vineyards and expansion of existing vineyard  
13 acreage. This includes an educational component to address  
14 technical support and workshops for growers.

15 In July of '18, the Commission approved  
16 transition of the vineyard program management to Institute  
17 for Advanced Learning and Research who is employing a part  
18 time vineyard program manager and changes have been made  
19 to allow for more participation. In November, the Institute  
20 hosted a new grower's workshop and they have been working  
21 with Pittsylvania County in partnership in requesting an  
22 extension to the grant to December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020 and  
23 establishing the new vineyard acreage. We're asking for an  
24 extension of time to incorporate this program so we can get  
25 the best possible outcome.

1 MR. HARRIS: What is the amount of  
2 money that's involved?

3 MS. CAPP: There's cost sharing  
4 involved.

5 MR. SPIERS: I've got a motion for an  
6 extension. This is to extend project #3102.

7 MR. MILLS: So moved.

8 MR. SPIERS: A motion is made and a  
9 second project #3102, December 31, 2020. All those in favor  
10 say aye. (Ayes.) All opposed, like sign? (No response.) Thank  
11 you. That completes our business. Any public comment? Not  
12 hearing any, I'll declare that we are adjourned.

13

14 PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF THE COURT REPORTER

I, Medford W. Howard, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public for the State of Virginia at large, do hereby certify that I was the court reporter who took down and transcribed the proceedings of the **Tobacco Region Revitalization Commission Agribusiness Committee meeting when held on Monday, January 7, 2019 at 3:00 p.m. at the Homewood Suites in Richmond, Virginia.**

I further certify this is a true and accurate transcript, to the best of my ability to hear and understand the proceedings.

Given under my hand this 5<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2019.

---

Medford W. Howard  
CCR #0313137