| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | VIRGINIA TOBACCO REGION REVITALIZATION COMMISSION |
| 4 | |
| | SOUTHSIDE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | Monday, September 30th, 2019 |
| 8 | |
| 9 | 11:00 A.M. |
| 10 | |
| 11 | THE PRIZERY |
| 12 | 700 Bruce Street |
| 13 | South Boston, Virginia |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| 1 | APPEARANCES: |
|----|---|
| 2 | The Honorable Thomas Wright, Chairman |
| 3 | The Honorable Edward Owens, Vice Chairman |
| 4 | The Honorable William M. Stanley, Jr. |
| 5 | The Honorable Daniel W. Marshall, III |
| 6 | The Honorable Kathy Byron |
| 7 | The Honorable Frank Ruff, Jr. |
| 8 | Mr. James Edmunds, II |
| 9 | Mr. Robert Mills |
| 10 | Ms. Gayle Barts |
| 11 | Mr. Buddy Shelton |
| 12 | |
| 13 | COMMISSION STAFF: |
| 14 | Mr. Evan Feinman, Executive Director |
| 15 | Mr. Andrew Sorrell, Deputy Director |
| 16 | Ms. Sarah Capps, Grant Administrator |
| 17 | Mr. Timothy Pfohl, Grant Director |
| 18 | Ms. Joyce Knight, Administrative Assistant |
| 19 | |
| 20 | COUNSEL FOR THE COMMISSION: |
| 21 | Ms. Elizabeth Myers, Assistant Attorney General |
| 22 | Richmond, Virginia |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

| 1 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: At this time I'll ask the |
|----|---|
| 2 | Tobacco Committee to come to order, please. |
| 3 | MR. FEINMAN: Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman. |
| 4 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: May I have your |
| 5 | attention, please? People talking. Call the roll. |
| 6 | MR. FEINMAN: I will, Mr. Chairman. |
| 7 | Delegate Wright? |
| 8 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: Here. |
| 9 | MR. FEINMAN: Mr Owens? |
| 10 | MR. OWENS: Here. |
| 11 | MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Pfohl? |
| 12 | MR. PFOHL: Here. |
| 13 | MR. FEINMAN: Ms. Barts? |
| 14 | MS. BARTS: Here. |
| 15 | MR. FEINMAN: Delegate Byron? |
| 16 | DELEGATE BYRON: Yes. |
| 17 | MR. FEINMAN: Delegate Edmunds? |
| 18 | DELEGATE EDMUNDS: Here. |
| 19 | MR. FEINMAN: Ms. Ehrhardt? |
| 20 | MS. EHRHARDT: (No response) |
| 21 | MR. FEINMAN: Delegate Marshall? |
| 22 | DELEGATE MARSHALL: Here. |
| 23 | MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Mills? |
| 24 | MR. MILLS: Here. |
| 25 | MR. FEINMAN: Senator Ruff? |

| 1 | SENATOR RUFF: Here. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Shelton? |
| 3 | MR. SHELTON: Here. |
| 4 | MR. FEINMAN: Senator Stanley? |
| 5 | SENATOR STANLEY: Here. |
| 6 | MR. FEINMAN: You have a forum, Mr. |
| 7 | Chairman. |
| 8 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: Okay. Who would like to |
| 9 | make a motion to approve the minutes? Second? All |
| 10 | right. Motion to second. Approval to meeting minutes |
| 11 | of the meeting, all in favor say Aye. (Ayes) All |
| 12 | opposed say no. Motion carries. |
| 13 | At this time I'll ask Sarah Capps if you'll |
| 14 | give notes for all the applications, please. |
| 15 | MS. CAPPS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, members of |
| 16 | the committee, there were 10 applications submitted for |
| 17 | Southside Economic Development. The staff is |
| 18 | recommending funding for five of those projects. One |
| 19 | project is recommended to be tabled. Two have a zero |
| 20 | pending recommendation, and there were two applications |
| 21 | submitted that were subsequently withdrawn. |
| 22 | So, I'll start to through those. You can |
| 23 | see the balances and the allocations on the front page. |
| | |

It's Grant Number 3574. It's a request for 200,762.

24

25

The first project is from Bedford County.

- 1 It's a request to support 50 percent of construction
- 2 costs for an access road to lot seven where the shell
- 3 building is currently being constructed in the New London
- 4 Technology Park. Bedford County does have a prospect for
- 5 this site. It's estimated to create 75 jobs and with
- 6 average salary of 45,000 and two million private capital
- 7 investment.
- 8 The county staff did check with VDOT, and
- 9 it was not eligible for the VDOT access road funds. The
- 10 county is providing a required match.
- 11 Staff is recommending grant award of
- \$200,762 to support up to 50 percent of the construction
- 13 costs.
- 14 The second request under the Bedford County
- 15 allocation is from the National D-Day Memorial
- 16 Foundation. This is a request for \$538,430. It requests
- 17 us to support site development costs for the initial two
- million dollars phase of implementing an 18 million
- dollar master plan to add a visitor's center and museum,
- 20 education and event center, an outdoor amphitheater to
- 21 D-Day Memorial.
- 22 And the D-Day Foundation reports that they
- are well under way with their initial capital campaign,
- and they expect to have 2.6 million raised by the end of
- 25 2019.

| 1 | Staff is suggests that consideration be |
|----|--|
| 2 | made for supporting 50 percent of the cost to do the |
| 3 | clearing and grading for the site area that would |
| 4 | accommodate the new structures. So this would be 50 |
| 5 | percent of the identified \$468,400. |
| 6 | So staff is a recommending a grant award of |
| 7 | \$234,200. |
| 8 | The next two projects on the list are |
| 9 | Brunswick County with the Fiberight Building purchase |
| 10 | located on West 58 Industrial Park, grant 3575. It's a |
| 11 | request for 730,000. This is to acquire a 50,000 square |
| 12 | foot building on 10 acres to be marketed for advanced |
| 13 | manufacturing. |
| 14 | And Brunswick County does not currently |
| 15 | have a building this size to market to prospects. Staff |
| 16 | is supported by (inaudible) is recommending award of |
| 17 | \$730,000 grant to support 50 percent of the costs for |
| 18 | acquisition and improvements to the building. |
| 19 | The next request from under the |
| 20 | Brunswick County allocation is from the Industrial |
| 21 | Development Authority. It's a \$71,900 request. It's for |
| 22 | the Sledge and Barkley Redevelopment project. This is |
| 23 | this request is to support some study costs for |
| 24 | redevelopment of the large Sledge and Barkley building. |
| | |

It's located in the historic downtown area. (Inaudible)

- 1 I said the Barkley building is one of the oldest
- 2 buildings in the downtown Lawrenceville. It covers two
- 3 commercial buildings, a double commercial block, I think
- 4 how it's referenced.
- 5 Funds are requested to support a plan for
- 6 development for a feasibility -- I'm sorry -- a plan for
- 7 development and feasibility analysis was completed in
- 8 2009. That was funded by VHDA's MUML program, and
- 9 determined the building to be satisfactory and proposed
- 10 the plan for commercial and residential development. The
- 11 new plan for the building is still under evaluation. And
- it's expected to be a mixed use development.
- The IDA acquired the building earlier this
- 14 year. So they do have ownership and control of it.
- The staff is supportive of the grant
- request conditioned on the IDA evaluating potential uses
- 17 of at least the two floors the building, four enterprise
- activities that job opportunities and work spaces
- 19 contributing towards the economy of downtown
- 20 Lawrenceville.
- 21 Staff is recommending a grant award of the
- 22 71,900 to support up to 50 percent of the professional
- 23 development contract.
- 24 The next project on the list is from the
- Town of Halifax. This is a \$179,000 request. It

| 1 | essentially is a VDOT funded project. We are matching |
|-----|---|
| 2 | funds or requesting from the commission that aims to |
| 3 | support improvements to the approach corridors and access |
| 4 | to the downtown historic sites in the town of Halifax and |
| 5 | particularly to access to the downtown historic district. |
| 6 | Typically with staff recommends funding |
| 7 | on capital projects that, of course, related to those |
| 8 | that attract national and international visitors. And |
| 9 | that level of data on tourism is not available for the |
| LO | historic (inaudible) the criteria. And there were no |
| L1 | measurable direct correlation between the improvements |
| L2 | that were proposed and the resulting visitors and visitor |
| L3 | spending to the downtown. |
| L 4 | So staff is recommending no award for this |
| L5 | one. |
| L 6 | The next project on the list is from |
| L7 | under Nottoway County. It's submitted by Nottoway |
| L8 | County, the Harris memorial Armory Restoration Project. |
| L 9 | It's Grant 3579. It's a \$50,000 request to support |
| 20 | improvement to the roof. For note, the roof repair |
| 21 | estimate was a little dated. It was from 2001. So we |
| 22 | did not have a current information on estimated cost for |
| 23 | the improvements. |
| 24 | More importantly, the intended use for the |

building does not currently align well with Tobacco

- 1 Commission priorities. The use for this bit of space is
- 2 more appropriate for athletic events. It was identified
- 3 as having a potential as an education center. However,
- 4 we did note an education provider was not identified, and
- 5 Southside Virginia Community College offers their best
- 6 education programs at their facility on Fort Pickett,
- 7 their satellite training facility.
- 8 So staff is recommending no award for this
- 9 project.
- 10 Let's see. The next two projects on the
- 11 list are under the Pittsylvania County allocation. The
- 12 first request is from the Old Dominion Agriculture
- 13 Foundation. This is for the land acquisition for future
- business development explanation. It's grant 3582. It's
- 15 a request for \$258,500. This project is for acquisition
- 16 of two parcels to expand the Old Dominion Agriculture
- 17 Complex just north of Chatham on U.S. 29.
- The grant funds would be used for one of
- 19 the parcels that contains four buildings, two with power
- and HVAC, and two that are more storage-type buildings.
- 21 There is the second parcel that would be
- 22 acquired with matched funds as a large cinder block
- 23 building.
- 24 The two parcels themselves would be -- it's
- 25 intended they be added to the whole complex that Old

- 1 Dominion Foundation manages. And it provides a greater value as far as accessibility. So the second property --3 these two properties provide greater accessibility to the backside of their property holdings of the ODAC. So 5 provide a second access point off of U.S. 29. And so that that was identified in that application. 6 7 As far as property the Tobacco Commission 8 funds would be invested, Old Dominion Foundation has 9 identified a plan to use one or more of the buildings for 10 a food aggregation type facility. 11 Nonetheless, staff is recommending this 12 request be tabled pending development of a feasibility 13 study to validate and quantify producer interest and 14 operating financial plans for the proposed food 15 aggregation hub. 16 The next project on the list is from 17 Pittsylvania County. This is Grant Number 3580, and it's 18 a \$500,000 request. This is funds requested for site 19 improvements to create two shovel-ready pads on 25 acres 20 at the Southern Virginia Multimodal Park. This is in Hurt, in the Town of Hurt. It's the former Burlington 21 Industries site. 22
- 23 And there is a prospect that the county is 24 currently working with the Project Emotion that's 25 expected to, let's see, identified to create -- invest 24

- 1 million; 10 million in building and 10 million in
- 2 machinery and tools, and create 65 jobs with an average
- 3 salary of 40,000. So those are the outcomes from Project
- 4 Emotion that this request would support.
- 5 Staff is recommending a grant award of
- 6 500,000 for site improvement costs, subject to the
- 7 commitment of Project Emotion to the site, and to
- 8 negotiation of a repayment plan with commission's
- 9 investment in the privately owned and developed site. So
- 10 the park where this one is located is currently privately
- owned.
- 12 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Thank you, Sarah.
- 13 First, let me say we have two proposals
- 14 withdrawn on 3561 and 3578. That would require a vote
- 15 since (inaudible) those two were withdrawn. And I think
- 16 at this time what we'll do is -- (Brief pause for
- microphone) As I received project 3561 and 3578 have been
- 18 withdrawn. So that won't require any motion or vote,
- 19 just for yours information.
- 20 I think at this time we will entertain a
- 21 motion on voting on these in the block. First, I'll see
- 22 if anyone would like to withdraw any grant proposals from
- 23 the block at this time.
- MR. MILLS: Mr. Chairman?
- DELEGATE WRIGHT: Yes.

- 1 MR. MILLS: I'd like to pull grant request
- 2 3580 out of the block.
- 3 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Okay. 3580 is withdrawn
- 4 from the block.
- 5 SENATOR RUFF: 3579 request be pulled out
- 6 of the block.
- 7 DELEGATE WRIGHT: 3579.
- 8 DELEGATE EDMUNDS: 3581.
- 9 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Any others?
- 10 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, 3582 I
- 11 have an amendment to it. So that -- do you want to pull
- 12 that out of the block?
- DELEGATE WRIGHT: I think that would be the
- thing to do. Pull 3582 as well. So that leaves us
- voting on grant proposal number 3574, 3577, 3575 and
- 16 3576, and that's it. The rest of them -- the other four
- other than the two that were withdrawn, we voted on those
- 18 separately. Do I have a motion?
- 19 DELEGATE EDMUNDS: Motion.
- MEMBER: Second.
- 21 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Motion to approve the
- 22 staff recommendation on the formerly -- previously
- 23 mentioned grants, all in favor say aye. (Ayes) Motion
- 24 carries. Okay.
- Now, we'll go to Grant Number 3581, Town of

- 1 Halifax. Who would like to speak on that?
- MR. MILLS: The man on the outside.
- 3 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Please come up here.
- 4 First get the mic.
- 5 MR. ESPY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that.
- 6 First, I guess with the traveling mic would be the
- 7 committee's pleasure for me to come over here to podium,
- 8 I assume. Thank you.
- 9 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Introduce yourself.
- 10 MRS. ESPY: I'm going to hook the mic back
- 11 up and do a sound test if you don't mind. So everybody
- 12 good there?
- Good morning. I'm Carl Espy, Halifax town
- 14 manager. I appreciate the committee allowing us an
- 15 opportunity to make just a very brief presentation based
- on some of the staff recommendations for this grant
- 17 application. And we appreciate and note that staff has
- 18 seen that it's difficult to provide national and
- 19 international visitation for a site which is open and
- 20 free to the public.
- 21 We did, in the application, provide
- 22 information an estimate of 5,153 visitors annually. With
- 23 the projection with these heritage tourism site
- 24 enhancements tying into the war memorial, projecting
- about 10 percent increase in visitation.

| Τ | for those of you are aren't aware of the |
|----|---|
| 2 | war memorial, may have seen this, I should think this is |
| 3 | a project that really kicked off a multiphase downtown |
| 4 | revitalization effort starting 2003. And this project |
| 5 | for the war memorial was conceived, funded and |
| 6 | constructed in 2003 by veteran's civil organization and |
| 7 | citizens who were able to raise the private capital, an |
| 8 | unprecedented level of \$250,000 to acquire the site to |
| 9 | make the improvements, and it really did kick off our |
| 10 | first phase of improvements in the downtown. |
| 11 | I do think that we could work with staff to |
| 12 | support additional visitation numbers. We have a whole |
| 13 | host of partners on this project and many of the projects |
| 14 | that we have been successful working with the county in |
| 15 | various funding agencies over the years. |
| 16 | To really pinpoint the genealogical |
| 17 | research numbers that come in, I will share with the |
| 18 | committee that the day that I got this report a gentleman |
| 19 | came within a U.S. Coast Guard veteran's cap in town hall |
| 20 | looking for the courthouse. And, of course, the |
| 21 | courthouse is difficult to find during construction right |
| 22 | now, but we were able to lead him there. And he was |
| 23 | doing genealogical research. |
| 24 | But also pointing out to the military |
| 25 | heritage of the Halifax County, particularly the war |

- 1 memorial which was made to commemorate the memory of
- those great men and women who answered the country's call
- 3 to arms in force to conflicts from the American
- 4 Revolution to Operation Desert Storm, I think it's
- 5 important to show that this is a significant cultural
- 6 historic site downtown.
- 7 So, again, I think tying into military and
- 8 heritage tourism initiatives and the various partners,
- 9 including Sandra Tanner with Virginia Tourism
- 10 Corporation, who is currently working with the town of
- 11 Halifax Department of Historic Resources, since we are a
- 12 community district affiliate, we want to look at
- 13 strategic plans to increase visitation. And we think the
- war memorial, clearly, is one that is significant not
- only to the Town of Halifax but is catapult since 1777 to
- 16 the entirety of Halifax County.
- 17 The last thing I did just want to provide,
- and I do understand staff's recommendation with regard to
- 19 looking at something that is primarily a VDOT funded
- 20 project, these are enhancements to improve accessibility
- 21 to the war memorial in addition to the courthouse, once
- 22 it's completed. This will actually be things that inc --
- 23 are ADA compliant accessibility issues and then, also, we
- 24 call street-scaping, but that is also to put in the war
- 25 memorial, I think in the context of the overall downtown

- project, which has been an investment with the department 1 of housing community development and community 3 development project grants, EPA grants and various funding sources. 5 We've invested close to \$2,000,000 in the 6 earlier phases. That's grant money for plannings on 7 construction. And that's also reflected \$890,000 in 8 local government match. This is the entirety of the 9 project in downtown for which this one project is a phase and a very vital phase, I think. 10 11 And I think most important, too, we've seen 12 a tremendous amount of private investment has come as 13 result of these phrase improvements. Look at that as 14 close to match of 2.2 million dollars in private investments as far as companies investing and 15 16 rehabilitating their buildings in the downtown. 17 And I think the way that we would like to 18 look at the committee's approach on this is really 19 looking at the way the -- thanks to the Southside 20 Economic Development Committee funding our -- eventually 21 our boat landing project. Numerous funding partners 22 involved with that project. 23 Certainly, the amount of support in terms
- 25 reach of the Roanoke River Basin Association and Virginia

24

of studies that would have been conducted for the upper

- 1 Tourism Corporation to look at what the recreation and
- 2 visitor numbers can produce, we did see that was
- 3 approximately a 29 percent investment from the Southside
- 4 Economic Development Committee for that project. We are
- 5 asking for 27 percent. So that \$179,000, of course,
- 6 represents only 10 percent of the overall allocation for
- 7 Halifax County.
- 8 But I do appreciate the committee allowing
- 9 me to have an opportunity to speak briefly, and I'll be
- 10 happy to work with the staff going forward.
- 11 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Any questions or comments
- for the committee member? Okay. Thank you for being
- 13 here today.
- MR. ESPY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 15 MR. OWENS: I just believe that we could
- work with the Town of Halifax and get the date that we
- need to testify to, and I'd like to make a motion to
- 18 approve.
- 19 DELEGATE WRIGHT: A motion.
- DELEGATE EDMUNDS: This project has come a
- 21 long way on private funds, and I think that grants can
- 22 take it most of the way, but allowing us to fund the
- 23 final miles of the peak of this with the lighting and the
- landscaping make this a project that much better, and I
- 25 would check on it.

| 1 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: Okay. Motion to second |
|----|---|
| 2 | any further discussion? |
| 3 | MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Chairman, speak to the |
| 4 | staff recommendation. Very frequently, as staff asked to |
| 5 | offer opinions, not just at how good or meritorious a |
| 6 | project is, but how to how well it fits into the |
| 7 | precedent that's been set by the commission, and the |
| 8 | guidelines of the program before us, and also to keep an |
| 9 | eye on what kind of precedence we set for future |
| 10 | applicants. |
| 11 | This project will beautify and make more |
| 12 | accessible the street-scapes of the Town of Halifax. The |
| 13 | challenge is we have not ever done this kind of |
| 14 | mainstream redevelopment project. In fact, we've said no |
| 15 | multiple times in the past to these sorts of projects. |
| 16 | If we say yes now, I guarantee you, you are going to have |
| 17 | a large line of towns before us asking us to re-do their |
| 18 | sidewalks, redo this signs, redo their street lights, |
| 19 | which will make those towns more attractive, but not is |
| 20 | in keeping with the priority set by the commission in |
| 21 | it's strategic plan or by this committee in its prior |
| 22 | votes in award decisions. |
| 23 | The case for the economic value of more |
| 24 | attractive sidewalks and street lights is thin. This is |
| 25 | and so while it is a good project on its own merits, |

- 1 it is not a good fit with the mission of this committee
- and this organization as they are understood by the
- 3 staff. And that is why the staff made a zero dollar
- 4 recommendation.
- I also, again, I'll caution you at your
- 6 next meeting will you see every town in Southside come to
- 7 you with a request to re-do their sidewalks and
- 8 crosswalks and lights and signs if we say yes here.
- 9 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Okay. Any further
- 10 questions? MR. Stanley?
- 11 SENATOR STANLEY: Maybe this is a question
- for the Town of Halifax, but have they attempted to
- 13 acquire Main Street USA funds? And there's Federal grant
- 14 program funds that allow for beautification, main streets
- 15 especially in unserved, underprivileged areas that have
- suffered economically. We've seen Bassett, Virginia
- apply for it, I think, obtaining those. Danville, I
- think, got some money for refurbishment of
- 19 their downtown.
- 20 Has that source been looked at before
- 21 coming to the Tobacco?
- MR. ESPY: Senator, thank you for the
- 23 question. We have, and that's why I try to give the
- 24 background of approximately two million dollars with the
- 25 CBG funds that had been used for not only planning but

- 1 also construction for developing future phases.
- 2 So I was trying to give a larger picture of
- 3 this, but I think as Delegate Edmunds described it, this
- 4 is sort of the last mile of this particular project.
- 5 And I do appreciate the director pointing
- 6 out that this may set a precedent for it. I do believe
- 7 we are requesting something that is actually set
- 8 specifically to the war memorial site itself. It does
- 9 provide, and will provide, better access to that cultural
- 10 historic tourism site, as well as courthouse when that
- 11 site is completed.
- 12 That actually is something, I think, is
- unique to the request here in town only because it is two
- 14 major cultural historic sites to generate major
- 15 visitation to town.
- 16 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Any further questions?
- 17 SENATOR STANLEY: I know you get CBG. Did
- 18 you apply for and receive from Main Street USA?
- 19 MR. ESPY: We are an affiliate of Main
- 20 Street Community and Virginia Main Street. We just
- 21 started in terms of -- we had a partnership for 13 years
- 22 with the Halifax Village Association to develop more of a
- 23 Virginia Main Street approach. So as a commercial
- 24 district affiliate, we have not made applications up to
- 25 this point because we did not have that status up until

- 1 two years ago when we started working on our Main Street
- 2 approach.
- 3 DELEGATE MARSHALL: So that was a no?
- 4 MR. ESPY: That was a no.
- 5 SENATOR STANLEY: You are eligible to do
- 6 that.
- 7 MR. ESPY: We will be eligible, I think,
- 8 once we show that we have satisfied the commercial
- 9 district affiliate basics for Virginia Main Street.
- 10 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Okay. Further questions?
- 11 Delegate Marshall?
- 12 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Ouestion. Is that
- 13 timeframe that if you did apply, how long does it take to
- apply to get the money?
- 15 MR. ESPY: And, Delegate, I appreciate your
- question. I wouldn't be able to give you an answer. We
- are in a pressed timeframe right now with the VDOT
- funding, because these are actually two VDOT projects
- 19 coming together; one a roadway improvement project. This
- 20 is not just a beautification project. This is a project
- 21 that's a smart scale awarded the -- part of a 6-year
- 22 improvement plan, and that is actually merging with what
- 23 had been multiple applications for street-scapers, for
- 24 enhancement project through VDOT.
- 25 So the Halifax Board of supervisors is

- 1 actually going to vote next week. They had taken the
- 2 recommendation of the war memorial advisory committee,
- 3 which is a citizen-based community with many heritage
- 4 organizations. Part of that is to make donation of the
- 5 needed turning radius improvement for the right-of-way.
- 6 So I think that's one issue we have in front of us.
- 7 VDOT will probably have this project up for
- 8 bids by the end of the calendar year so that they can
- 9 accept construction bids by, I think, April of 2020.
- 10 We want to work with, also, the war
- 11 memorial, to make sure no construction would start until
- 12 after Memorial Day.
- 13 So, again, there has been a great deal of
- input and expectation from the entire community about
- 15 seeing these improvements occur at this war memorial
- 16 site.
- 17 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Ms. Byron.
- 18 DELEGATE BYRON: I'd like to make a
- 19 substitute motion. It seems like some things are a
- 20 little bit premature. There might be some other
- 21 resources that you could reach out to. I know of Alta
- 22 Visa, the Main Street. Couple areas in my district that,
- 23 if you table this, and would allow them -- since we are
- 24 not going to do it until next spring anyway, allow them
- 25 to reach out to some of those resources first and then

- 1 come back to us.
- 2 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Okay. Do I have a
- 3 second?
- 4 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Second.
- 5 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Motion to delay, second.
- 6 Table this motion until -- what date?
- 7 DELEGATE BYRON: The next Southside meeting
- 8 would be January or whatever. Give them time to apply.
- 9 SENATOR STANLEY: Can I just ask a question
- 10 real quick?
- 11 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Yes.
- 12 SENATOR STANLEY: Am I correct that bidding
- 13 starts January 2020 for some of the work VDOT does, but
- then it starts March 2020. Then you are going to have a
- 15 year window putting this all together, a year, to March
- 16 2020; is that correct?
- 17 MS. ESPY: Actually, we are putting this
- 18 together now so that this match would be to help the
- 19 project that is going forward currently with right-of-way
- and the bid.
- 21 And, again, if I can qualify, you know, the
- 22 seeking other funds, I think what I'm trying to
- 23 demonstrate is actually the Town of Halifax is working in
- 24 partnership with the county, looked at various grants
- over time in addition to Southside Development.

- So -- but I think this is why we saw this
 opportunity particularly for the impact for -- in
 military areas site, cultural site provided to the town.
- 4 DELEGATE WRIGHT: We've got a motion and
- 5 second on the substitute motion to table Grant Number
- 6 3581 until our January meeting. All in favor. Let me
- 7 know by saying aye. (Ayes) All opposed? Motion
- 8 carries.
- 9 SENATOR STANLEY: To delay the motion.
- 10 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Right.
- 11 SENATOR STANLEY: Okay. Next one is 3579,
- 12 Nottoway. Anyone here from Nottoway that would like to
- 13 speak to this?
- 14 SENATOR RUFF: Mr. Chairman, considering
- 15 the fact there is no one here from Nottoway, I move that
- this be tabled to the January meeting.
- 17 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Got a motion and a second
- to table until the January meeting. All in favor say
- 19 aye. (Ayes) Okay. Motion carries. Grant 3579 is
- 20 tabled also to our January meeting.
- 21 The next grant we have is 3580, Old
- 22 Dominion Agricultural Foundation, amount of \$258,500.
- 23 MR. MILLS: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that
- 24 someone from the foundation have an opportunity to come
- 25 up and speak.

| 1 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: If you will please come |
|----|---|
| 2 | by and get the mic, take it to the podium. |
| 3 | MR. HARRIS: Sure. |
| 4 | DELEGATE MARSHALL: My name is John Harris. |
| 5 | I'm the executive director with the Old Dominion |
| 6 | Agricultural Foundation, who's the owner of the Old |
| 7 | Dominion Agricultural Complex. |
| 8 | I'd like to make a couple of points just |
| 9 | from listening this morning. One of the points is if you |
| 10 | refer back to the application, we have went to great |
| 11 | lengths to work with DRF, who has they have a regional |
| 12 | foundation. It's the Danville Regional Foundation. And |
| 13 | I'm going to bring out that they have already done a very |
| 14 | extensive study with farmers, with restaurants, with the |
| 15 | school system, with other producers that would, |
| 16 | basically, through their health collaborative, their |
| 17 | community food network says, yes, an aggregation center |
| 18 | and an aggregation facility is absolutely a part of our |
| 19 | region's needs. |
| 20 | However, I do want to go to the point that |
| | |

However, I do want to go to the point that
we have already moved forward with many meetings and with
farmers, with businesses, with organizations to try to
fulfill the fact that this is not a building project.

This is a -- buildings that are already in existence. We
want to fill them up. I think the economic impact of

- 1 that, for us we are not here to manage the independent
- 2 businesses that would be filled up there. We are part of
- 3 the economic benefit that would allow for those
- 4 businesses to come there.
- 5 If -- that's really my second point is that
- 6 this is a moving target, of course, but among everything,
- 7 as Sarah pointed out, this would allow for us to -- as
- 8 Sarah Capps pointed out, this would allow for us also to
- 9 have a better access to the whole facility. We have
- 10 169-and-a-half acres at the facility. Only a small
- 11 portion of that is developed at this point. That access
- 12 points and that road frontage is extremely important to
- 13 us it's over time.
- The last point I'd have to make is this is
- 15 time sensitive. These buildings are up for sale. They
- 16 are under contract. They will be sold to somebody, and
- 17 we would like to be the ones to make sure that this is
- 18 all part of our complex.
- 19 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Ready for comment?
- DELEGATE MARSHALL: Clarification, you call
- 21 for 2580. They are speaking about 2582. So let's be
- 22 make sure.
- MR. HARRIS: Sorry.
- 24 MR. MILLS: 25 80. No. No. I'm
- 25 sorry. 3582.

- 1 MR. FEINMAN: It's reversed on the page
- 2 from the --
- 3 SENATOR STANLEY: Never doubt. Never
- 4 doubt.
- 5 MS. CAPPS: 2582 is correct.
- 6 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Mr. Harris is referring
- 7 to 3582.
- 8 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Okay. Go ahead and make
- 9 a verbal back to that --
- 10 DELEGATE BYRON: Mr. Chairman, is 3582 is
- 11 the 25 -- 100,000.
- MR. SHELTON: So just swap.
- 13 DELEGATE WRIGHT: There is one being
- 14 discussed and one being considered 3582.
- 15 MR. FEINMAN: They got transposed on the
- 16 printout is what happened.
- 17 DELEGATE WRIGHT: All right. Heard the
- 18 testimony so far. Okay. Any further comments?
- 19 MR. FEINMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I may be
- 20 able to add a little clarity.
- DELEGATE WRIGHT: I mean the people up
- there. Any further comments?
- 23 MR. SIDES: I'm Greg Sides. I'm an
- 24 assistant county administrator for Pittsylvania County.
- I just want to make it clear Pittsylvania County fully

- 1 supports the project. We've worked with the foundation,
- 2 the fact that it draws from Southside allocation from the
- 3 county. We think that the Old Dominion Ag Foundation
- 4 contributes greatly to our overall development plans for
- 5 Pittsylvania County in a lot of different ways. This
- 6 looks like a unique opportunity that's become available
- 7 to capitalize on what's already out there and make it
- 8 even better. So I just want to say that the county fully
- 9 supports it.
- 10 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Any questions?
- 11 DELEGATE MARSHALL: So this is to Mr. -- I
- 12 understand this property has been appraised?
- MR. HARRIS: Yes.
- 14 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Speak to that.
- 15 MR. HARRIS: The appraisal, both parcels of
- 16 the property have been appraised. They are appraised at
- 17 slightly more than what we are putting in the contract
- for the purchase for. The four buildings totally
- 19 appraised at -- I'm going to have to do this off the top
- of my head. I got my book here if you want to know the
- 21 exact appraisal. Hold on a second.
- 22 DELEGATE MARSHALL: I've got it right here.
- 23 I'll help you out.
- MR. HARRIS: Okay. Help me out.
- 25 DELEGATE MARSHALL: So one appraisal is

- 1 341,000. The other one appraised 190,000.
- 2 MR. HARRIS: That's correct.
- 3 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Thank you.
- 4 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I think we have a couple
- 5 questions or comments.
- 6 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Chairman, so the staff's
- 7 view on this, and reason there was a recommendation to
- 8 table, if you've seen the staff is not particularly shy
- 9 about recommending zero dollars when we don't believe
- 10 that a project fits in our award categories or when it is
- 11 not sufficiently meritorious.
- Here it was our view that there probably is
- sufficient public benefit from the acquisition of these
- buildings, and the uses that had been proposed, but we
- 15 wanted more documentation to be sure before we advised
- 16 you-all to spend this money.
- 17 What has come to our attention since then
- is that these properties need to be purchased by the
- 19 foundation or someone else before your-all's next
- 20 meeting. So, unfortunately, a table recommendation here
- 21 became a recommendation to kill it because these
- 22 properties need to be purchased by November 21st or not.
- I think, in keeping with the spirit of the
- 24 original staff recommendations, what the staff could
- 25 undertake, if the committee were so inclined, is a motion

| 1 | to approve this purchase, provided staff can be shown |
|----|---|
| 2 | sufficient public benefit from the proposed uses between |
| 3 | now and the purchase date. |
| 4 | SENATOR STANLEY: Mr. Chairman? |
| 5 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: Stanley. |
| 6 | SENATOR STANLEY: So then my question would |
| 7 | be how do you create that in a real estate contact where |
| 8 | you have a contingency, say, we are putting in the offer |
| 9 | that's this amount contingent upon people you haven't met |
| 10 | yet that think there is some public benefit? |
| 11 | MR. FEINMAN: Well, I think we need to act |
| 12 | swiftly, what I would say, Senator. Get staff meeting |
| 13 | together to recommendations with some speed and make that |
| 14 | decision in the next couple of weeks. |
| 15 | SENATOR STANLEY: So there would be no |
| 16 | contingency that the contract would have to be would |
| 17 | not put in a contract until those releases were |
| 18 | MR. FEINMAN: The other opportunity would |
| 19 | be to come back before you-all in a brief meeting during |
| 20 | your full commission meetings in a couple of weeks. |
| 21 | SENATOR STANLEY: Mr. Chairman? |
| 22 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: Go ahead. |
| 23 | SENATOR STANLEY: Mr. Harris? |
| 24 | MR. HARRIS: Yes. |
| 25 | SENATOR STANLEY: You kind of said in the |

- beginning, kind of ran through it, is this property --
- 2 has it been registered with a real estate broker? Is
- 3 there a sign out front? Is it on MLS?
- 4 MR. HARRIS: At this point --
- 5 SENATOR STANLEY: -- pocket sale.
- 6 MR. HARRIS: At this moment in time we have
- 7 -- we are holding those contracts. They are holding them
- 8 in hold.
- 9 SENATOR STANLEY: Mr. Chairman? Has the
- 10 property been listed or is this a pocket listing where
- 11 you are going to be given the first right of refusal?
- 12 MR. HARRIS: This is a pocket listing we're
- 13 going to get --
- 14 SENATOR STANLEY: It's not on the market.
- 15 When do you anticipate, Mr. Harris, that this will be
- available for sale to the public? And that is to say,
- 17 when the owner says, I had enough of you. I want to see
- 18 what I can get for it out in the open market?
- MR. HARRIS: I would imagine this would be
- open the public by November.
- DELEGATE WRIGHT: Mr. Stanley?
- 22 SENATOR STANLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 23 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Cross-examination.
- 24 SENATOR STANLEY: So, Mr. Chairman, my
- 25 question is, so we have a little bit of time for us to

have some assurances that this is good thing, not a bad 1 thing. We are not wasting Tobacco funds on something. 3 It's not that I think it's a bad thing. The Ag complex is amazing. But to make sure that we are getting some 5 assurances here, we have maybe the month of October where 6 this pocket listing and assurance right now or at least a 7 contract offer agreeable to the seller is going to be 8 with in 15 to 20 days and. 9 And then, Mr. Feinman, my question would be can your staff work with them to make those assurances 10 11 occur before our meeting before November? MR. FEINMAN: We can, I believe. We have 12 13 about a week-and-a-half, which will require some 14 scrambling from the applicant and some scrambling from us, but I think we can get gather sufficient 15 16 documentation to make full recommendation. And we can do 17 a 15 or 20-minute meeting of this committee at the full 18 commission meetings on the 9th for you-all to hear our 19 recommendation. 20 SENATOR STANLEY: Mr. Chairman? DELEGATE WRIGHT: Ouestion? 21 22 MR. SHELTON: Go ahead. 2.3 DELEGATE WRIGHT: No. I recognized you. 24 MR. SHELTON: Let me disclose, obviously,

that I will have to abstain from this vote, because I do

- 1 sit on this committee. But I would like to speak to it.
- One question Senator Stanley brought up, to
- 3 the best of my knowledge, Director Harris, the foundation
- 4 was able to take a short-term option on these properties;
- 5 is that correct?
- 6 MR. HARRIS: We have the short-term option
- 7 through November.
- 8 MR. SHELTON: As soon as that's over with,
- 9 both of them supplied, both of them immediately, that's
- 10 the end of the hold. They would immediately go public,
- 11 to a realtor.
- 12 But I think what I want to speak to here,
- like I said, I'm stepping away from the fact that I'm on
- that board, but I'd like to speak as a tax payer and
- someone in agriculture in Pittsylvania County and
- 16 Southside. And everybody knows how depressed that whole
- 17 economy is right now. I think we are getting in the
- 18 weeds a little bit on this. So I feel like we're
- 19 scrutinizing this as if it was an application to the ag
- 20 business community where we are looking for a short-term
- 21 quantification of the existing buildings on this site.
- 22 And I think the Director Harris, and the
- 23 rest of this board, has done an excellent job of trying
- 24 to put together the most comprehensive program that they
- 25 can to utilize in the short-term as much benefit of the

- 1 existing structures there that are.
- 2 And I feel like this is something that will
- 3 grow and it will come. But I think what we are missing
- 4 here is the opportunity of the commercial assemblage of
- 5 the 29 corridor is very bleak. And I think we have
- 6 Pittsylvania County right here that is recognizing that
- 7 there is 150-plus residual acres that has been shown many
- 8 times, because when we have industry, potential industry
- 9 with agricultural inclinations, they want to see this
- 10 property because they recognize that this is the hub, not
- 11 just of Pittsylvania County, but for the surrounding
- 12 areas of counties in the regions.
- There are two potential rail siding sites,
- and I believe those are two of only three that the county
- would have connection to in the county.
- So you are talking about feed
- 17 manufacturing, grain distributions, some large bales of
- 18 construction that would not fit maybe right in the
- 19 proximity of the City of Danville, and wouldn't be
- agriculture inclined, needs to go there to access the 29.
- 21 The safety in and out, the ability to build further
- 22 access and utilize that is going to pass if we do not
- 23 support this.
- 24 And my position on it is Pittsylvania
- 25 County has recognized that agriculture is still our

- leading industry; that this is the hub of where
- 2 agriculture expansion, not just in Pittsylvania County,
- 3 but in your area is going to be. And I actually I do
- 4 think that if we miss this opportunity, I think the Old
- 5 Dominion Complex will find a way, because that is the
- 6 history that they've done.
- 7 But I think we are going to pass on our
- 8 first time opportunity to enter into a great partnership
- 9 with Pittsylvania County for economic development. And I
- 10 just don't think we need to see that with the county
- 11 saying these are our allocations, we believe in the
- 12 concept, we believe in the project. I don't think we
- 13 need to dally around on this, on details of whether
- somebody who is going to store cabbage and (inaudible).
- 15 I think we're getting in the weeds on that
- and need to see the big picture.
- 17 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Thank you for your
- 18 comments.
- 19 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Let me follow-up a
- 20 little bit on what Mr. Shelton said. I'm going to ask
- 21 Matt to come up. And Matt, I understand that we just had
- 22 a company look at this property last week. I know you
- 23 couldn't tell us what company it is, but so this site is
- 24 being shown?
- 25 MR. ROWE: We are marketing the site

- 1 exactly as Mr. Shelter said. It is one of three
- 2 properties in the county. I guess here in the next
- 3 request that would take off one of those others, who
- 4 would then be one of two, the other being the mega site.
- 5 Yes.
- To answer your question a little bit
- 7 further, Delegate Marshall, obviously, this group and all
- 8 of Southern Virginia and Southwest Virginia is putting a
- 9 heavy emphasis on industrialized hemp. And one of the
- 10 key things that industrialized hemp is looking for is a
- 11 rail access, because they're trying to rail as far as
- 12 finished goods out into the markets. So we are seeking a
- 13 lot of that use.
- 14 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Please identify yourself.
- 15 MR. ROWE: Oh, I'm sorry. Matt Rowe,
- 16 director of economic development, Pittsylvania County.
- 17 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Thank you. Mr. Stanley,
- 18 questions?
- 19 SENATOR STANLEY: No, just a statement.
- MR. MILLS: Are you done?
- 21 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Got a question?
- MR. MILLS: I got a motion.
- DELEGATE EDMUNDS: I second.
- 24 MR. MILLS: Motion to approve \$258,000 for
- 25 the foundation.

- 1 DELEGATE WRIGHT: A motion and a second. 2 Now, any discussion? 3 SENATOR STANLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that Mr. Shelton understands that there is a 5 balance in all of us must undertake because, look, I'm 6 one of the biggest fans of the agriculture center. I 7 think our farmers, our ag, our lumber industry, our 8 timber industry is what's kept us from being on the 9 bottom, and have employed people and brought tax money 10 here. That's not really the issue. 11 And I believe that this piece of property, 12 I mean, if I had to say do I believe in something, I 13 mean, yeah, it's a leap of faith, because everything 14 you-all have done has been successful. Especially Mr. 15 Harris stepped in that role, done an outstanding job. 16 But I think all of us need to recognize 17 when staff is doing it, let's say, table this, take a 18 slower approach, slow down just a little bit, it's not in 19 a negative sense of no, you just can't have what you 20 want. It's not sort of taking away candy from a child. But rather we have a fiscal responsibility as well to the 21 22 tax payer money. And that fiscal responsibility 23 sometimes makes us take a short course, but not lose the
- 25 So when I ask these questions, we've got an

24

opportunity at all.

- option until November 1, we can get more answers, which I
- 2 know I believe what the answers will be, I will support
- 3 this project. I think our staff needs -- not sit there
- 4 and think, if we just beat 'em up and run them over; that
- 5 there is a real reason for this project. There is a real
- 6 reason to support this project, but because of our
- 7 fiduciary responsibility to have the facts on our side.
- 8 As well, Mr. Chairman, because, quite
- 9 frankly, my concern is if the elections are held on the
- 5th, and there is a change, that this commission may be
- in peril of doing future things. So we have to
- demonstrate fiscal responsibility to both sides of aisle.
- 13 So I believe that this -- our staff is doing the prudent
- 14 thing.
- 15 And especially when we've got a little bit
- of window, look, nobody can take this property away with
- 17 executed option until November 1. I think it was
- reasonable to say, let's get together the piece we are
- missing and make sure that we are all comfortable doing
- that, and we will not have crossed the road.
- 21 If I believe that -- if all of a sudden and
- fools rush in and the price goes up and we've lost an
- 23 opportunity, then I would certainly believe in that
- position, and I would say, well, let's just go with a
- 25 leap of faith. Prudence.

- 1 It's nothing against Old Dominion ag
- 2 companies. It's not. It's what we are here for.
- 3 And so sometimes we all want to rush
- 4 through. It's going to be great. But this commission
- 5 has proven on more than one occasion that when we rush
- 6 through the door, we make mistakes. That's what I'm
- 7 looking out for now.
- Now, having said that, I have no choice but
- 9 to support a project like this because I support the ag
- 10 segment. But I don't think we should run over the staff
- 11 with your hard work and saying we just need a little more
- 12 time to be sure. Always the way to go.
- Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 14 DELEGATE WRIGHT: We got a motion and
- 15 second. Still open for discussion. Anyone like to
- 16 comment? Now is the time to do it.
- MR. OWENS: For clarity, if I may, Mr.
- 18 Chairman, we are just going to -- we are voting on a
- 19 motion to give --
- MR. MILLS: correct.
- 21 DELEGATE WRIGHT: The motion is to approve
- 22 the grant for 3582 in the amount \$258,500.
- 23 MR. OWENS: And the recommendation from the
- 24 staff was -- what it was?
- 25 MR. FEINMAN: The recommendation from the

- 1 staff is we are confident they wouldn't be overpaying.
- 2 We agree to be approving appraisal, agree it would open
- 3 up new access, but what we haven't seen is a specific
- 4 plan for usage of the buildings, value for the access of
- 5 that plan. I think we can get together. It sounds like
- 6 there is a DRF study applied to that, sounds like some
- 7 other opportunity for discussion and further evaluation
- 8 of what the ag center plans to do with the locations.
- 9 But our concern was it isn't quite enough
- 10 for us to say, well, you know, it finishes out the
- 11 property and we know that we are not overpaying for it.
- 12 So just give it to us. We promise we are going to do
- something good with it. It was a little thin from the
- 14 staff's perspective.
- 15 I think we can put that together for
- 16 you-all. In a week we can have a short meeting in this
- 17 committee at the full commission meeting on the 9th, and
- you guys can act on what we discover between now and
- 19 then.
- 20 DELEGATE WRIGHT: All right. You've heard
- 21 the comments, heard all the discussion. Now, all the
- 22 questions. All in favor of approving Grant Number 3582
- going to be by saying yes. (Yeses) Any opposed?
- MR. SHELTON: Abstain.
- DELEGATE WRIGHT: Okay. The motion passes.

| 1 | MR. HARRIS: Thank you. |
|----|---|
| 2 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: Next 3580 also |
| 3 | Pittsylvania County. |
| 4 | DELEGATE MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, the staff |
| 5 | approved the requested amount of the what was asked. |
| 6 | And so since somebody was just called said (Brief |
| 7 | pause) So the reason I asked it be pulled out, I think |
| 8 | the gentleman from Pittsylvania County would like to |
| 9 | address maybe the last sentence in the staff |
| 10 | recommendations. |
| 11 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: Introduce yourself. |
| 12 | MR. SIDES: Yes. Greg Sides, assistant |
| 13 | county administrator of Pittsylvania County. I'll do the |
| 14 | general comments, but Mr. Rowe can provide details. |
| 15 | Certainly want to thank staff and their |
| 16 | positive comments on this project. What we are proposing |
| 17 | is site improvements. Very detailed in the application. |
| 18 | It's a lot of grading as well as concrete removal to make |
| 19 | the site usable. |
| 20 | But I want to point out that all of this |
| 21 | we're speaking of is in Hurt, Town of Hurt, the |
| 22 | Burlington Mill site. So it's a portion of the county |
| 23 | that we are not oftentimes in front of you for any |
| 24 | project. So we are happy to see something happening. |
| 25 | The only comment or the only issue in the |

- 1 recommendation that causes us a little bit of concern is
- 2 the language that refers to the negotiating a repayment
- 3 plan.
- 4 And we, in our application, I don't know if
- 5 we are able to transmit the full details of the
- 6 transaction, but for this particular project in Hurt,
- 7 it's a competitive negotiation with trying to lure this
- 8 company here. They have a presence in another state that
- 9 is competing against us for the facility. So we had to
- 10 put a pretty robust city package together. That involved
- 11 Pittsylvania County financing the purchase of the land.
- 12 So we already have a loan situation there where we had to
- 13 buy the property.
- 14 We also have enterprise zone and cash out
- of -- from Pittsylvania County. We had capital
- investment grants that involve tax grants or wavering of
- 17 revenues coming to Pittsylvania County. So it's not a
- automatic and quick revenue generator for Pittsylvania
- 19 County.
- 20 It is 24 million dollars of investment and
- 21 65 jobs, which is critical and very important, but we
- 22 feel like in light of the other applications you've
- looked at today where the recommendation has been a
- 24 certain grant amount for up to 50 percent of the project,
- 25 we would appreciate similar type motion for this project.

- 1 It is well under 50 percent. I think my quick math is
- 2 about 27 percent of our local money towards the overall
- 3 project, with the rest coming from the private sector.
- 4 We understand the director's concerns about
- 5 being careful and working with a private company. We
- 6 certainly don't want to back tradition in ridge (ph) a
- 7 private company. We think that can be addressed, the
- 8 fact that staff already points out in the comments that
- 9 if in the future this site is improved with tobacco
- 10 assets would be transferred to the company, we would have
- 11 to go through the Tobacco Commission to get permits
- 12 approved. So we think at that point we could address the
- drawbacks and contract requirements, the protection the
- 14 Tobacco Commission is seeking.
- But we would prefer to that have prosecutor
- language about negotiating a prepayment plan to be
- 17 reconsidered.
- And, Mr. Rowe, do you have anything else to
- 19 add?
- 20 MR. ROWE: Sure. Mr. Chairman, Matt Rowe
- 21 director of economic development of Pittsylvania County,
- 22 Virginia.
- Obviously, as you can see the staff report.
- 24 This is a very credit worthy company. It's a company
- 25 that has been in business for quite some time. In the

- job numbers that are there, obviously, we do a letter of
- 2 intent with the company. Those are the very minimum as
- 3 far as for one shift. So they are right now working on
- 4 finalized contracts. Those numbers will likely double or
- 5 even triple, which is typical for the industry that they
- 6 are in.
- 7 But compared to the Green Field site in the
- 8 other state, we know this is what is needed, ultimately,
- 9 to put Virginia first and to bring this type of
- 10 investment to an area that has been neglected for quite
- 11 some time from investment.
- 12 So I think Mr. Sides did a great job
- 13 summing up overall deal, but if any additional details,
- 14 I'll certainly fill them in.
- 15 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Yes. Question. Is
- this a part the river site?
- 17 MR. ROWE: It is, Delegate Marshall. It's
- 18 the largest regional facility regarding by land area in
- 19 the State. We did that for the whole purpose for
- 20 investing in the site.
- 21 DELEGATE MARSHALL: What localities are
- 22 involved?
- 23 MR. ROWE: It's the City of Danville,
- 24 Pittsylvania County, and the Town of Hurt.
- 25 DELEGATE MARSHALL: So those three

- 1 localities share the property taxes and --
- 2 MR. ROWE: They will share, yes, they will
- 3 share all the revenue, which is what everybody usually
- 4 focuses on but, of course, also going to share the cost.
- 5 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Thank you.
- 6 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Any further comment? Has
- 7 everyone responded to that?
- 8 MR. FEINMAN: Mr. Chairman, our concern
- 9 here, as always, is making sure that we are not creating
- 10 public accesses that are then immediately turned over to
- a private entity without the public being made whole.
- 12 In conversation with representatives from
- 13 Pittsylvania County ahead of this meeting, I think we
- came up with a strategy that may work.
- 15 This committee, and other committees of the
- 16 commission, have in the past instructed staff to create a
- 17 trough-like agreement such that should the promised
- 18 project not materialize, the claw-back (ph) not just of
- 19 any associate trough, but also of this grant could be
- 20 worked into the project.
- 21 We also need to make sure that there is a
- 22 third party developer, that the company that is moving in
- would not be the company that would be possessing and
- 24 improving the site in the interim; that they were a party
- 25 to that agreement so that we could make sure there was no

- 1 situation where only the county would be left holding the 2 baq. 3 I think we can do that in our grant 4 agreement by making it a three party agreement and ensure 5 that we both have a claw-back for the commissions 6 investment should the promised jobs not materialize, and 7 the security interest is protected throughout. 8 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Detective Marshall? 9 DELEGATE MARSHALL: So, Evan, how would the wording of that motion -- would it be just like a 10 11 trough-like agreement be in place of this or --12 MR. FEINMAN: I think if you were to 13 instruct the staff to create a trough-like claw-back, as 14 well as ensure that all relevant parties were included in 15 the ultimate agreement, so that, in essence, the same
- 19 remained in public control.

 20 We'd make sure that we were not at any

 21 point simply improving an industrial site for a third

 22 party, because we've all seen -- we've got a lot of near

 23 misses on great economic development projects. I'm

 24 passed the point in my time in it where I get really

 25 excited when we just see a prospect anymore. Until there

corporation, which would be the developer, would be

responsible for either paying back this site improvement

or turning the land back over to the county so that it

16

17

18

- is ink on paper, don't know if it's going to be there.
- 2 We feel good about this project. I know
- 3 Matt feels good about the project. He's seen things slip
- 4 through his fingers, too. No disservice to Matt or the
- 5 crew in Pittsylvania County. They do great work.
- 6 But you don't have a bird in the hand until
- 7 it's all the way in your land.
- 8 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Motion?
- 9 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Well, I think I did.
- 10 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I know you did.
- 11 DELEGATE MARSHALL: So, Evan, my motion is
- 12 to accept the staff recommendation on --
- 13 MR. FEINMAN: 3580.
- 14 DELEGATE MARSHALL: 3580. And we will
- 15 delete the last line of the staff recommendations and add
- 16 with a trough-like agreement being placed.
- 17 MR. FEINMAN: And adequate protection for
- 18 the commission security interest.
- DELEGATE WRIGHT: We can go back on the
- 20 record and have what you see it as a balance of that.
- DELEGATE MARSHALL: We got more paperwork.
- 22 So that's my motion.
- 23 DELEGATE WRIGHT: As long as you are
- 24 satisfied in what we have. As long as it's clear what
- 25 the amendment actually is.

| 1 | MR. OWENS: First of all, the second? |
|----|---|
| 2 | DELEGATE MARSHALL: Yes. |
| 3 | MR. OWENS: I second. And then, can you |
| 4 | repeat what you said? |
| 5 | SENATOR RUFF: Yeah, what? |
| 6 | MR. FEINMAN: The motion would be, as I |
| 7 | understand it, to approve the staff recommendation |
| 8 | funding subject to a trough-like agreement that includes |
| 9 | all three relevant parties as well as an adequate |
| 10 | protection for the commission's security interests in the |
| 11 | property. |
| 12 | MR. OWENS: Okay. |
| 13 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: Everyone understand what |
| 14 | we are doing? Any questions or comments? If not, ready |
| 15 | for a motion. |
| 16 | DELEGATE MARSHALL: That was a motion. |
| 17 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: He doesn't make the |
| 18 | motion. |
| 19 | DELEGATE MARSHALL: I made my motion and he |
| 20 | clarified. |
| 21 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: You need to |
| 22 | DELEGATE MARSHALL: So I make the motion. |
| 23 | MR. OWENS: Second. |
| 24 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: Got a motion to do what |
| | |

Evan just said, and a second. Everyone in favor say aye.

25

| 1 | (Ayes) Opposed say no. Motion carries. All right. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Next I think we got one thing on the |
| 3 | agenda, other business for Sarah. |
| 4 | MS. CAPPS: No. |
| 5 | DELEGATE WRIGHT: Any other business to |
| 6 | come before the committee? Any public comment? If not, |
| 7 | we're adjourned. |
| 8 | (Whereupon the hearing concluded.) |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| | |

25

| 1 | COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA AT LARGE: |
|-----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | I, THERESA J. PATA, a Court Reporter and Notary |
| 4 | Public for the Commonwealth of Virginia at Large, do |
| 5 | certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate |
| 6 | transcript of the stenographic notes of the proceedings |
| 7 | on the date and place hereinbefore set forth. |
| 8 | I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither attorney |
| 9 | nor counsel for, nor related to or employed by, any of |
| LO | the parties or attorneys to the action in which these |
| L1 | proceedings were taken, nor am I financially interested |
| L2 | in this case. |
| L3 | I FURTHER CERTIFY that no exhibits were given |
| L 4 | to me for safekeeping or to be submitted with the |
| L5 | transcript. |
| L 6 | Given under my hand this 14th day of |
| L7 | October 2019. |
| L8 | |
| L 9 | |
| | THERESA J. PATA |
| 20 | COURT REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC |
| | Notary Registration #7244306 |
| 21 | Expires July 31, 2021 |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |