MIDDLEBURG TOWN COUNCIL
Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes
Thursday, January 22, 2026

PENDING APPROVAL

PRESENT: Mayor Trowbridge M. Littleton
Vice Mayor Chris W. Bernard
Councilmember Pamela Curran
Councilmember J. Kevin Daly
Councilmember Deborah Scott Gallagher
Councilmember Chris Hersh (remote participation)
Councilmember C. Darlene Kirk
Councilmember Cindy C. Pearson

STAFF: Danny Davis, Town Manager
Martin Crim, Town Attorney
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk
Will Moore, Deputy Town Manager
Ali MacIntyre, Director of Business Development & Community Partnerships
Angela Fletcher, Finance Director/Town Treasurer

The Town Council of the Town of Middleburg, Virginia held their regular monthly meeting on Thursday, January 22, 2026 in the Town Hall Council Chambers, located at 10 West Marshall Street. Mayor Littleton led Council and those attending in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. The roll was called at 6:00 p.m. Councilmember Hersh advised that he was attending the meeting remotely from Colorado, as he was on vacation.

Public Hearing

Special Use 25-01: Professional Office on Street Level/First Floor – 11 E. Washington Street – Catherine P. Cherry

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded Council of their review of this application during their January 8th meeting, which included the opportunity to discuss it with the applicant. He reported that she confirmed earlier in the day that she did not plan to attend this meeting. Mr. Moore reviewed the history of the request. He reminded Council that the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation for denial of the permit based on citations from both the zoning ordinance related to the purpose of the C-2 District and conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan.

Megan Gallagher, 214 E. Marshall Street, spoke in support of the Planning Commission's recommendation for denial. She acknowledged that the professional office had been in place for seven or eight years; however, she opined that approving the application would set a precedent for something that was a mistake and would chip away at what the Town was trying to do. Ms. Gallagher noted that the Council limited real estate offices in the downtown core district and suggested this should extend to other kinds of offices.

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Vice Mayor Bernard opined that the decision was a straightforward one based on the Comp Plan and zoning ordinance. He further opined that this use was not appropriate for this location.

Councilmember Curran moved, seconded by Councilmember Daly, that Council deny SU 25-01 for the following reasons: the proposed office use at this location is inconsistent with the C-2 District's purpose to accommodate pedestrian oriented commercial activities.

Councilmember Hersh moved to make a friendly amendment to add that the proposed office use of this location is also inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's intention to increase vitality in the Town's central business district. The friendly amendment was accepted by Councilmembers Curran and Daly.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Bernard, Curran, Daly, Gallagher, Hersh, Kirk, and Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain: N/A
Absent: N/A
(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.) (on motion as amended)

Public Presentations

Asbury Church Restoration Schematic Design Plans

Town Clerk North reviewed the history of the project. She advised that with the acceptance of Commonwealth Preservation Group's report recommending the church be used as an interpretive site and a small meeting space, the Town issued Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for an architectural/engineering (AE) firm and construction management (CM) firm and ultimately engaged Glave & Holmes and Downey & Scott respectively, both of which were experienced and well respected firms. Ms. North noted that both firms worked on the Town Hall Project and that the Town was very happy with their services. She advised that Glave & Holmes would present the schematic design plan, which was essentially the first step in the design process toward developing construction documents. Ms. North explained that they were a big picture look at what was being recommended. She noted that following the presentation of the schematic design plans, Kevin Fallin of Downey & Scott would present the cost estimate for the project based on the schematic design. Ms. North introduced Susan Reed, of Glave & Holmes.

Susan Reed, Director of Historic Preservation for Glave & Holmes Architects, introduced the members of the design team who were present, as well as the structural engineer and mechanical/electrical/plumbing engineer. She reviewed what each member would present and advised that they would take questions at the end of the presentation.

Gibson Worsham, Architectural Historian for Glave & Holmes, reminded Council of the history of the Asbury Church. He reported that most of the improvements to the building were made in the 20th Century, including the addition of electric lights in 1923, some of which remained; the addition of a furnace and of opalescent glass windows in 1950; and, the construction of new restrooms and floors, the expansion of the pulpit platform, the replacement of the plaster ceiling with particle board and the application of cement stucco on the exterior of the building in 1973. Mr. Worsham advised that in the 1980s, the wood entry doors were replaced; the paneled door jambs were covered; and the southwest gallery stair to the balcony was replaced with a wider modern stair. He noted that the congregation left the building in 1994. Mr. Worsham reviewed the Town's stabilization efforts since it assumed ownership of the building, including the replacement of the roof, window repairs, and the addition of new cornice and downspouts. He advised that, based on the review of the building, Glave & Holmes recommended an interpretive date of between 1923 and 1950, which would allow for the removal of the restrooms and the 1980s accumulations in the front of the church, and the retainage of the electric light fixtures.

Nicolas Coile, Project Manager for Glave & Holmes, reported that the entire AE team visited the church to thoroughly review the interior and exterior. He advised that they immediately saw concerning items, including holes in the stone wall; a modern retaining wall that abruptly stopped; the cutting of one of the main structural beams that held up the gallery space when the modern stair was installed; the rear exterior wall, which was bowing; bowing rafters; and, modern post and kickers that changed how the entire building operated structurally. Mr. Coile explained that a lot of the point load was now on decorative columns, which was causing the columns to push out. He noted that this was what necessitated the cables that were recently added by the Town, as well as the diagonal bracing.

Kenneth Hill, Structural Engineer for TyLin, reported that during the site investigation, they found the need to rebuild and/or underpin the openings and bases of the walls in the cellar in order to provide for a continuous masonry wall down to suitable bearings. He noted that there appeared to be openings that were created for various mechanical and electrical equipment throughout the life of the building, as well as excavation that created a lower basement space. Mr. Hill advised that as to the walls, the need was relatively limited and would basically consist of the repointing of areas of damage to both the interior and exterior walls. He noted the bulging areas that needed to be repaired. Mr. Hill advised that the gallery/mezzanine level connection had acted as a diaphragm to the walls over time. He noted that the mortar between the masonry had deteriorated and advised that the wood bearing on the walls was no longer able to hold the wood into the wall. Mr. Hill noted the need to rebuild that in order to make the reattachment at the connection. He stressed that the interior columns were never designed to carry any of the roof load. Mr. Hill reported that the change in the load path, which placed additional load on the columns, was the reason for the bowing. He noted that the original roof was also undersized compared to the new one and opined that this was also why the bowing was occurring. Mr. Hill advised that given their age, the walls, mortar, and wood diaphragm were not able to hold the wall in place. He noted that the repairs to the interior columns would be limited to restoring the original load path. Mr. Hill explained that this, along with the attachment of the diaphragm to the walls, would address the bowing. He noted that some of the original wood lintels were in poor condition and needed to be replaced. Mr. Hill reported that the floor framing was in good condition and advised that the occupancy loading that existed was good for assembly loading. He advised that the occupancy loading for the gallery was reasonable. Mr. Hill recommended the new stair that was installed be removed and the primary structural support beam be reinstalled. He reported that as to the roof structure, the plan was to restore the original load path and noted that this would require the original under sizing to be reinforced. Mr. Hill explained that the newly installed posts that were transferring the load to the interior columns would be removed and reiterated that this was contributing to the bowing of the walls.

Mr. Coile reported that from an exterior standpoint, the metal roof, belfry, gutters, downspouts, and cornice were all in good condition. He advised that Glave & Holmes was recommending the painting of the wood components and the addition of appropriate exterior lighting that would not be attached to the building. Mr. Coile further advised that they were recommending the removal of the cement stucco coating, repairing the walls, and repainting the entire exterior in a historically sensitive color. He noted that they were also recommending the replacement of the modern sheathing on the east side, as well as the modern arched panel on the west side, with ones that were more historically appropriate. Mr. Coile advised that as to the windows, their goal was to keep as much historic material as possible and noted that they wanted to repair and consolidate the sashes, frames, and headers as much as possible, as well as replace all of the glazing putty, which was a typical maintenance item. He recommended the donor plaques be retained and the modern sill projections be reduced. Mr. Coile noted that most of the deterioration on the windows was the wood portions of the sills on the east side windows. He reported that as to the front doors, the goal was to create a historic reproduction of the original door and repair the existing historic door panels. Mr. Coile noted that one original historic door remained in the church. He advised that the basement door would be replaced so it could be secured, with one of a historically sensitive design.

Mr. Coile reported that as to accessibility, the recommendation was to connect the sidewalk and curb and to provide an ADA path from the public way to the leftmost front entry point of the building. He noted that completing the sidewalk and curb would allow for more parallel parking, some of which could be designated for handicapped parking. Mr. Coile advised that the slope of the sidewalk was shallow enough that handrails would not be needed. He noted that the curved path also created a space for the display of the historic bell from the church, as well as a garden. Mr. Coile advised that there would be a smooth transition from the sidewalk into the building through the reduction of the existing door threshold so it would comply with ADA code requirements. He noted that the replacement of the modern frame and door would provide for the width needed to be ADA compliant. Mr. Coile reported that the entry floor would be raised to be flush with the sanctuary. He advised that as to the restrooms, the existing ones would be removed, and a new ADA compliant restroom would be constructed that would be clad in the historic tongue and groove boards that would be saved. Mr. Coile noted that the existing window would be used to light the space and advised that translucent glass would be added to the interior to provide privacy.

Mr. Worsham reported that the interior rehabilitation would begin with the removal of the extraneous elements that were added in the late 20th century, including the paneled wall in front of the apse and the communion rail, which was very modern. He advised that the floor would be restored under the removed platform and noted that the original floor was still intact. Mr. Worsham recommended the removal of the modern sanctuary light fixtures, the removal of the existing restrooms and the vestibule. He suggested the removal of the late 20th century additions, including the things in the front of the church and the wainscotting. Mr. Worsham opined that much of these modern materials came from another church, as the original church did not contain wainscotting but rather, the walls were plastered to the floor. He reported that they were recommending the plaster throughout the building be patched and the rough texture preserved. Mr. Worsham advised that they were recommending the installation of operable interior storm windows and new beaded baseboards that would match the one that survived in the gallery. He noted that they were recommending the floors be cleaned, repaired where necessary, and refinished to match the original finish. Mr. Worsham recommended the addition of new drywall ceilings and insulation, unless it was cost prohibitive, in which case, they would recommend the ceiling be left open as an interim solution. He noted the additional elements that had been added to the chancel and advised that they were recommending they be removed and replaced with a simple raised platform and a step up on each side with a small handrail, and with two steps up to the apse. Mr. Worsham opined that these existed under the current floor. He recommended the repair to the tongue and groove boards in the apse. Mr. Worsham noted the remaining original gallery stair, which was architecturally sophisticated and historically significant, and recommended the repair to any floorboards that were out of sorts in the gallery. He advised Council that the recommendation was to restrict public access to the gallery. Mr. Worsham reiterated the recommendation to remove the modern, unsafe, and non-code compliant southeastern stair and advised that it could either be replaced with a stair that matched the remaining original one or it could be floored over in the short term, depending on the cost. He reiterated that the recommendation was to remove the 1980s light fixtures and suggested the one surviving fixture in the main sanctuary be restored and reinstalled. Mr. Worsham noted that the light in the apse was also original. He recommended sanctuary lights be installed in each corner of the gallery that matched the original one. Mr. Worsham suggested the addition of track lighting along each side of the building, both above and below the gallery, to light any interpretive panels. He displayed a 3D rendering of the interior based on the schematic design plans.

Lucas Hoffman, of 2RW, noted that the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems had been added over the years and recommended they be removed and replaced with modern ones. He further recommended the mechanical system be a simple light commercial split system heat pump that would serve the building well and keep the public comfortable. Mr. Hoffman noted the recommendation to add an energy recovery ventilator to address the times when increased ventilation air was needed based on the use of the building. He advised that the plan was to hide the grade mounted heat pump in the rear alcove of the building so it would not be seen from the street. Mr. Hoffman noted the need to make improvements to the existing crawl space so the mechanical equipment could be installed there so it could be accessible. He advised that he

would coordinate with the structural team as to how to route the ductwork through floor registers. Mr. Hoffman reported that as to the electrical system, a 240 single-phase service could be installed, which was how the building was currently fed. He noted that this would limit the amount of work that needed to be done with Dominion Power; although, it would require a new feed from the pole to the new electrical panel that would be located in the basement. Mr. Hoffman advised that a fire alarm system would be provided that would be initiated via smoke detection and notification by public occupants. He reported that as to plumbing, they were recommending the complete replacement of the plumbing, including the service laterals to the street, to support the bathrooms and the small electric water heater for the restroom.

Kevin Fallin, Vice President of Downey & Scott, reported that the cost estimate for construction based on the schematic design plans was $1.859 million. He noted that this included a 10% design contingency. Mr. Fallin advised that there were several elements where the costs were significant. He reported that three items would be add-alternates, including plaster repair of the walls above the gallery floor, which was estimated at $43,717; the addition of a gypsum wallboard ceiling, with insulation, which was estimated at $20,665; and, the addition of a lightning protection system on the roof, which was estimated at $5,520. Mr. Fallin advised that he estimated the project would take six months to complete, possibly longer depending on the craftsmen and the size of their crews. He reported that site demolition costs were estimated at $44,000; and, concrete for the curb, gutter, mechanical floor, retaining walls and sidewalk was estimated at $62,000. Mr. Fallin noted that the masonry cost, which was one of the larger numbers, was estimated at $151,351 to repoint 40% of the total area and explained that until the stucco was removed, an exact amount could not be determined. He advised that there was quite a bit of structural repairs needed to return the building to its former state, which resulted in a significant number of $437,000. Mr. Fallin noted that this included repairing 50% of the lintels; removing 8,482 square feet of cement stucco and repairing it with age-appropriate lime, which was costly at $209,933. He reported that the cost to rebuild the two front entry doors was $35,573, including hardware. Mr. Fallin further reported that the cost to repair and reglaze twenty windows was estimated to be $96,000; and the cost to add interior storm windows was another $43,000. He noted that very skilled craftsmen were required to do the repairs under the guidelines of the National Park Service. Mr. Fallin advised that from the standpoint of the MEP (mechanical, electrical and plumbing), the cost for the plumbing was estimated at $28,000, the mechanical at $26,759, the electrical at $62,635, the fire alarm system at $6,886, the security system at $7,516, and the voice/data system at $8,610. He reported that the cost estimate for the earthwork was $13,000 and for the milling, paving, curb and retaining walls was $57,000. Mr. Fallin noted that he included a $15,000 allowance for outside site lighting; however, that had not been designed. He advised that the cost of the excavation and backfill for the water and sewer laterals was estimated at $30,000. Mr. Fallin reviewed the markups that would be included. He advised that $164,000 was included in the cost estimate for cost escalation based on the schematic design; however, this number would decrease to $0 as the design progressed. Mr. Fallin noted that he included a 2.8% cost escalation based on the proposed date for bidding the project. He reiterated that the cost estimate was $1.8 million.

Councilmember Curran opined that what was proposed was beautiful. She questioned whether any consideration was given to curated space related to preserving artifacts.

Ms. Reed advised that they tried to make sure there was space for displays; however, it was flexible so the Town could decide how it would showcase items.

In response to an inquiry and comment from the Council, Ms. Reed confirmed the restroom was designed to be ADA compliant. She further confirmed there would only be one unisex restroom due to the amount of space needed for it. Ms. Reed noted that there were currently two restrooms.

In response to an inquiry from the Council as to the difference between limestone and cement stucco, Mr. Worsham explained that historically, stucco was done using simple lime and sand and advised that this was what covered most of the building. He further advised that it was still in reasonable condition. Mr. Worsham noted that toward the end of the church's occupation, the limestone was scored to allow the new cement stucco to stick better, with a skim coat being applied. He reported that the skim coat was coming off readily, as it had come loose. Mr. Worsham advised that with a solid masonry building like this, there were contractions and expansions, with the building essentially healing itself so it would last longer.

Mayor Littleton noted the term "craftsman" was used. He further noted the cost estimate for the replacement of four doors, which was almost $40,000. Mr. Littleton inquired as to the level of craftmanship needed for the doors and whether that was driving the cost.

Ms. Reed confirmed the most cost-effective approach would be pursued; however, the design needed to be custom. She explained that it would be based on the existing historic fabric on the building; therefore, the doors would not be available off the shelf. Ms. Reed reiterated the desire for a level of quality in the design; however, she reiterated that the most cost-effective way would be sought to get to the appropriate design.

Mr. Worsham advised that this was the only element in the restoration that would require this level of detail. He explained that it was because they were recreating a historic detail.

Ms. Reed noted the need to follow Secretary of Interior Standards. She advised that it was important not to be conjectural or add something that was never there. Ms. Reed further advised that this was an important area to focus on to make sure it was based on evidence.

Mayor Littleton noted the need for the project to be affordable. He opined that while Secretary of Interior guidelines were great to have, they were not have to haves. Mr. Littleton advised that at the end of the day, the Town wanted the building restored and functional for its intended use within a manageable budget. He questioned what was driving the stucco being lime and opined that there were multiple types that would look great and last forever.

Mr. Worsham advised that the stucco was relatively intact; therefore, they did not recommend removing it. He explained that the new stucco needed to be compatible with the existing stucco. Mr. Worsham advised that the skim coat would be a masking agent that was applied over the original. He noted that except where the stone was cracked, there were no plans to remove the stucco. Mr. Worsham advised that it was essential that the new material be compatible with the existing stucco. He opined that the cost was not in the lime but in the workmanship.

Councilmember Curran opined that the cost was over what the Council thought it would be. She questioned whether consideration had been given to value engineering.

Ms. Reed confirmed they were looking at cost and advised that they would prioritize the most important things that needed to be done. She confirmed the doors were very important and advised that there were other things she would prefer to sacrifice. Ms. Reed advised that they would take a hard look at how to best prioritize the work that needed to be done and how it could be done economically. She opined that there may be items that could be saved for later that may not be visible.

Town Clerk North explained that part of the reason Downey & Scott was brought in at the design level was so they could help the Town value engineer during the design phase. She noted the desire to do so at that time rather than waiting to the end.

In response to inquiries from the Council, Town Clerk North confirmed the $1.8 million cost estimate was only for the construction/restoration costs for the building. She advised that there were other costs for the project, such as the AE and CM costs, hazardous materials inspection costs, and recent stabilization costs, that had already been incurred. Ms. North further advised that there were other costs that were anticipated such as for landscaping. She reminded Council that this cost estimate was based on the schematic design plans. Ms. North estimated the total project cost would be $2.4 million. She reminded Council that the Town currently had $1 million available for the project in capital funding. Ms. North confirmed the $2.4 million was the all-in cost estimate that included what had already been spent. She reminded Council that money had already been spent for the oral histories project. Ms. North advised that of the $1 million, approximately $400,000 was available for construction. She confirmed the Town had spent or committed approximately $600,000 toward this project to date. Ms. North further confirmed the construction contract would be a fixed price one and advised that once the construction plans were developed, the Town would issue an Invitation For Bids (IFB).

Town Manager Davis confirmed it would be a fixed price contract as much as possible in the construction world.

Mayor Littleton opined that the plans would be specific and detailed so the contractor would know what they were getting into. He noted that it was the hidden things that increased the cost and advised that the desire was to avoid that as much as possible.

Town Manager Davis noted that the Town had experience in having the best construction plans, but the contractors did not read them well. He confirmed this project would be clearly defined; however, he noted that change orders happened. Mr. Davis advised that there would be contingencies for that and noted that Mr. Fallin pointed out that one of the biggest unknowns of the cost estimate was the repointing of the stone. He advised that 40% was estimated and noted that if it was double that amount, the cost could be an additional $150,000. In response to a comment from the Council, Mr. Davis advised that the Town was relying on the design experts. He opined that TyLin had done a great job of looking at all the structural elements and identifying what needed to be done; however, there could still be unexpected items. Mr. Davis advised that the staff did not anticipate anything significant, as this was a small building. He noted that there would be very little site work and advised that in terms of the interior, it was a very basic project so the building could hold forty to fifty people. Mr. Davis further noted that it would not be overly ornate as the Town was trying to be historically sensitive. He advised that he did not see the challenge of it going from $2.4 million to $3 million unless there was a major issue, at which point, the staff would talk about a change in scope.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Town Clerk North confirmed she included a modest amount of money for furniture, fixtures, and equipment, as the plan was to restore the pews in the center of the church. She noted that there were no plans to restore those on the outer edges and advised that they would simply be stored on the second floor. Ms. North confirmed this was included in her $2.4 million estimate.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Town Clerk North explained that Downey & Scott was working on the cost estimate right up until the meeting. She advised that she would send it to the Council.

In response to inquiries from the Council, Mr. Fallin confirmed he did not include value engineering in the cost estimate to date. He noted that based on the early discussions, it was realized that the higher end options would be costly, such as the HVAC system; therefore, the plans dialed those items back to a simpler system. Mr. Fallin advised that the entire design team was aware of cost being an issue and was keeping an eye on this throughout the design process. He expressed hope that the Town could do some fundraising so it could do all the work; however, the team was putting together a prioritized list of what had to be done. Mr. Fallin advised that the structural repairs needed to be done, as did the exterior of the building to stop the water infiltration. He suggested that other than the ADA restroom, the other work could be done in a later phase.

Mr. Fallin noted that he would have a price associated with each item on the prioritization list so they could be ranked. He reiterated that an estimate had been made of the amount of stone that needed to be pointed up and advised that this could go either way. Mr. Fallin noted that the lime overcoat was labor intensive and explained that there were touch-ups that needed to be done with the stonework. He further explained that it came down to labor and advised that anywhere where labor savings could occur would translate into dollars.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Town Clerk North advised that, assuming the Town continued to move forward with the project, it was anticipated that the construction plans would be presented to the Council in July or August. She noted that the next phase was to look at the financing and advised that the schedule anticipated a couple of months for that. Ms. North noted that during that time, the team would be preparing the IFB documents and pre-qualifying general contractors to bid on the project. She advised that the IFB would be issued and opined that it would be the end of 2026 before the staff would be prepared to make a recommendation to the Council on the acceptance of a bid. Ms. North reminded Council that it would probably take the contractor a month to mobilize and anticipated that construction could begin in February.

Town Manager Davis reminded Council that the project was still in the design phase and that what was presented was just the schematic design. He advised that the construction plans would be available in five months and suggested the Council could talk about the project later if needed. Mr. Davis advised that the staff was moving on the project and reiterated that the construction plans would return to Council again.

Mayor Littleton noted the need for the Council to discuss costs because it had only set aside a million dollars. He further noted that they always knew the project would cost more; however, $2.4 million was more than he expected. Mr. Littleton noted that he was not saying stop; however, the Council needed to think about how the Town was going to be able to afford the project. He suggested it may be delayed.

Town Manager Davis advised that unless the Council told the staff to pause the project, the staff would move forward with the design. He agreed the Council could have conversations in parallel with the design.

Town Clerk North reiterated that there was time built into the schedule to discuss financing. She opined that it may need to be more than two months; however, this time was included as Phase 3 of the project.

Mayor Littleton suggested the need to have conversations about affordability before the design was completed.

Councilmember Hersh opined that the phasing was important in terms of restoring the integrity of the building. He advised that he was also interested in restoring the staircase on the other side and noted the need to have the costs available so it would help the Council make decisions.

Mayor Littleton suggested the need to align the cost around the stabilization of the building. He further suggested there were other things that could be done in the future as funds became available.

Vice Mayor Bernard opined that looking at phasing was important. He suggested that what was provided was the optimum situation; however, there were things that could be done in another phase. Mr. Bernard noted the need to be cautious about doing the work in phases, as it could cost more in the long term. He advised that until the Town finished the project, it would be sitting with an incomplete building and questioned whether that made sense. Mr. Bernard suggested that completing all the work may be less in the long run and the Town would have a building it could use right away. He noted the need to see the phasing plan.

Town Manager Davis reported that Town Clerk North and the design team had already talked about identifying the core critical work that needed to be done, especially fixing the roof loading. He noted the need to make sure the work was not split so much that it created a more difficult or cost-consuming project.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Town Manager Davis advised that the staff intended for the fundraising to be run organically with a personal outreach to the community who have been engaged with the project. He advised that if the Council would like to talk about hiring someone to do a capital campaign, he would be happy to figure out if this would be worthwhile.

Councilmember Curran noted that a building campaign was different than a cause or program campaign. She inquired as to the focus in raising the money.

Town Manager Davis advised that it was about talking to the members of the community who had an interest in supporting the restoration project and noted that there had been a lot of people who had expressed interest in this in the past. He advised that it would be a building campaign, which would be the cause. Mr. Davis noted that it was not like the Town Hall Project, which was a functional building, but rather was about restoring history. He suggested the need to make outreach to those who have a vested interest in it and that wanted to support it.

Vice Mayor Bernard noted that timing was important and advised that the amount of funds raised could make a difference in the Council's decision making. He noted that he would hate to get all the way through the design, do value engineering, and then find out the cost was not a big issue.

Town Manager Davis reminded Council that Town Clerk North was organizing the February 11th Americas 250 event with the oral histories project and Asbury Church Restoration Project being the key features. He noted that this would be the first opportunity to let people know the Town was accepting donations.

Town Clerk North noted that the Council was jumping into the discussion of a later agenda item, which was approval to accept donations for the project. She advised that she had been speaking with Tim Clites, who was a part of the Middleburg Library Expansion Project that was done ten years ago. Ms. North noted that he shared information on how they conducted their fundraising, as it was the community who provided the funds for the project. She advised that she was proposing to follow the same model that the library successfully used for their restoration/expansion project.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Town Manager Davis confirmed the project would be on the Council's strategic planning retreat agenda.

Mayor Littleton thanked the design team from Glave & Holmes and advised that the design looked wonderful. He opined that they did a nice job and noted that he loved the path in the front with the bell. Mr. Littleton acknowledged that they were respecting the history of the building and opined that focusing on the 1920-30s period, which were the glory days of the church, was great. He reiterated that they did a really nice job and advised that he appreciated their hard work. Mr. Littleton thanked Mr. Fallin for doing a great job with the cost details and noted that it was important. He advised that the Council wanted to bring this cornerstone of the community back to life; however, it needed to do so in a fiscally responsible manner for everyone. He suggested the need to find efficiencies, while not sacrificing quality and the integrity of the design. Mr. Littleton reiterated his thanks to the design team.

Staff Reports

December Utilities Report

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Town Manager Davis advised that there were no issues at the sewer treatment plant currently. He noted that the Town had some air valves that were not opening and closing properly and advised that Vince Gugliotta was working with a maintenance team, which was why he was not present. Mr. Davis confirmed this was just a routine maintenance item. He displayed the average daily flow chart, which indicated the wastewater flow was less than typical and explained that this was due to the lack of rain. Mr. Davis noted that the Town did get inflow & infiltration (I&I) into its sewer lines; therefore, less rain meant less water coming into the sewer plant. He reported that there was a decline in water production from the prior year and explained that this was due to a change in patterns of some of the highest users, specifically people who were not using a lot of water for irrigation. Mr. Davis noted that the Council would discuss the impact of this on revenues and anticipated revenues during the budget discussions. He reported that the staff was recalibrating the revenues to the new normal in terms of expected consumption patterns.

Town Manager Davis advised that on the sewer side, the contractor completed the videoing of approximately half the sewer mains and identified a few concerning issues for which the Town would seek bids. He cited as an example a sewer line that had partially collapsed on South Pendleton Street. Mr. Davis advised that this needed to be replaced before it collapsed entirely and noted that it was the Town's first priority. He reported that Mr. Gugliotta and his team were working with Valley Automation on issues that had arisen at the wastewater treatment plant.

Town Manager Davis reported that on January 11th, the Town experienced an overflow situation at the wastewater treatment plant when the sensor that measured the level of the reactor basin failed. He noted that one of the police officers saw the overflow and was able to alert IES. Mr. Davis advised that the required notices were provided to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). He reported that the solution was to install a redundant system so that if one sensor failed, the other could report any issues. Mr. Davis advised that approximately 20,000 gallons of sewage flowed out of the basin. He noted that the Town tried to avoid having single points of failure; however, it could not catch all of them. Mr. Davis commended IES for redirecting the flow to another location where it could be held and getting the plant back into operation quickly. He advised that they also did a site cleanup. Mr. Davis noted that they understood the importance of what occurred and thanked them for their responsiveness.

Town Manager Davis reported that on the water side, there was a private water lateral that needed repairs. He reminded Council that the Town used Virginia Rural Water Association (VRWA), who assisted small water systems, to provide general leak detection services.

Town Manager Davis reported that the Town's well levels were holding steady. He noted, however, that there was concern about longevity. Mr. Davis reminded Council of the forecast for snow that would help the groundwater. He reported that Mr. Gugliotta had been running Well 3 more frequently, which allowed Well 4 to recharge. Mr. Davis noted that by doing this, Well 4's static water level had increased by thirty feet, which was good news. He advised that while this was labor intensive due to the need to flush Well 3 to provide for clear water, it was not hard to do.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Town Manager Davis advised that ten to fifteen inches of snow equated to a one-inch rain, which was great. He explained that because it would be sitting on the ground, it would slowly seep in and would not run off. Mr. Davis noted that the area received a good, slow, steady rain on January 10th, which provided an inch and a third of rain. He advised that multiple snows would lead to a wet springtime and allow the ground to be ready to receive rain. Mr. Davis noted that while he did not normally pray for massive amounts of snow, he would take as much precipitation as the area could get.

Councilmember Pearson opined that this was similar to the situation with Wells L and P.

Town Manager Davis advised that IES found that one of the valves on the raw water line at the water treatment plant was leaking, which was causing about a quarter of the water from Well L to be lost. He advised that the Town did not want to lose water; therefore, it shut Well L off. Mr. Davis noted that even though this had a negative impact on Well P, its water

level was still two hundred feet above the pump. He reminded Council that the demands on the system were not huge at this time; therefore, he was comfortable running Well P by itself. Mr. Davis advised that IES ordered the parts to rebuild the valves and opined that they should arrive in six weeks, at which point, the Town could get Well L running again. He noted that this would allow the Town to see how it recovered during this period. Mr. Davis reminded Council that Wells L and P fed the Stonewall Water Treatment Plant.

Councilmember Pearson noted that the Council had never received a report like this before related to the need to make lots of repairs. She questioned whether the Town would get to the point where it was ahead of the game.

Town Manager Davis confirmed this was the goal for the major items, such as well pumps, blowers, motors, and booster pumps. He advised that IES was planning replacement costs in the capital asset fund, so the money would be ready when it was needed. Mr. Davis opined that the Town was doing a better job with its larger pieces; however, he noted that something like a valve was not something that was normally anticipated. He advised that there would always be a time frame of something happening that the Town did not anticipate, which was why it kept money in the capital program. Mr. Davis noted that the large items were being put into a five-year capital improvement plan and advised that Mark Inboden prepared a spreadsheet on the wastewater side that contained every major component, its anticipated lifespan, its current and future cost, and when its life cycle would end. He advised that he now knew how to plan for replacements because of the spreadsheet. Mr. Davis noted that Mr. Inboden was working on a spreadsheet for the water side as well. He advised that with these, the Town's CIP would be even more robust.

Vice Mayor Bernard questioned whether the Town was prepared from a utilities and infrastructure standpoint for the forecasted snow event. He noted that the forecast was not only for a lot of snow but also for extremely cold temperatures for multiple days. Mr. Bernard questioned whether the Town had a plan that it could put out to the citizens related to preparedness for the extreme cold, such as tips for protecting water pipes.

Town Manager Davis reported that the staff had met multiple times, including the police and IES, to discuss preparedness for the storm. He advised that on the utilities side, the Town was making sure it had all the supplies it needed and was topping the generators off with fuel. Mr. Davis opined that it had everything ready to go and advised that he did not have any concerns about the utility operations. He reported that he issued a news release earlier in the day on a broad range of topics related to preparing for the storm. Mr. Davis noted that Loudoun County also provided a lot of great information from their emergency management team. He advised that he provided links to those, as well as to the National Weather Service on how to be prepared for snow events. Mr. Davis advised that Vice Mayor Bernard had spurred him to think more directly about the utility side and suggested the need to do a specific post on people's own utilities, including on ways to keep the water flowing when it got really cold, such as allowing a faucet to drip in order to keep the meter moving. He noted that in terms of other preparedness, the Town's maintenance crews were already scheduled to begin work early Sunday morning, when the snow was expected to begin falling. Mr. Davis opined that the Town should have a better idea tomorrow afternoon as to the forecasted snow totals and when it would turn to sleet. He reminded Council that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) was responsible for snow plowing operations in Middleburg and noted that Deputy Town Manager Moore was on a phone meeting with them earlier in the day. He advised that they stated that their focus would be on primary interstates and primary roads and that people should not expect them to be in neighborhoods for the first two or three days. Mr. Davis noted that in the past, the Town had pretty good responsiveness from the contractor assigned to Middleburg; however, this storm was hitting the entire Commonwealth and would be heavy in the south. He advised that the staff had information about plowing and how to track snowplows and noted that it was listed on the news flash on the Town's website. Mr. Davis reported that in terms of the Police Department, the Chief, Lieutenant and one of the police officers would spend the weekend in the Town Hall and reminded Council that it was equipped with facilities to allow them to stay to keep the community safe. He advised that the Mayor would be issuing a snow emergency declaration that would prohibit parking along Route 50, as it was a snow emergency route. Mr. Davis explained that this would allow the Town to plow the street without concerns about hitting parked cars. He advised that most of this information had already been covered by the news alert that was issued; however, he would do another one related to utilities and no parking on Route 50. In response to inquiries from the Council, he explained that the Town did not have the authority to declare a state of emergency due to its size and noted that it did not have an emergency management function. He explained that the State and County could issue a state of emergency if necessary. Mr. Davis confirmed that in the event of a power failure, the Town Hall Council Chambers would be turned into a warming center.

Action Items

Council Approval – Request to Accept Donations – Asbury Church Restoration Project

Town Clerk North reminded Council that there was $1 million in capital funding available for the Asbury Church Restoration Project, some of which had already been spent or committed. She reported that there was a balance of just under $400,000 available for the construction. Ms. North reminded Council that the total project cost would be more than $1 million and advised that the staff was recommending Council authorize the acceptance of cash donations to be used toward the project. She noted that she had already been approached by an individual who wished to donate $10,000. Ms. North reminded Council that under the Town Code, Council approval was required to accept cash or personal property donations and for the cash donations to be used for the project. She reiterated that the staff was recommending the Council approve the acceptance of cash and personal property donations for the project. Ms. North noted that she had conversations with Tim Clites, who shared how the Middleburg Library Board went about their fundraising activities for the expansion of the library and advised that it was very successful for them She suggested the Town handle its fundraising efforts in a similar manner in that it would accept not only one-time donations but pledges over a two-year period.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Town Attorney Crim confirmed the acceptance of donations for this purpose was allowed.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Mayor Littleton opined that the Library Board raised over $500,000 for their project.

Councilmember Daly moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that Council approve the acceptance of cash donations for the Asbury Church Restoration Project. Councilmember Daly further moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that Council authorize the staff to accept donations in the form of personal property as determined to be appropriate by the Town staff for display in the Asbury Church.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Bernard, Curran, Daly, Gallagher, Hersh, Kirk, and Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain: N/A
Absent: N/A
(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.)

Council Approval – Middleburg Community Farmers Market

Business Development & Community Partnerships Director MacIntyre reviewed the history of this item and explained that the Council was being asked to give formal direction. She reminded the Council that there were three options – hire an outside management company to operate the market; transfer ownership/management of the market to another entity located in the town; or cancel the market. Ms. MacIntyre advised that the Town's events management company narrowed outside management companies down to two; however, it did not have quotes yet from them. She noted that both were located in Loudoun County. Ms. MacIntyre advised that as to the transfer of ownership/management to another town entity, she and the Vice Mayor met with that group; however, there was no optimistic path forward.

Town Manager Davis noted that the staff hoped to have more information on a third party to run it, including cost, however, it had not been able to get it.

Business Development & Community Partnerships Director MacIntyre advised that this information would be available for the next Council meeting.

Town Manager Davis acknowledged that the Council did not have the information it needed to make a decision at this time. He noted that the Town received approximately ten applications from vendors who wanted to be a part of the market.

Business Development & Community Partnerships Director MacIntyre confirmed she was getting applications weekly. She noted the need for visitors to also be interested in attending. She advised that the staff was fine with moving this decision to the next meeting, to which the members of Council agreed.

Vice Mayor Bernard asked that the members take time to think about this. He opined that the second option could be removed from consideration if the Town was going to continue to run the market on Saturday mornings. Mr. Bernard opined that Saturday mornings were the only viable time given the other markets in the surrounding areas.

In response to inquiries from the Council, Business Development & Community Partnerships Director MacIntyre confirmed the Town received ten completed vendor surveys, with the majority saying they loved the market and experience; however, they needed more foot traffic. She advised that those who responded to the survey indicated they planned to return. Ms. MacIntyre noted that two vendors said they would not. She confirmed she was not anticipating additional responses, nor did she receive any responses to the survey about how they did financially this year.

Mayor Littleton directed that this item be placed on the next agenda.

Council Approval – (1) MOA with Loudoun County Pertaining to Virginia Erosion & Stormwater Management Program and (2) Ordinance to Amend Town Code Chapter 36 Pertaining to Erosion & Stormwater Management

Town Manager Davis reminded Council that the Town staff provided an overview of this item a couple of months ago and reported that it was now ready for action. He explained that the Town had always relied upon Loudoun County to provide regulatory activities and enforcement of erosion and sediment control and stormwater management in the town. Mr. Davis further explained that due to changes in the State Code in 2024, Loudoun County had to re-adopt their provisions and needed to enter into an MOA (Memorandum of Agreement) with the towns to manage their programs on their behalf. He advised that in order to do so, the Town would need to enter into an MOA with the County and noted that their enforcement on the Town's behalf would be at no cost to the town. Mr. Davis further advised that the Council would need to amend one of its current chapters in the Town Code stating that Loudoun County would enforce these provisions on the Town's behalf, which was similar to what was done with the building code. He noted that both items were ready for action and advised that they have been reviewed by the Town and County Attorneys and Town and County staff. Mr. Davis reported that the County Board of Supervisors had adopted the MOA.

Councilmember Daly moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Bernard, that Council approve a Memorandum of Agreement for a Virginia Erosion & Stormwater Management Program between the County of Loudoun, Virginia and the Town of Middleburg, Virginia.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Bernard, Curran, Daly, Gallagher, Hersh, Kirk, and Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain: N/A
Absent: N/A
(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.)

Councilmember Daly moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Bernard, that Council adopt AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND TOWN CODE CHAPTER 36 PERTAINING TO BUILDING, PLUMBING AND ELECTRICAL, TO ADD AN ARTICLE PERTAINING TO EROSION & STORMWATER MANAGEMENT.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Bernard, Curran, Daly, Gallagher, Hersh, Kirk, and Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain: N/A
Absent: N/A
(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.) (by roll call vote)

Council Approval – Amendments to Town Hall Facilities Use Policy

Town Clerk North reminded Council that during their last meeting, they reviewed the Town Hall Facilities Use Policy and held some discussion about amending it to allow applicants who wished to use one of the meeting spaces during non-business hours to do so if the Mayor or a member of Council was willing to essentially chaperone the building and to open and close it. She reported that the staff proposed language that would allow this to occur. Ms. North explained that as proposed, the applicant would have to submit the online application, which the staff would review to determine whether they were eligible to use the facilities and whether a meeting space was available. She further explained that if so, the staff would send an email to the Council asking whether anyone was willing to open, monitor and close the facilities for the applicant. Ms. North advised that if not, the request would be denied. She noted that this clause would apply to the use of the audience space in the Council Chambers, the Executive Conference Room, and the Admin Conference Room, all of which were located in the lower portion of the building. Ms. North advised that this would keep the Police and Administration sides of the building locked after hours. In response to an inquiry from Council, she explained that the policy listed those organizations that were eligible to use the facilities, including non-profits and government organizations. Ms. North explained that those same organizations would be eligible to use it under this expanded clause.

Vice Mayor Bernard moved, seconded by Councilmember Daly, that Council adopt amendments to the Town Hall Facilities Use Policy as presented by the Town staff, with an effective date of January 23, 2026.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Bernard, Curran, Daly, Gallagher, Hersh, Kirk, and Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain: N/A
Absent: N/A
(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.)

Discussion Items

Burns Night Event

Town Manager Davis announced that the staff was continuing with the Burns Night Event as planned. He reviewed the schedule. Mr. Davis advised that the staff would review the guidance from the National Weather Service and cancel the event if it looked like it would become a safety issue by the end of it. Mr. Davis suggested the solution would probably be to end the event early if the snow began sooner than expected. He reported that Business Development & Community Partnerships Director MacIntyre had already worked with the vendors and musicians to compress the time frame if necessary. Mr. Davis expressed hope to keep it running as long as possible; however, he noted the need for safety, not only for the patrons, but for the vendors and Town staff. He advised that as the forecast currently stood, the snow would not begin until midnight. Mr. Davis reiterated that at this time, the event was still on and noted that it was sold out.

Americas 250 Event

Mayor Littleton reminded Council and the audience of the Americas 250 event on January 23rd beginning with the National Anthem and ceremonial flag raising, followed by a parade to the Community Center, where the full event would occur.

2026 General Assembly Legislative Session

Town Manager Davis reported that he and Town Attorney Crim have been reviewing bills in tandem and would try to add to the list as they could. He noted that the list became obsolete as soon as it was printed because of the new bills that were being submitted; however, it provided a high-level overview of the most concerning ones at the moment. Mr. Davis noted that another update would be provided prior to the next Council meeting. He advised that Town Attorney Crim had requested a closed session discussion during the February 12th meeting to discuss one of the bills. Mr. Davis noted that there were some zoning bills that were of concern, including one that would limit or prohibit localities from having minimum parking standards, which the Town was opposed to. He reminded Council of the need to have parking onsite for both

residential and commercial properties. Mr. Davis advised that a bill that was similar to one submitted last year would require the Town to allow accessory dwelling units on single-family detached properties. He noted the concerns related to traffic density and impacts on water and wastewater systems; therefore, the Town would continue to oppose this legislation. Mr. Davis reminded Council of the legislation that was submitted last year that would mandate localities to meet a certain threshold of growth in housing units, which was 7.5% last year. He advised that it was submitted again this year and had already been referred from one committee to another in both the House and Senate. Mr. Davis noted that the bill, as currently written, did not have a carveout for localities of a certain size and noted that Middleburg was already almost fully built out. He advised that it would be difficult to add another thirty-five to forty units. Mr. Davis noted that the staff would continue to watch that one and would continue to send letters as needed.

In response to an inquiry from the Council as to the repercussions if a municipality did not meet the requirements, Town Manager Davis reminded Council that under last year's bill, a developer who was denied could take his request to the housing board at the state level, who would administratively approve a zoning application. He advised that as drafted, they could appeal to the board of zoning appeals. Mr. Davis reminded Council that the BZA was a quasi-judicial body.

Town Attorney Crim advised that it would be a major change in zoning law to allow a board of zoning appeals to override the decision of an elected body. He noted that they currently heard appeals of the zoning administrator, applications for special use permits if allowed by local ordinance, and variance applications. Mr. Crim advised that this bill would vastly expand their authority.

Town Manager Davis advised that two bills that were not related to zoning were also concerning. He noted that the first would require localities to pay prevailing wages on public works construction projects that were over $250,000 and noted that this would increase the costs significantly if a locality had to pay Davis-Bacon wages. Mr. Davis advised that the other was a Senate Bill that said that if a locality provided liability insurance for public safety employees, such as police, the locality was deemed to have waived sovereign immunity as a defense. He noted that this would make everyone's insurance rates go up and reduce the coverage the Town had under its sovereign immunity. Mr. Davis advised that it continued to chip away at sovereign immunity for police officers who must make decisions in split seconds. He noted that the Town would definitely oppose this bill and advised that the Virginia Municipal League had opposed it as well. Mr. Davis advised that the staff was tracking other bills; however, these were the most concerning.

There being no further business, Mayor Littleton declared the meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

APPROVED:

_____

ATTEST: Trowbridge M. Littleton, MAYOR

_____

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

January 22, 2026 Middleburg Town Council Meeting

(Note: This is a transcript prepared by a Town contractor based on the video of the meeting. It may not be entirely accurate. For greater accuracy, we encourage you to review the video of the meeting that is on the Town's website – www.middleburgva.gov)

Bridge Littleton: All right. We will call the meeting to order. First item is Pledge of Allegiance.

All: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands. One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Next item is the roll call.

Deborah Gallagher: Deborah Gallagher.

Darlene Kirk: Darlene Kirk.

Bridge Littleton: Bridge Littleton.

Chris Bernard: Chris Bernard.

Cindy Pearson: Cindy Pearson.

J. Kevin Daly: John Kevin Daly.

Pam Curran: Pam Curran.

Rhonda North: Rhonda North, Town Clerk.

Danny Davis: Danny Davis, Town Manager.

Martin Crim: Martin Crim, Town Attorney.

Bridge Littleton: And Chris if you want to call yourself off calling in remotely. [off mic]. Chris, if you want to roll call yourself in too.

Chris Hersh: Chris Hersh, present on vacation in Colorado.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. The first item is public comment. If anybody would like to address Town Council on any non-public hearing related matter, you may approach the Council and do so. Miss Murdock.

Ms. Murdock: I [off mic] to see your beautiful face.

Bridge Littleton: Well. [off mic] [laughter] Do I need to ask the officers for help? Since there's no public comment, we will close the public comment and move on to the first action item, which is a public hearing request of Catherine P. Cherry for a Special Use Permit. Mr. Moore, if you would like to give us a rundown and then we can take the next steps.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. You held the discussion on this at your meeting earlier in January, including the opportunity to discuss with the applicant. She would confirm earlier today that she did not plan to attend this evening. Just a quick reminder. This involves a business that has occupied the space on East Washington Street since 2019. Some investigation last year led to enforcement action for a violation, a use violation. So, operating a business

other than what it was permitted for under its occupancy permit that is now a thing decided, meaning the applicant had the ability to appeal that decision but chose not to. So, the result is in order to abate the violation, the applicant would either have to vacate the property or apply for a Special Use Permit. So, in the C2 district to have professional office use on the first floor or street level requires a Special Use Permit. And it was determined that that is the type of business that is being conducted there. Again, you discussed this at your meeting earlier in January. There's no update to provide since that time. Just a reminder that the Planning Commission did hold its own review and forward a recommendation to you for denial of the permit. And that recommendation was based on citations from both the zoning ordinance, the purpose of the C2 district, as well as a language with which the Commission saw conflict in the Comprehensive Plan.

Bridge Littleton: Great. Does anybody have any questions for Will? Okay. Does anybody have any objections to going ahead and opening the public hearing right now? Okay. We will open the public hearing on this item Special Use 25-01. Any member of the public would like to address Council on this application they may do so.

Megan Gallagher: Hi, my name is Megan Gallagher. I live at 214 East Marshall Street. Happy New Year! I would like to support the Planning Commission's recommendation that you all deny this. Because I really believe the consistency of your goals and Comp Plan about keeping retail space in the retail core, it doesn't get more core than that stretch of West Washington, East Washington, so I'd support it. I understand the office has been there happily for 7 or 8 years, but it sounds like this would be setting a precedent for something that was a mistake or overlooked, and that chips away at what you're doing. You did start limiting real estate offices in the core. And so, I think it extends to other kinds of offices that aren't retail spaces. Thanks.

Bridge Littleton: Thank you. Anybody else wish to address the Council in this public hearing? Okay. We will close the public hearing. Is there any discussion of Council? I know we talked about it at length last meeting. Chris.

Chris Bernard: I think this is pretty straightforward based on our Comp Plan and on just kind of basic Zoning and Planning, it's not an appropriate use for those locations. So, I'm glad we have got it sorted out. Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Any other commentary or questions? We do have to act on it. So, if somebody wanted to make a motion, they could do so.

Will Moore: The question was asked whether you closed the public hearing.

Bridge Littleton: I did.

Will Moore: Okay.

Bridge Littleton: Or the public hearing is closed. Happy, Martin? [off mic] Just go ahead and go.

Pam Curran: Let's see. I move that the Council deny SU 25-01 for the following reasons. The proposed office use at this location is inconsistent with the C2 district's purpose to accommodate pedestrian-oriented commercial activities.

J. Kevin Daly: Second.

Bridge Littleton: Any other discussion?

Chris Bernard: A friendly amendment.

Bridge Littleton: Okay.

Chris Bernard: I would also say it is the proposed office use of this location is also inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plans intention to increase vitality in the town's central business district, not just option one.

J. Kevin Daly: Second.

Bridge Littleton: Or do you accept the friendly amendment?

Pam Curran: I accept it.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. And Kevin seconded. Rhonda, are you going to call the roll?

Rhonda North: Vice Mayor Bernard.

Chris Bernard: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Curran.

Pam Curran: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Daly.

J. Kevin Daly: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Gallagher.

Deborah Gallagher: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Hersh.

Chris Hersh: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Kirk.

Darlene Kirk: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Thank you all very much. Will, thanks for all that. And thank the Planning Commission as well. Okay. Next up, we have a public presentation from Glavé and Holmes on the Asbury Church project. So, Rhonda, I will turn it over to you first.

Rhonda North: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. So just a little history for our newer members of Council. In 1994 the Asbury Church was abandoned by its congregation. It shortly thereafter moved into private ownership and remained in private ownership for about 20 years at which point the property owner donated the church to the Town of Middleburg. The town spent a few years issuing RFPs, trying to come up with a public private partnership. We're not able to successfully do so. And in 2018, the Council agreed to go ahead and retain the church and stabilize it and update it and operate the building itself. So, we spent a little under $200,000 to do some initial stabilization. To get the town through at that time, we were on the town hall project, so we needed to get through that project because we just didn't have enough human resources to do two large projects at once. So, once we got through that, we hired a firm Commonwealth Preservation Group who helped us do some community engagement to determine what uses the community would like to see the building used for that report came out the recommended uses were as an interpretive site and for small meeting spaces. The Council accepted that report and those uses and then in 2025, we issued a request for proposals for architectural engineering firms which we referred to as A E firms and a construction management firm, which we refer to as a CM firm. We engaged Glavé and Holmes, who is an experienced and well-respected firm out of Richmond. They have a division that focuses on historic preservation. And we also contracted with Downey and Scott for construction management services. They are

also an experienced and well-respected firm there out of the Warrenton area. Both of those firms did work with the town on the town hall project. And we were very happy with their services. So Glavé and Holmes, this evening, is going to present the schematic design. And what that is, is essentially the first step in the design process to get towards construction documents. Sort of a big picture look at what we're recommending. And then from there you start working on the details of the construction plans. And then following that, Kevin Fallin with Downey and Scott is going to present the cost estimate for the project, just the construction portion of the project based on the schematic design plans. So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Susan Reed with Glavé and Holmes, and she will introduce her team, and they will present the schematic design plans. So, Susan, over to you.

Susan Reed: Thank you so much. Sorry, I'm hearing a feedback. It's gone perfect. If you could go to the next slide, Nick, I'll jump right in. We are pleased to be with you tonight to present the schematic design. From the A E team we have myself, the Director of Historic Preservation at Glavé and Holmes. Also, Gibson Worsham, Architectural Historian, Nikolas Coile, Project Manager. And then from TYLin, the Structural Engineer Ken Hill and Lucas Hoffman, MEP, Engineer from 2RW. And for the agenda we're going to go through kind of quickly, we want to try to be concise. The following items Gibson will talk about a little overview of the history. Nicholas will talk about the site investigation, and then Ken will review the structural scope. Nicholas will jump back in with the exterior and accessibility updates. Gibson will come back in with the interior rehabilitation overview, and then Lucas will walk us through the MEP scope and all that will be focused in trying to do that in 15 minutes. So, we would love to take questions at the end. Kevin Fallin, as Rhonda mentioned, will jump in with talking about the cost estimate after the MEP scope. So, if we can get through all of this, we would love to take your questions at the end, and we'll be happy to go back and review any slides that you need. So, with that, we're going to jump right into it. You're muted Gibson.

Gibson Worsham: I'm trying to get unmuted. Sorry. Yes. So, I've been it's been such a pleasure working on this wonderful building. And as you may know, it was built in 1829, in order to house Middleburg's Methodist congregation on a lot at the northern end of the village. In the early 1860s, a congregation of Black Methodists in town was given the building. And I just show these illustrations to show typical exterior of African Methodist Episcopal Church, very similar. And the interior layout of a similar church in Georgia showing how the Chancellor really worked in that period. Next. So, most of the improvements we see were made in the 20th century. In 1923, they added electric lighting, the light fixtures several of them still remain. 1950 they got a furnace and they put in opalescent glass windows which survived. 1973 restrooms, new floors. The pulpit platform was widened, and the particle board was substituted for plaster on the ceiling. And then, very significantly, an exterior coat of cement stucco was added on the exterior. Then in 1980s, the wood entry doors were replaced and paneled jambs were covered. The southwest gallery stair replaced their two stairs that go to the gallery we call that balcony area, the gallery were replaced with a wider modern stair one of them. And then finally the congregation, as you heard, left the building in 1994. So, the roof was replaced. The building was structurally stabilized in some ways. The windows were repaired and the new cornice and downspouts were all added. Next. The suggested interpretation date, which is the way we begin to build how we're interpreting the building is from 1923 to 1950 that would allow us to remove the restroom, remove the 1980s accumulations around the front of the church. And it would actually and after the installation of the light fixtures, which we want to retain, it would be most suitable for the proposed building use. Next.

Nikolas Coile: So, upon the onset of this project, the entire A E team visited the Asbury Church site to thoroughly review the interior and the exterior. So immediately we saw some concerning items including holes in the stone wall. There was a modern retaining wall that just abruptly stops. We don't know if the footing these actually are sitting on any footings whatsoever. And at the main level onto the gallery level. A modern stair, as Gibson had mentioned, was installed. But when they did this, they cut one of the main beams that holds up the gallery space. Really depending on that tremor stair tremor to carry that, which is not the case. Walls on the exterior, what we a notable item on the exterior would be bowing at the back wall of the church and in the rafter locations. Modern post and kickers were added, which changes how the entire building operates structurally. And so, there's a lot more point load now on the beams pushing out the columns. This is what has necessitated the cables that were added most recently by the town, as well as the diagonal bracing.

Ken Hill: All right. So, we can go to the next one. So, to address some of these issues that we found in the site investigation, we're going to work our way bottom up. And so, the basic approach in the cellar and with all of the walls and the bearing is to basically rebuild or underpin any openings and bases of the wall so that we have a continuous

masonry wall down to suitable bearing. There appears to have been openings for various mechanical or electrical throughout the life of the building, as well as the excavation to create the lower basement space. And go on to the next. At the walls, the scope is relatively limited and will be basically to repoint areas of damaged walls on the interior and the exterior. There's a few bulging areas. As noted in the site investigation that would need to be repaired. The other scope on the walls is related to the gallery or the mezzanine level connection of that wood framed level that is acting as a diaphragm to the walls over time. The mortar between the masonry has deteriorated. And so, the wood bearing on the walls is no longer able to hold the wood into the wall. And so, there's a little bit of rebuilding to make that reattach that connection. The interior columns were never originally designed to carry any roof load. And it was only when the modern posts above were installed that the load path was changed and additional load was to put on them. And so, we think that the reason that the bowing is occurring is a combination of things, a combination of the added load from the roof reconfiguration as well as the original roof being a little bit small or undersized which is pretty common for this era of construction. And also, the age of the walls and the mortar and that wood diaphragm not being able to hold that wall in place or hold the diaphragm to the wall. So, a combination of these three things is what's causing the bowing. And so, for the interior columns, the repair scope is fairly limited. And in fact, primarily we're just restoring the original load path. And that combined with the attachment of the diaphragm to the walls to help address the bowing. Some of the original wood lintels are remaining, and some of them are in poor condition and need to be replaced. We can go on to the next slide. For the floor framing, generally, the floor framing is in good condition. We found that the main level has an occupancy loading of 100 psf, which is reasonable, which is good for an assembly loading, and that the gallery floor loading has an occupancy loading of available of 65 psf, which is limited by the columns, but again a reasonable gallery loading. The new stair that was installed that Gibson and Nick mentioned will be removed and the original stair configuration reinstalled, this will mean a reinforcing of that primary beam that was cut. We can move on to the next. And in the roof structure, as I was talking about the original roof structure was a little undersized for the modern environmental loading. And that will be we're going to be restoring the original load path. And so that original under sizing will need to be reinforced. And we're going to be removing those posts which are transferring the load through to the interior columns and contributing to the bowing. And I think that's it.

Nikolas Coile: Exterior restoration. So, the great news is that the metal roof, belfry, the gutters, the downspouts, the cornice all in good condition. We would suggest, of course, painting the wood components and then adding appropriate exterior lighting not attached on the building that would not be historically sensitive. So, it would be a sight lighting moment that would be happening there for exterior walls. Removing the cement, the incompatible cement stucco coating, repairing those walls, and then repainting the whole exterior with historically sensitive colors as well as replacing the modern sheathing on the east side and the modern arched panel on the west side with more historically appropriate design. So, with the windows, our goal is always to keep as much historic material as possible. So, we want to repair and consolidate the sashes, frames, and headers as much as possible. Of course, replacing all the glazing putty, that's a typical maintenance item that one needs to do every so often. Retain those donor plaques reduce the modern sill projections. And most of the deterioration that we found on the windows, on the wood portions of the windows is that the sills as well as the east side those windows need a little bit more TLC. For the doors, the main goal of the front door is historic reproduction of the original door. So, we would be taking the historic panels that are still there, as well as the one remaining historic original door on the interior as guides in this design as well as providing appropriate hardware that would complement the reproduced door. The basement door would be replaced, and the goal with that would be to secure that door and to replace all the components. But the goal is not to reproduce a historic piece because it's more of a modern door, but to create a historically sensitive design. Accessibility updates. So, with the site one of the main items would be connecting and reinstating the sidewalk and the curb that are not there fronting the site and to provide a curved sidewalk ADA path from the public way, the sidewalk all the way down to the leftmost front entry point. Reinstating the completed the sidewalk and the curb would allow for more parallel parking along the site. And we could also designate some of those as handicap parking spots and provide appropriate curb cuts. And I did want to mention that the slope of the curb sidewalk is shallow enough. So, where we do not need handrails. So, with the exterior site rendering, you'll see the curved path, no handrails. And you'll also see that this curved path has created a space to place the historic bell of the church on display, as well as a garden. For the entry in the main level the goal is to align that new path that I just was speaking on with this outermost sill that you see there, so that there's a smooth transition from that sidewalk onto the outer sill. And then to reduce the door threshold. So, the replacement door threshold would be a maximum of a half inch, so that it complies with ADA code. We will be replacing the modern frame and doors as already mentioned, and that will allow us to have the clear width needed for us to be ADA compliant. Also, we will be raising the entry floor to be flush with the

sanctuary. For the restrooms, the goal is to remove the cross partition and the non-compliant toilets and replace that with a compliant toilet with closet and to clad that restroom with historic tongue and groove boards. Also, it should be mentioned that the west central west window will once again light a space, so it'll light this restroom. But being cognizant of privacy, adding an interior storm window with translucent glass.

Gibson Worsham: So, the interior rehabilitation will begin with removing extraneous elements that were added in the late 20th century, including the paneled wall in front of the apse and the communion rail, which is a very modern element. It looks like it's made of pieces from Lowe's, probably. And then restoring the floor of the platform to its original form, it's still there, as well as the floor and the apse, which is still intact under the current floor. We'll also remove the modern sanctuary light fixture, and we will remove that existing restroom and vestibule, as you've seen. We'll also remove the late 20th century additions to the church, including all those things we see in the front and the wainscot, which you see in that lower right-hand slide. Sometime in the late 20th century, a lot of this material came from some other church, and it's been sort of added to the existing building, which never had a wainscot. It just had plaster all the way down. And as you'll see, a little baseboard at the bottom. Next. We're going to patch the plaster throughout the building using historic formulation of plaster and preserving the rough texture which it currently has. We're going to add some operable interior storms and a new beaded baseboard based on the one that survives in the gallery. It's going to repair, clean, and refinish the existing floors, which are a late 19th, late 20th century floors, but the floor underneath seems to have been entirely removed. So, we're going to keep that floor and refinish it to match the finish that it had originally. And we will add new drywall ceilings and insulation or if the cost is prohibitive, we can just leave the ceiling open as an interim solution. Next. The Chancel you can see in the upper picture all the additional elements and then the lower floor plan there. You'll see how that's been altered with a simple raised platform with a step up on each side and a little railing. And then the apse will have two steps up as it as it has underneath the current floor. It will also repair the tongue and groove boards in that apse. And then the gallery stairs. You can see on the upper right that original gallery stair, which is probably the most architecturally sophisticated and historically significant part of the interior. We'll restrict, however, public access to the gallery but we will repair any floorboards that are out of sorts. We'll also keep that beaded baseboard, but we will remove the modern, unsafe, code compliant southeast stair. And whether or not we replace it with a matching stair to the one on the other corner, or whether we simply floor over that for the short term depends again on the decisions based on cost. Next. Here you see we'll remove the added 1980s light fixtures, and we will restore the one surviving main sanctuary light, which is in there. We found in the corner of the room. And then the light in the apse is also an original one. We can also see from the photograph in the upper right that there were more lights in the corners under the gallery. And we will replace those with you know, matching types of electroliers. We'll also add track lights along each side of the building, under and above the gallery, so that we will be able to wash the walls in light and display interpretive panels and so forth. Next, and here's a rendering of what the interior could look like after all those things were done. You can see the track lighting on each side, the modern the new antique light fixtures in the corners, the historic light fixture in the apse and a repainted woodwork floor refinished new baseboard. Next.

Lucas Hoffman: For the MEP Scope of Work all the existing engineering systems that have been described that were added over the years by Gibson will be removed and modernized. For mechanical system we're going to go with a simple approach of a light commercial split system heat pump, which will serve the building well and its usage as an interpretive space for the public to come and be comfortable. We are adding an energy recovery ventilator to try to address the times when we need to increase ventilation air to the space if any meeting or gatherings are planned for the building use. On the next slide, you'll kind of see a rough layout it's going to mimic of some of what other installation had been done previously. Grade mounted heat pump that we try to hide in the rear alcove of the building so that we don't see it from the street. We're going to make improvements to the existing crawl space and install the equipment down there so that it can be maintained, accessible. And we're going to coordinate with the structural team of how we route the ductwork through the openings to floor registers throughout the space. Electrical with the mechanical system we picked, we're able to stay at a 240 single phase service, which is how the building is fed today. So that will limit the amount of work we have to do with the Dominion Energy. We will be doing a new feed from the pole that's below grade to a brand new existing electrical panel. The electrical panel located in the basement will be supporting the different lighting that's been described by Nick and Gibson, as well as the different outlets that we want to put throughout the space to support the interpretive and meeting function. We will be providing a fire alarm system as part of the renovation that will be providing initiation via smoke detection, as well as notification to public occupants. Plumbing, we are going to do a complete replacement of plumbing utilities back to the street utilities. So, we'll have a new water service connection with backflow prevention, as

well as a new sanitary lateral supporting the renovated bathrooms and all new piping throughout, and a small electric water heater to support the restroom itself.

Kevin Fallin: Okay, can everyone see my screen?

Bridge Littleton: It's very small. We can't see it. Can you scroll in? Thanks. That worked.

Kevin Fallin: So, I'm just going to hit some highlights and show you what's driving the costs right now. Scroll down to the bottom to start, and I'll just show you that our estimate is indicating we're at about 1.859 million. This does include a 10% design contingency, but there's several elements where the costs are significant. And I just kind of want to point those out for you. As we go down through, I want to point out as well that there's also three alternatives that have been priced. One is to plaster repair of walls above the gallery floor, which would be a $43,717 add. The second add alternate would be to add gypsum wallboard, ceiling, and attic insulation on the bottom of the roof trusses. That would be about $20,664, and alternate number three was to add lightning protection upon the roof and bring it down to a grounding station at the ground level, and that would be $5,520. I'm going to slowly scroll through the estimate and then I'll show you the larger numbers. We've estimated that it's going to take about six months to do the project, maybe a little bit longer. It really depends on the craftsmen that are hired and the size of their crews. And we've broken everything down by divisions. So, this is what we just looked at was kind of division one, general conditions, things of that nature. You'll see that total was 189. As we scroll on through, we go through the demo site demo that's going to run around $44,000. When we get into the concrete talking about the curb and gutter, the new floor in the mechanical room, the retaining walls and also the sidewalk here that all comes down to about $62,000. And now we're into the masonry, and you're going to see here that one of the big numbers as we go through this is the repointing of the stone. We've estimated that about 40% of the total area may need to be re-pointed. Until we remove some of the stucco and take a little bit closer look that's a guess at this point, but you can see that that number of $151,351.52, that's the first significant dollar amount we've seen. As we move on down through the estimate, you'll see some different numbers woods, plastics, and composites here. Fairly small numbers. And then when we get down to the structural repairs, then we start to see some significant numbers. There's quite a bit of structural repairs that need to be done to return the building to its former state. And so that's one of the significant costs is the structural repairs. So, you can see that that particular section adds up to $437,000 right there. So that includes repairing 50% of the original lintels at a cost of $38,000. You've got all the different structural repair line items. But what's also driving that up is this number right here, $209,933.59 and that's to remove the cement stucco and repair it with the age-appropriate lime. So that's 8,482ft² that's a pretty big number. It's also driving up the costs. The next area I'll just hit upon is reconstructing the doors and windows. So, we have two front entry doors that are going to have to be basically be rebuilt, and that's going to take some time and some craftsmanship. And so that's driving up the cost of the doors. So that'd be $35,573.65 for those two doors. That does include the door hardware and then the windows as you can see here, we've got $96,000 to reglaze and repair 20 windows, and then another $43,000 to add the 20 interior storm windows. So that's driving those costs up. And that's a lot of very skilled craftsmen who do these repairs under strict guidelines issued by the National Park Service. A little bit of cost for the plaster on the first floor on the interior. Nothing special there. As we scroll on down through, we start getting into the MEP type areas. So, plumbing see here this cost for demo and all the new piping and fixtures, but all in the plumbing scope is only $28,000. So comparatively speaking, that's a small number. Mechanical again, a fairly standard type of unit with an ERV. We're estimating that to be about $26,759. And then for the electrical again, we've got some demo costs in there. New wiring, new panel, new lighting. We estimate that that's going to be about $62,635. And then that brings us down to electronic safety and security. So, we've got the fire alarm system that's $6,886. We've currently included a security system at about $7,516. And we have voice and data as well at $8,610 that brings us up to Earthwork. Got a little bit of work to get the soils graded and all cut and infill. So, $13,000 there. Then we've got some milling and paving, curb, and gutter again, some retaining walls and seed and sod to restore that. So that's $57,000. And then some other utilities outside site lighting. We've put in an allowance of $15,000 right now because it hasn't been designed, but we see that possibly being a mixture of bollards and perhaps a couple of lights on poles. Again, tying into the water service requires excavation and backfill, the same for the sewer and also for the storm that total comes to $30,000. And then here's a summary of the markups. You'll see we have a combined markup of 26.69%. That includes 10% overhead and profit, 1.22% for bonds, 0.63% for insurance, 10% is a design contingency. And as the design progresses, we will lower this number to zero. So, you can see that that 10% is $164,000 right now. So, and then we've got some costs in there for escalation at 2.8%. And with that, that brings us back to the top where you can

see the divisional breakdown. And that brings us to the total of the $1.8 million. And I'm happy to answer any questions at this time.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Thanks everybody. We really appreciate the presentation. Let's do two pieces to this. Any questions for the design team on what they present? Let's go through any questions on the design, the ideas, the concepts, stuff like that. And then we can ask Kevin and Rhonda and Danny about the costs. So, on the first side of it, which was the design elements and the structural and all that kind of stuff. Anybody have any questions for Glavé & Holmes?

Pam Curran: I have a comment.

Bridge Littleton: Go ahead.

Pam Curran: I mean, it's beautiful. You know, if we get there, I mean, it's beautiful, I think. And then the question I had, because we're going to have artifacts and museum type things on display, is there any consideration for like a curated space related to, you know, preserving what may be given to us related to artifacts, older artifacts? Do we do, I mean, maybe. [multiple speakers] I guess it's a question for them.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah, it's a question for them.

Deborah Gallagher: Yeah, that's just a question I had.

Gibson Worsham: Well, there is a [inaudible] gallery level that could handle a certain amount of storage.

Susan Reed: And we have tried to make sure that there's space for displays or you can use it. It's flexible. It's something that you can decide how you'd like to showcase items, whether they are hung on a wall in two dimensional or display cases around the perimeter of the space so that there's circulation. It was designed with that in mind?

Bridge Littleton: Kevin.

J. Kevin Daly: I like the concept of the sidewalk being disabled enabled. Inside the building will the bathrooms also be able to be entered into with someone in a wheelchair?

Susan Reed: Definitely. They are designed to be ADA compliant, and the ADA path from the exterior will go straight into the interior, and you can make the turn into the restroom. It's also compliant. So, the entire pathway.

Cindy Pearson: So, I just wanted to make a comment. There is just one bathroom, correct? Yes. It's a handicapped unisex bathroom because I hear at times we are saying.

Susan Reed: Basically, for the size to make it ADA accessible it and also to keep it the size overall from not being too large. It is, one, but it is usable for general use for ADA.

Cindy Pearson: Yes. Right. Just wanted to clarify that because sometimes we're saying the word bathrooms plural, and I think people are hearing that, where there's just one bathroom.

Susan Reed: Yeah, historically there were two.

Cindy Pearson: Exactly. So, it started out two.

Susan Reed: It went from bathrooms to bathroom singular.

Cindy Pearson: Right. Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Anybody else?

Deborah Gallagher: [off mic] I have a question about the difference between limestone stucco and cement stucco. Can you talk a little bit about that?

Susan Reed: Gibson, do you want to go through that?

Gibson Worsham: Sure. So historically stucco was done using simply lime and sand. And that is what currently covers the building for the most part. And it's still in reasonable condition. When the towards the end of the church's occupation, they scored that lime which was showing signs of deterioration, they scored it and used in order to get the new stucco cement to stick better, and they just simply skim coated the whole thing. We found that that skim coat comes off pretty readily because it's much harder than the lime, and it sort of comes loose. It's already coming loose if you go look at the building, you'll see it's peeling off. So, we found that with a building like this, which has it's a solid masonry building, they're going to be contractions and expansions and that a softer mortar or plaster on the exterior of the building is will heal itself, essentially, and it lasts longer.

Deborah Gallagher: Excellent. Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Any other questions? I had a couple quick questions, so.

Danny Davis: Rhonda needs to unmute us real quick. Sorry.

Rhonda North: Sorry [off mic] at once.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. So, a couple quick questions. In the approach you guys took towards the different restoration factors. What level of. I'm trying to think of the right way to ask this question. The word craftsman was used many, many, many times. And when you say craftsman, you also say cost. So, I'm not it's not really a cost question. Where I'm going is an example is the entry doors. So, there's four doors and I think the cost estimate for that is almost $40,000. Is that like hand building and hewing and, you know, making new doors from scratch? Or is it, you know, custom, but from a fabrication shop? I mean, you know, I'm trying to understand the level of yeah, the level of finish that was put into this design. You know because those are going to be what drive the cost.

Susan Reed: Understood? Yes. The most cost-effective approach would be pursued, but the design does need to be custom. It would be based upon existing historic fabric that is on that building. So, we know what profiles need to be used. We are not going to find them off the shelf. So, it is I think the emphasis is on custom. And we do want a level of quality in the design, but by all means it is about finding the most effective way to get the appropriate design constructed.

Gibson Worsham: I can also add that those are really the only elements in the restoration that require that level of attention, because it's the only thing we're recreating that has historic detailing of that sort.

Susan Reed: Just oh, sorry. I was just going to add that it is following the Secretary of the interior standards. It's important not to be conjectural about or add something that we know was never there. So, it really is an important area to focus on making sure that it is based upon evidence.

Bridge Littleton: No. Understood. I mean, but I think what's very, very important is it needs to be affordable. So, the Secretary of the interior guidelines are great to haves but not got to haves. So, at the end of the day, we want the building restored and we want it to be functional for the intended use, but within a manageable budget. So, there is going to have to be give and take. To Deborah's question about the stucco, is the approach you guys are using for the stucco what's driving it being lime? Because I know there's multiple types of stucco that can that look great and last forever and are durable and all that kind of stuff. I think the, you know, so give a little bit more on that because those costs were in the hundreds of thousands just for the stucco.

Gibson Worsham: Sure. Yeah. the stucco is actually relatively intact on the building. And so, we don't want to remove the stucco. And so, the new stucco needs to be compatible with the existing stucco. The skim coat is simply a masking

agent that was applied over the original stucco. All of which, as I say, is except where the stone has cracked or given all that's still there. And we don't plan on removing the stucco. So, it's really essential that our new material is compatible.

Bridge Littleton: Got it. Okay.

Gibson Worsham: I don't think the cost is in the lime it's just in the workmanship.

Bridge Littleton: Sure. Okay. Any other questions about design stuff before we go to cost? Pam.

Pam Curran: I had a question similar to yours. Bridge is just in terms of value engineering. You know, given the fact that it is so much over, I think what we had thought. Have we looked at that and then a guess again, alternatives to Bridges point for, for a lot of what we have still conveying, you know, what we're trying to offer the community. So do we. Have we looked at all of that.

Susan Reed: Nicholas, you might want to jump in as well, but we are looking at the cost. And one of the key things we do is prioritize where our, the most important things are. Those doors actually are really important. And there are other things I'd rather sacrifice than have doors that aren't historically accurate. So, you know, we will be taking a very hard look at those kinds of decisions about how to best prioritize. Also how to maybe do things a little more economically. Sometimes you can look at, for example, the extent of the stucco repairs, the places that are not as visible maybe would not, at this phase be treated. Those could be saved for a later phase. So, we do go through and work with it until we can meet the budget.

Rhonda North: And Council Member Curran part of the reason that we bring on Downey and Scott at the design level is so that they can help us value engineer throughout the design level so that we're not waiting to the end until the designs done and then trying to value engineer.

Pam Curran: Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Kevin, if you can bring your top-level sheet up again and we can have a conversation about the costs. So, I think the first question, well, let me go around the room first. If anybody's got any questions on the or actually, Rhonda, is there anything else you want to add to that? Because I know this 1.8 million is not the total cost. What's the estimate for the total all in, finally done? Because this is just the building and there's stuff we've already spent and there's costs that will have to be incurred that's not in that estimate. So, what's the total all in at the moment?

Rhonda North: So yes, Mr. Mayor, this the figure, the $1.8 million figure cited by Mr. Fallin is just for the construction and restoration cost for the building. So, we still have the cost for the A E for the C M. We have incurred costs to do hazmat inspections. We've incurred some costs already to do some stabilization recently. And there will be other inspection costs as well as landscaping, you know, those type of things. Just an estimate, you know, based on the schematic design. I think it's probably going to take it to somewhere around 2.4 million. And we currently have $1 million available in CIP funding towards the project.

Bridge Littleton: Does that include what we've spent to date? So not the 200 we spent ten years ago that's all gone. But does that 2.4 include what we've spent to date or is that 2.4 the 1.8 plus everything else that needs to be done.

Rhonda North: So, the 2.4 would be the all in cost, including what we have already spent. So, of the $1 million in the capital fund. And of course, we spent some of that on the Oral histories project. So, by the time you back out the oral histories project cost the C M the A E and the inspections and things we have about $400,000 left to apply towards the construction.

Bridge Littleton: So, we've spent $600,000 so far.

Rhonda North: Well, we have committed.

Bridge Littleton: Or committed. Okay.

Rhonda North: Yes.

Bridge Littleton: So. I just want to make sure I get the numbers right. So far, we've spent our committed 600 grand. We've got 400 grand that we haven't spent or committed yet. We haven't committed beyond that. But with what we've spent so far and all the construction and everything, all in the price tag right now is 2.4 thereabouts.

Rhonda North: That is the estimate at this point.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Is the contract for the construction fixed price?

Rhonda North: So yes, we would once the construction plans are developed, we would issue an IFB and it would be a fixed price project.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. So, and I'm looking to you and to Danny and it's going to be a real fixed price contract that.

Danny Davis: As much as you can in the construction world. Yes sir.

Bridge Littleton: Yes, I get you, I get you, but I mean, but we will be incredibly specific and incredibly detailed, so they know what they're getting themselves into because, you know, it's the hidden things that creep up. Oh, we didn't see this little thing in the whatever that. Oh, if you want that, it's another hundred, you know, avoiding that as much as we can.

Danny Davis: Well, I think, I think we've had experience where we can have the best construction documents and contractors may not read them well. However, that being said this would be very clearly defined and this would not be a walk in the door and say, oh, let's, you know, change this up on the spot. Change orders can happen and do happen. There's contingencies for that, I think Mr. Fallin, though, did absolutely point out one of the biggest unknowns of the cost estimate, and that is the repointing of the stone. He's estimated about 40% of the stone needing that at, I think, an amount of $150,000. Well, if we have to double that, there's another $150,000 and that just comes with the territory, so.

Bridge Littleton: No, I understand, I just, my concern is, you know, it goes from 2.4 to 3, you know, that's where my concern is, right?

Danny Davis: Right. And I think part of part of it again. Relying on the experts here of design, especially the structural elements of this, that's where you see, I think in my layman's concern, the biggest idea of where could we run into huge red flags? I think TYLin has done a great job looking at all the structural elements and identifying what needs to be done to bring it to that point. And I think that while yes, there still could be some unexpected, I don't anticipate it being significant. And the other component is it's a small building. You know, we're in a different comparison than this project here. Very little site work, very little unknowns getting into the ground like we had here. And then in terms of the interior of it, very, very I'm not sure if basic is the right word, but it's a very, just basic project, you know, we're getting the walls and the ceiling up and making sure there's a possibility. And you can have a restroom, and you can have HVAC, and that means we can hold a gathering of 40 or 50 people in there. So, you know, we're not making it overly ornate. We don't want to do that because that would not be historically sensitive. So, we don't see the challenge or concern of it going from a 2.4 to a 3 million unless we run into some just major issue. And in that case, we would be talking about a potential just change in scope.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Pam, go ahead.

Pam Curran: So is the FF&E in the 1.8, you know, display cases, chairs.

Danny Davis: It is not.

Pam Curran: So that's above.

Danny Davis: And I believe Miss North had had anticipated a.

Rhonda North: I did include a modest amount of because we are going to restore the pews in the center and return those in the space. But there is no plan to restore the pews in the outer edges. Those will just be stored up on the second floor.

Danny Davis: But that was part of your 2.4, correct?

Rhonda North: Correct.

Bridge Littleton: Other questions for Kevin regarding cost? Go ahead.

Chris Bernard: Yeah. Just very quickly. We don't have that in front of us. Is there any way that you guys could send out that breakdown, Kevin. Thank you.

Rhonda North: So, they were working.

Kevin Fallin: Rhonda has it.

Rhonda North: Yeah, they were working on that right up until we. We walked in the meeting room this evening, so, yes, we will share it.

Bridge Littleton: Did you have a question? Okay.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Kevin, let me ask you a couple quick questions then. In the cost estimate that you've put together, as Pam mentioned, have you done any value engineering?

Kevin Fallin: So, we have not done any value engineering to date. We talked about different options early on and realized that some of the higher end options, for example, with the HVAC, we're going to be costly. And so, we kind of dialed back to a simpler system. So, I think the whole design team is aware of the cost being an issue, and we're going to keep an eye on it as the design progresses. And our hope would be that through some fundraising and things of that; we can maybe get all of the work done. But I think, as Susan mentioned earlier, we're going to start to put a prioritized list together of what has to be done. And right off the top of my head, I'd say, you know, the structural repairs need to get done. We want to complete the exterior of the building and stop the water infiltration and then anything beyond that and, you know, maybe do the ADA toilet, but anything beyond that is, you know, could be done in phases at a later stage. So, we're going to work with the design team to put that list together and have a kind of a placeholder, you know, price for each one of those items so that we can take a look at it and rank them.

Bridge Littleton: Where do you see the biggest opportunities for savings?

Kevin Fallin: Well, right now we've kind of put a stake in the ground with regard to the amount of point up of the stone. So, it could go either way. We could find out that you need less and you'd have some savings. We could find out that it's going to be more. And then the costs with the lime plaster overcoat. Right now, it's just very labor intensive to pull that skim coat off and then go back. And we've got some touch-ups that has to be done with the stonework there as well. So, it really comes down to labor. And so anywhere that we can obtain some labor savings is going to translate into dollars for the project.

Bridge Littleton: Yep. Okay. And from a time perspective. No. No, I get that. How much more work needs to be done between today and construction being able to be begun? And I know whatever date you give me, it's going to move to the right, so.

Rhonda North: So based on our project.

Kevin Fallin: I want to make sure I understand the question. Are you talking about when will we have construction documents available?

Bridge Littleton: No. I'm asking, you know, if we said yes today how much more work needs to get done before the construction can begin? What's the timeline?

Danny Davis: For design or construction?

Bridge Littleton: From today to beginning construction?

Danny Davis: Okay.

Bridge Littleton: How much time is that going to require?

Danny Davis: So let Miss North.

Bridge Littleton: The day we say go.

Danny Davis: Go for the day we sign a contract for construction?

Bridge Littleton: No. If [multiple speakers]

Danny Davis: If Council says yes, we want to move forward. Okay, so let's step back if I can. Miss North, would you please just give the base timeline for completing the design?

Rhonda North: Yes. So, assuming we continue forward, we anticipate that we will be presenting the construction documents, the final construction documents, to the Council in July or August of this year. We will then look at the financing piece of it. We're anticipating a couple of months to look at the financing piece. During that time period, we will be preparing the invitation for bid documents. We will be pre-qualifying general contractors to bid on the project, and then we will be issuing the IFB. I would anticipate it would be the end of the year before we are ready to make a recommendation to the Council to accept bids and make a recommendation to the Council. Usually, they take a month to mobilize. So, I would anticipate probably about February they would start construction.

Bridge Littleton: Right. And there's no way we're going to meet that. So, there's a lot to go through here. So okay. So, it's really construction from thumbs up. Put it that way. It's a year to begin construction, basically saying next February. It's February now so. Okay, to get through all the design work and the construction or not construction, the bids, and the award of the contract and all that, it's going to take us a year.

Danny Davis: So close to it. I just want to reiterate that we are still in the design phase. This is just a schematic design.

Bridge Littleton: Understood. Understood. Okay. Yeah, but I mean.

Danny Davis: So, five months. Five months to get from where we are today to an actual set of plans so we can talk later if we need to. But I think this idea of Council saying, go, we're already in go. We are going and we are going to, I mean, this is schematic design. We're going to take this to the next level of design, and then we're going to come back to you a second time.

Bridge Littleton: I mean, but we need to have a conversation before that about costs, because we have set aside a million. And, you know, we always knew it was going to be more than that. But 2.5, 2.4 all in, I think, is I know for me more than what the expected cost was. So, I'm not saying we're stopping anything and it's a decision of Council, but I think we have to think how we're going to afford this. So that could delay things?

Danny Davis: No, 100%. I'm just saying unless Council tells us tonight or in a month, pause the whole project we're still moving the design forward.

Bridge Littleton: We're not saying that. I mean, we can have the conversations in parallel.

Danny Davis: Absolutely.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah.

Rhonda North: And as I say, once we get through the construction design, we do have a period built in there to talk about the financing.

Danny Davis: And that can be longer than.

Rhonda North: It may need to be longer than two months. But we do have time. But that's sort of phase three of the project.

Bridge Littleton: But I think it's important that we not go all the way through the design if what we want to see is some value engineering, because then you're going to have to go back and redo it. Right. So, if we want you guys to look at value engineering and find or I think somebody said you could do maybe in phases to make it more affordable. We need to have those conversations before just getting everything done. Because then you're going to have to go back and it'll actually be a waste of time.

Chris Hersh: Mr. Mayor.

Bridge Littleton: Who was that? Oh, Chris.

Chris Hersh: Chris.

Bridge Littleton: I'm sorry. Booming from above.

Chris Hersh: Surprise! The phase component to me is important in terms of the, like, restoring the integrity of the building. I'm also interested in the cost of restoring the staircase on the other side but basically phasing it and have those costs available in that direction to help make decisions.

Bridge Littleton: It's a great point. And align the cost around the stabilization and the structural. So, we, you know, damage stops it's stabilized. And then like you said, Chris, there's things that you can do down the road as you have more funds available. No, that's a great point. What's that? Go ahead.

Chris Bernard: Yeah. I think looking at the phasing is important. I think we should also kind of similar to that be looking at the you know, what you've given us is I think what it looks like in an optimum situation. But as you guys mentioned, there are certain things that we could do at a certain level, or we could do it at another level that would affect the cost. What I want to be careful about with doing the actual work in phases is that it may be cheaper in the short term, but does it actually make, you know, does it cost more in the long run? And until you're finished, are you sitting with an incomplete building? You know, does it make more sense? You know, look at costs a lot, but it's less than in the long run and you actually get to use it right away. So being able to see that step-out would be helpful if you guys can do that.

Danny Davis: Yeah. Excuse me. I think we can work with the team and with Kevin to definitely dial that out. And I know Miss North and the team have already talked about just like what you said specifically those different the core critical piece to start with what really needs to be done, especially when you look at the roof loading, all falling on those decorative columns that just needs to be addressed. And then going from there being careful, though, that we're not splitting it so much that it creates actually a more difficult or cost-consuming project.

J. Kevin Daly: Question.

Bridge Littleton: Go ahead, Pam.

Pam Curran: So, I read and then I just heard that we're talking also about doing fundraising. Are we going to hire someone to do a capital campaign?

Danny Davis: I think we're intending for it to be organically run a personal outreach to the community who's been engaged in this project. If Council would like to have that as a conversation, I'm happy to talk with you about that and figure out if we think that would be worth our while.

Pam Curran: Well, because a building campaign is a little bit different than maybe a cause or a program. So, you know, I just with the gap, I just wondered, you know, what the focus would be with raising money?

Danny Davis: Yeah, it's I mean, at this point, it is about talking to the members of the community who have an interest in supporting it. We know there's a lot of people who have expressed interest in the past. And this is, you know, it's a building campaign, but it is a cause. Right? And it is not a building like this town hall that becomes functional. It is a really restoring history. And so, making outreach to those who have a vested interest in that and want to support that throughout the community.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah.

Chris Bernard: I mean, and I'm not like a fundraising genius. And so, timing may be important here, but from our end, I think it would be helpful if we did have some idea like, is someone going to come out of the sky and contribute a half a million or $1 million because that could make a difference in the decision making?

Danny Davis: Correct.

Chris Bernard: So, I'd hate to get all the way through to design and do all this value engineering and get down and then we find out really the cost wasn't a big issue.

Danny Davis: So again, due to Miss North's brilliance with our February 11th event we're sandwiching this discussion in between the oral histories conversation but giving the community who's at that event the first kind of opportunity to say also is part of this; to help bring this to fruition, we are taking donations. We have pledges, you know, opportunities for those who are part of this event and then into the future to say, I want to be a part of the Asbury Church project. So that will be beginning on February 11th.

Rhonda North: And so, we're sort of jumping a little bit into a later agenda item which is, you know, approval to, to seek to accept donations for the project. But I have been talking to Tim Clites, who is here in the audience. And Mr. Clites was on the was a part of the Middleburg Library Expansion project that was done, I think, about ten years ago. And he has shared some information with me on how they did their fundraising because the community provided the funds, all of the funds for that project, as I understand it. So, what we're essentially doing is, is following the same model. We're going to recommend we follow the same model that the library successfully used to do their restoration and expansion project.

Bridge Littleton: Any other questions for Rhonda, Kevin, or the Glavé and Holmes team? Danny, I can't remember, do we have this on the agenda for the Strategic Retreat?

Danny Davis: It's a topic that I will add. Sure.

Bridge Littleton: Yes. No, because, I mean, we really need to get into the weeds. I mean, we haven't seen we just now saw the cost and from Kevin and whatnot. So. Yeah, let's absolutely have that on the Saturday. I think that will be really important.

Danny Davis: We might need Sunday as well. We have a lot on this agenda.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah.

Chris Bernard: Until Monday. [off mic]

Bridge Littleton: Yeah. The previous Monday. Okay. Well first let me say to the folks at Glavé & Holmes the design looks wonderful. I mean, you guys did a really, really nice job. And I love the path out front with the bell and that looks really great. And you know, we You appreciate you respecting the history of the building, respecting the time period, I think is great. You know, focusing on the 1920s, 1930s in the glory days but also making it functional for the community you know, the bathroom being handicapped accessible, restoring the doors, restoring the windows. I think you guys did a really, really nice job. So, we appreciate all the hard work and all the hard effort and Kevin, thank you again to for, you know, doing a great job on getting the details with the cost. It's really important. You know, we want to bring this cornerstone of our community back to life, but we have to do it fiscally, responsibly for, you know, for everybody. So, it's just like when we were doing this building, you know finding the places where we can find efficiencies but also not sacrifice the quality or the integrity of the design. So again, thank you guys very much. And I think with that you guys can log off and we'll go to the next item. Okay.

Susan Reed: Thank you very much.

Gibson Worsham: Have a good night. [multiple speakers]

Nikolas Coile: Thank you.

Kevin Fallin: Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. So next item up is staff reports. I don't think Vince is here, so, Danny, if you want to cover for him.

Danny Davis: Absolutely, Mr. Mayor, and I have his report. We'll bring that up real shortly. It'll take us just one second. But thank you for the opportunity to share. Okay. Come on. There we go.

Darlene Kirk: Is there an issue at the treatment plant right now?

Danny Davis: Thankfully not an issue. We were having some air valves as part of the plant that have just from time to time, been sticking in place, not opening, not closing. So, he had a maintenance team working and he called about 5:30 and said, “we’re just like on a roll. We just want to keep rolling. And I said, keep doing it because I'd rather, you know, when you have the team take advantage of them. And so, they're just it's routine maintenance. But a few small issues that were challenged previously. As you see here, and similar to charts you've seen before, the average daily flow, we continue to see less wastewater flow than typical. Again, a lot of that due to lack of rain. We do still get some INI inflow and infiltration into our sewer lines. So, when we have less rain and the ground water table is lower, we just have less of that water coming into our sewer plant but continuing to produce water at a good rate. Overall, seeing a little bit of decline from the prior year. Some of that is due to changes in patterns of some of the highest users, specifically folks who were using a lot of water for irrigation systems, especially even at the end of the fall of 2024. We aren't seeing that quite as much now that their lawns have been stabilized. So, you will see that when we talk about budget in a month or so, a little bit of impact on revenues and anticipated revenues, but we're recalibrating that to maybe our a better new normal, if you will, in terms of expected consumption patterns. On the wastewater side, you have the report. Vince was just going to highlight a few of these issues here. We had done the CCTV video of about half of our sewer lines. We have a few projects that are hotspots that we're going to be looking at putting out some bids for addressing those real concerning issues, particularly South Pendleton at the top of the sewer line itself, the pipe is collapsed to a degree. Now it's kind of being held up by, let's say, rock. I mean, it's you see it from the inside. There's breakage in the concrete, but it's still holding steady. It's just not that it needs to be fixed before it actually collapses. So that's probably priority number one. We have a few teams. We do both a cut open cut repair, and then we would line the rest of the sewer pipe with a lining

system, so we don't have to replace the entire line with new pipe. It's much cheaper to do a cured in place lining system, but those don't work when you have such a split or break in the concrete itself. Again, Vince and his team have been very responsive to issues that have arisen at the wastewater plant working with Valley Automation. There are controls and electrician team. They also help with some equipment when things don't run as expected. The last item here occurred in January, but I wanted to go ahead and raise it to your attention just for your own awareness. On the 11th, we had an overflow situation at our wastewater plant, where one of the sensors that would measure the level of the reactor basin, the sensor itself, went bad. And so, it told the system, everything's great, you don't need to run. And it didn't send any alarms because it said everything is great. You don't need to run. Thankfully, one of our officers was going to fill up his car before heading home and gave us a call and let us know that there was an overflow at the sewage plant. So [off mic]. Which one? [off mic] Yeah, but that was in January. [off mic] So. Yep. Sorry. So, we made the required notices to DEQ provided them both a recap of what occurred. And then also, you have to tell them what you're doing. So that does not occur again. Our solution essentially is to put in a redundant system. So, if one of the sensors fails, we'll have a another float, another sensor that will tell us, hey, you're getting a weird reading. And so, we estimate about maybe 20,000 gallons of sewage flowed out of the basin. And so, we're just waiting to hear if has any input on that. So, part of what happens in normal activity, and we try to avoid these proactively as much as we can with not having single points of failure but can't always catch them all ahead of time. But I will say kudos to the IES team they this was on a Sunday evening. Vince and Gary were out here immediately redirected the flow to another location so it could hold it. Found the issue, got the plant running. And then Monday morning, we had a full crew of five guys from IES doing site cleanup, and they were back again Tuesday. So, they understand the importance. I mean, I was on the phone with Mark on Sunday evening making sure that his crews were coming as quickly as possible, and they were right on it.

Danny Davis: So, I want to thank them for their responsiveness. On the water side you'll see a few different items. There was a private lateral that needed some repairs. We did have VRWA Virginia Rural Water Association there. The Association of just municipal small water operators and systems. And they have services; they have circuit riders that go around and just provide assistance as needed. And they came to look and see. They can just do general leak. They'll listen out to hydrants; they'll listen out around. Just see if they notice any leak issues so far have not found anything. Again, regular maintenance activities going on. And then again, as discussed at the last meeting, the well levels are holding steady. They're okay. Again, we have the concern of longevity and long term, if we don't see good precipitation, we'll talk about this weekend at a later part of the meeting. So, we are grateful for the snow from the standpoint that it will help with our groundwater. Vince has provided the graphs. These are again, similar. I showed you these at the last meeting, so I'm not going to run through them. What I will tell you, though, and I apologize. I have it on my other computer for the month of January. He now that he's back from holidays and his paternity leave, he has been running Well 3 more frequently and running Well 3 allows us to let Well 4 take a breather. And so, if you look on the chart here. Well 4 the kind of static water level is about 215 to 217ft. And what he indicated is that by running Well 3 we're actually seeing now the static water level of Well 4 go up about 30ft. So, it's now at 185ft instead of 217. So that's really good news that as we run Well 4 less or maybe just not as hard, it is recovering back up, and we can use Well 3. It's a little labor intensive because we have to flush Well 3 for anywhere from 15 to 45 minutes to get a lot of that really the turbidity in the water. It's the stirred-up iron and manganese that Cindy often sees because she's the first one off the well right there. So, if we flush that first, then the rest of the water coming out is really clear and much better than the issues we had probably 3, 4 or 5 years ago. So, we're trying to be very cognizant of that before we put that water straight into distribution. And the rest of these are just well graphs from December. They don't cover the last three weeks. So, I'm happy to try to answer any questions you might have.

Bridge Littleton: Any questions for Danny? Pam.

Pam Curran: I'm going to try and ask this question, but how would six feet of snow translate into impacting the water table?

Danny Davis: Correct. So, we look at the actual precipitation value. So, you generally estimate that every inch of water equals ten inches of snow. It's about a 10 to 1 ratio. Right now, the forecasts are anywhere from one inch of precipitation to 1.6in of precipitation depending on the model, depending on who you look at. So, if we get an inch to an inch and a half of precipitation, that's anywhere from 10 to 15in of snow it's twofold. One, it's like a one-inch rain, which is great. But then the second part is because it's sitting on the ground, is that slow seep into the ground. It doesn't run off into a creek

and depart. So, we did have that good rain that was actually the day before the overflow at the wastewater plant on January 10th. We had an inch and a third of rain, and it was a slow, steady rain all day long. And you could see the ground was, you know, trying to soak it up. Snow helps with that, especially if we get multiple snows. And then that leads into a wet springtime. Then the ground's ready to receive that rain. So again, I don't pray for masses and masses of snow too often, but I will take as much precipitation as we can get.

Bridge Littleton: Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: On. Geez, it just flipped. With the water, and it's on 12:30. It says turned Well L off. It does not make sense to run the well unless we must. Yeah, that's right. I can see it, I know. There we go. So, is that the problem that we have when P and L do, they're?

Danny Davis: A little bit a little bit. There are a couple things going on with that Well L we found that one of the valves of that raw water line at the plant was leaking. It's about, again, 15 years old. And so, it was causing some of that water coming from Well L to be lost anywhere from, I think 8 to 10 gallons a minute, and it's usually pumping about 40 gallons a minute. So that's about a quarter of the water from Well L was just going to waste. So, two things happening. One, we don't want to lose that water. So, we shut Well L off. And two, Well L is the one that just was having a hard time recovering on its own so Well P even though there's a little bit of negative impact to P when it's running by itself, it still has about 200ft above the pump. It has a lot of space to go, and it doesn't see a precipitous drop when we run it. It's just it loses a foot a day or so. And again, the demands on the system are not huge right now. So, we're comfortable running Well P by itself. We have the parts to rebuild those valves on order they should be here in 4 to 6 weeks, give or take. And then we can then start running Well L. It will be interesting to see what the recovery of L looks like if we don't run it for, you know, a month or two. See if it gains more than just a few feet if it gains 50, 60, 70ft. But Well P does do fine by itself. It's just those are the two wells that feed into the Stonewall plant. And so right now we could run L if necessary, but we'd rather just focus on running P. Does that help?

Cindy Pearson: Yes, that does that answers. And it seems of course, we've never had a report like this before, so it seems like there's always a lot of repairs and things that break and things that happen crazily, which I'm sure they did all along. We just didn't know it. But do you think we'll get to a point where we keep things running better, you know, ahead of the game a little.

Danny Davis: So, our goal is on the major items. So, if we think, well pumps, blowers, motors, booster pumps that we have a better sense of, we know this booster pump will last ten years. So, we are planning replacement costs even now in our capital asset fund so that in two, three, four years when one needs to be replaced, we have that money ready to go. So, I think we're doing a better job on our bigger pieces, the valves like this that you don't necessarily anticipate or it's 15 years old. So, the general life cycle of things like this is in the 12-to-15-year range. So, if we replace this, our goal would be yeah, these valves won't go for another 15 years, but it might be the next set and the next set. So, there is always going to be a time frame of something happening that we didn't anticipate. And that's why we try to keep dollars in our capital program to backfill and pay for that. The really big ones are the ones where we're starting to be more proactive and thoughtful about how we plan the five-year CIP. Mark has put together a great spreadsheet for us for the wastewater side. Essentially every major component. How long its lifespan is anticipated to be, what its cost is today, what its cost is, would be when that life cycle ends based on guessing at inflation? And so over the next 40 years, I might have to replace one component four times. But I know how to plan that out because it's on a spreadsheet. So, we have that for wastewater. He's working on that for water as well. I think once we get all those pieces together, our CIP will be even more robust. It also goes to show how much it costs.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Any other questions for Danny?

Chris Bernard: I'm going to do like a little bit of a tangent on this. But Pam brought up the snow. Two things, are we prepared or do we have special things that we are doing to prepare for our utilities and infrastructure? Because not only is there going to be a ton of snow, it's going to be in the single digits for multiple days. So that's one and then two, do we

have a plan, or can we put together something to put out to the local citizens, surrounding areas about preparedness for those single digit temps? As far as you know, their individual, you know, water pipes and all that stuff. Maybe some just tips and recommendations. I think that would be helpful.

Danny Davis: Yes. So, kind of falls under the overarching conversation this weekend. I don't know if Mr. Mayor you're okay if I just go ahead and kind of capture it all now, I don't want to lose sight of the utilities in the big picture, but we've met a couple times.

Bridge Littleton: Anybody got any other utility questions? Okay.

Danny Davis: So, staff has met a couple of times already. We've met with the police department earlier this week. We met with IES on Wednesday, and we're meeting again tomorrow to talk about those very things. How are we preparing for the storm coming up? Specifically on the utility side we have all the supplies we need, all the heaters, the temperature. We've topped off all the generators with fuel. And we have everything ready to go and to run. So don't have any concerns right now about anything on our plant side related to our particular utility operations. And I'll maybe come back to the overall preparedness in a second. Our today we issued a news release or a news flash and an alert for the community on a broad range of topics about preparing for the storm. Loudoun County provides a lot of great information links from their emergency management team on preparedness. So, we have provided links to National Weather Service to Loudoun County, how to be prepared for snow events, driving in the snow as well as preparing for the cold, and what to do for that. Having emergency kits and planning ahead. Now, we did add in there, and I think maybe you've spurred me to think a little more direct on the utility side. We could do a specific post just on your own utilities. We included in there a little bit of information about making sure to keep your water flowing. So, when it gets really cold, even if you have good pipes and you're using water, just keep a little drip going overnight. It's not even necessarily just for your own service line, but the water in the meter itself. If it's not moving, it's just such a small amount that the meter itself can actually freeze. And if that happens, we have a solution. We come in and we put a can of Sterno in the meter crock; you light it and within about 15 minutes it warms up enough. Everything lets loose and you're good to go. So, it's actually a relatively straightforward solution, but we'd rather not. We'd rather not have to go dig through a foot of snow to get to your meter crock. So, the big encouragement to the community is on the super cold nights and tomorrow night by the way, I think we're all looking at snow. Tomorrow night's going to be down to seven and also the windchill just be prepared for that tomorrow night. So tomorrow night if you want in and it doesn't have to be a constant stream, it can be a drip every second or so, just enough to keep that water moving through the meter is the most important thing residents can do for their own homes. And then if you know that a certain area of your house is susceptible to freezing, or maybe it's in an unfinished crawl space, you might want to have those faucets running a little bit too. Because if your pipes aren't insulated well or they're continuing or they're running in the crawl space of your house, there's more of a tendency for them to freeze. In terms of our other preparedness for this event we have our maintenance crews already lined up to begin on early Sunday morning as the snow falls. Snow is expected to begin falling around 10 to 10 p.m. Saturday night to midnight in that kind of range. They keep pushing it. So, and the totals keep changing too. We tomorrow afternoon, we should really have a good idea. Bless you. On some better consensus on the models. Anywhere from 6 to 15in right now. Right. Potentially changing over to some sleet at the end. VDOT does all the plowing of our streets in town. I will say that on a call that Mr. Moore was on earlier today, right before this meeting they reiterated one of their favorite lines, which is their focus is on primary interstates and primary roads. And don't expect your neighborhood streets to be plowed within the first 2 to 3 days. [off mic] No, we know that in past storms we have had pretty good responsiveness from the contractors. The ones they have assigned here are very, very good. But this storm is essentially hitting the entire Commonwealth. And frankly, a little bit heavier down south in some areas, but also then more, more ice and more concerns in those areas. So, we have information about plowing and how to track snowplows on that news flash as well, which is pretty cool. And then in the terms of the police department, I believe three of our chief lieutenant and one of our officers will be spending the weekend here. We have the capabilities in our town hall here. We have showers and air mattresses and ability for them to be able to be here and keep the community safe. So, we want to make sure that from all sides, we're best prepared and able to respond as quickly as possible. So, the final item is we will be tomorrow issuing a what is called a snow emergency declaration. That is something in our code that the Mayor can issue that requires or prohibits any parking along Route 50. It is a snow emergency route. And what that does is it allows us to have an easier way to plow the street during a snowstorm and avoids the potential conflict of a parked car on the side of the road and a plow, you know, hitting it or throwing snow on it. So that will be effective Sunday morning at 6 a.m... So, we want all cars off of Route 50 for the

entire length of town to make sure that the trucks can plow the thoroughfare as best as possible. So that's a lot of information, but I'm happy to answer other questions about preparing for the storm.

Chris Bernard: Yeah. So now that we all know all that good information, you guys are going to do some kind of another whatever output via text or email?

Danny Davis: Correct? Yeah.

Chris Bernard: Some of those basic details.

Danny Davis: We will I think most all of that's covered already in what we've sent out, I will do one on utility specific and then one about no parking on 50 specific.

Chris Bernard: And then just as a follow up, I noticed I saw a headline today. I didn't really get into it, but I think Warrenton, the town of Warrenton, declared like a state of emergency for this weekend. I don't know if that's similar to what you guys were going to do, or if that, if there's some benefit from the state that comes through that, but just.

Danny Davis: Sure.

Chris Bernard: So interesting.

Danny Davis: It's probably very similar just for that purpose of telling people they have to move their cars off the road. We technically, I don't think, have the direct authority to declare a state of emergency based on our size. We don't actually have an emergency management function. That's something that we typically the state would do. And then the county, if necessary, would. But if that is something that becomes necessary, I can look into that.

Bridge Littleton: Pam.

Pam Curran: Have we thought about if the residents lose power and electricity, the town hall being a warming center again, that was well received.

Danny Davis: Yes, ma'am. We have definitely. And so again, a lot of that's dependent upon what does happen with the power. Assuming all is well, then we would plan just to not turn it into a warming center. But on the off chance that there is power outages or extended outages, especially for the first few days when it's going to be very cold. We've talked briefly about the opportunity that we can open this part of the building up for people to come and stay warm. So, we'll talk a little bit more about that tomorrow with our team, and then we can address that with the community.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Anybody else? All right. Chris, anything.

Chris Hersh: Okay.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah, I know. Okay. Next item is action item Council approval request to accept donations. Rhonda.

Rhonda North: Did we skip the special projects report?

Bridge Littleton: Oh, sorry. Yeah. Go ahead. Yeah. I don't I mean, I think we've already covered the things that are on there, too. So yeah, let's just go to the donations.

Rhonda North: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. So, as we discussed a little bit earlier, we have $1 million in capital funding for the Asbury Church restoration project, some of which has already been committed and or spent. Which leaves us a balance of just under $400,000. And we knew, obviously, construction costs were going to come in at more than that. So, what staff would like to recommend? Because we have already had interest expressed. I've had one person approach me. They'd like to make a $10,000 cash donation towards the project. I've had another person approach me who has an

Asbury Church artifact that they would like to donate. So, under our town code, in order to accept either cash or personal property donations, the Council has to approve the acceptance and then approve the use of those towards that project. So, the staff would like to recommend that we do accept cash and personal property donations towards the Asbury Church project. As I mentioned I did have some conversations with Tim Clites about the Middleburg library boards how they went about doing fundraising when they did their project ten years ago. He did tell me that their pledge program was very successful for them. So, we would suggest that we do something similar. Obviously, we accept one-time donations if anyone would like to make them but that we also accept pledges and allow folks to pay over a period of time over a two-year period of time, if they're, so if the Council is so inclined to accept the donations.

Bridge Littleton: I'm going to assume no one has any issues with this. [multiple speakers]

Chris Bernard: Yeah, I was going to ask Martin if there's any issues with this, but.

Bridge Littleton: He's already charged us for his viewpoint.

Martin Crim: You're good.

Pam Curran: I did have.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah, Pam.

Pam Curran: How much money did they raise for the librarian? Do you know over what period of time?

Rhonda North: Oh, I wish Mr. Clites were still here. [multiple speakers] $750,000, was it? Oh.

Bridge Littleton: I think it was half a million.

Rhonda North: Half a million?

Bridge Littleton: Yeah. And it was like over 18 months, I think is what it was.

J. Kevin Daly: If this is a no brainer, I'd like to make a motion.

Bridge Littleton: Kevin. These are designed for you.

J. Kevin Daly: Thank you. I move that Council approve the acceptance of cash donations for the Asbury Church restoration project. I further move that Council authorize the staff to accept donations in the form of personal property, as determined to be appropriate by the town staff for display in the Asbury Church.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Chris Hersh: Second.

Bridge Littleton: Any other discussion? All those in favor say aye.

All of Council: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Opposed? Abstentions? Okay. Next up is the Farmer's Market.

Ali MacIntyre: Anybody need a break? Hello, everyone. You have my memo. Nice to see you all again. Hope you're gearing up for the weekend. So just a brief recap of my memo. This is a follow-up discussion. Based on the past discussions in our last two Council meetings to formally request direction from Council. Oh, thank you, Rhonda. Regarding a decision about the Farmer's Market. So, the three potential paths forward were hiring an outside market

management company. So, I did speak with Brian Bishop, our event manager, through our event management company. And he did narrow it down to two perspective companies. He just doesn't have a concrete quote yet just for transparency. And they are both local to Loudoun County. The transfer of ownership management to another town entity, Vice Mayor Bernard and I did meet with that group. And I mean, the takeaway, I would presume, is that it is a.

Chris Bernard: Not optimistic about a path forward. [laughter]

Ali MacIntyre: That and then the third option would be canceling the market for the 2026 season.

Danny Davis: So, I think the challenge we have is we were hoping to have some information to you about if a third party would be interested in running it, what the cost would be. And unfortunately, we just haven't been able to get that information from a potential vendor yet.

Chris Bernard: Can we get that by the next meeting?

Ali MacIntyre: Yes.

Chris Bernard: Can we make a decision at the next meeting?

Danny Davis: I think we can. I mean, if.

Chris Bernard: I know you wanted it tonight.

Danny Davis: No, sure. But if we don't have the information to make a decision, we don't want to put you in a spot of trying to do that.

Bridge Littleton: Did Brian have a bogey?

Danny Davis: A general guess. A general guess.

Ali MacIntyre: No. No.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. I'm not trying to box you in. I'm just if he was like, you know, it'll be 20 to 40 or anything like that, so. Okay, that's fine. Don't worry about it.

Danny Davis: What's interesting is we've still been getting applications for vendors to be part of the market.

Ali MacIntyre: Oh my gosh.

Danny Davis: We've probably had ten in the last couple of weeks.

Ali MacIntyre: I mean. Oh absolutely. Yeah, we're getting them weekly for sure between the Art in the Burg and the Farmer's Market. I mean, we have applications coming in daily, so the interest is definitely there. We just need the visitors to also be interested.

Cindy Pearson: So put out the application for visitors to come.

Ali MacIntyre: Would you like to come to Middleburg? Please fill this out. Yes. So, yes. In short, we're fine with pushing it to the next meeting for a decision. That's fine. [multiple speakers].

Bridge Littleton: Yeah. I mean, I think we should do that just so we can have all the information. Anybody have any concerns with pushing this to our next meeting?

Deborah Gallagher: Nope.

Bridge Littleton: Go ahead.

Chris Bernard: I would say just, you know, for everyone's clarity, please take some time to think about it. It's really hard thing, but, I mean, we can take two off the table if we're going to continue to run the market on Saturday mornings, which I think is really only the viable time because the Plains is on Sunday. Buchanan Hall is midweek in the evening. It's really if we're going to do it, it's Saturday morning. And if Saturday morning is the thing, it's got to be here. There's no one else that can take it. So, eliminate two. We're really looking at one and three.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. No, I think it's a fair point.

Deborah Gallagher: And if I understood correctly, you're awaiting surveys from previous vendors and getting replies from them as to how they felt about things.

Ali MacIntyre: So, we did have some come in. I think it ended up being between 9 and 10 that came in and the majority the response was that they loved the market, they loved the experience. They just need more foot traffic. So outside of that number, we didn't get more response. But those that did respond did say that they would plan on coming back. I think we only received two, two folks that said that they wouldn't be able, two vendors that said they would not be.

Deborah Gallagher: But you're not anticipating additional responses?

Ali MacIntyre: Not at this time.

Danny Davis: I think we had asked also a follow up if they would provide any financial information.

Ali MacIntyre: Yes, we did.

Danny Davis: Just about financially how they did. And I don't think we heard back from any of them on that.

Ali MacIntyre: [multiple speakers] They were keeping that close to the vest. Did not get any responses on those.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. So, we'll put this on back on the agenda for next meeting. All right.

Ali MacIntyre: Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Ali, thank you. Thanks. Okay. Next item is Council approval of the MOU or the MOA with Loudoun County for Erosion Stormwater Management program.

Danny Davis: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, and Council Members. We brought this to you a couple months ago, just as a brief overview. And this is now ready for adoption if Council is ready. In short, the town has always relied upon Loudoun County to provide regulatory activities and enforcement of erosion. Boy, my title is wrong. It should say Erosion Stormwater Management. My bad. But erosion and sediment control, as well as stormwater management within the town and with some changes in state law in 2024. Loudoun had to re adopt their provisions and then needed to enter into an MOA with each of the respective towns to manage our erosion and stormwater management programs on our behalf. So, there are a couple of components that are required as part of this. One is simply just agreeing to an MOA with the county that they would provide this for us. I won't say it's at zero cost, but it's pretty much at zero cost to the town. And we appreciate when the town, when the county provides those services, knowing that we don't have the capabilities to do that on our own. And then, secondly would be adopting an amendment to one of our current chapters of Town Code simply stating that we declare Loudoun County to enforce these provisions on our behalf. So, it's similar to what we do with the building code saying we adopt the building code, and we identify Loudoun County to be our enforcement authority for the building code within the town limits. So, this is ready for action. I'm happy to answer any questions if you have them. But it's been through plenty of review of the attorneys and the various town and county staff. The Board of Supervisors has

already adopted and approved this. I would ask if you support this that you would take the motions individually. So, take motion one, vote on that and then take vote motion two and vote on that. They probably could be taken together. I just have, if they can be distinct, that'd make me feel better. Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: And we're all here to make you feel better. [laughter] Any questions with the. I mean, again, I know we went through it before. Any questions concerns for Danny on the MOU's. Okay, Kevin.

J. Kevin Daly: I move that the Town Council of Middleburg approve a memorandum of agreement for Virginia Erosion and Storm Water Management program between the County of Loudoun, Virginia and the Town of Middleburg, Virginia.

Chris Bernard: Second.

Bridge Littleton: Any discussion? All those in favor say aye.

All of Council: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Opposed? Abstentions? Okay. The second one.

J. Kevin Daly: I move that the Town Council adopt an ordinance to amend Town Code chapter 36 pertaining to building plumbing and electrical, to add an article pertaining to Erosion and Storm Water Management.

Chris Bernard: Second.

Bridge Littleton: Any discussion? What? Oh. For both.

Danny Davis: No, just this one.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Oh, it's a code. Yeah. It's ordinance. Rhonda, would you call the roll, please?

Rhonda North: Vice Mayor Bernard.

Chris Bernard: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Curran.

Pam Curran: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Daly.

J. Kevin Daly: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Gallagher.

Deborah Gallagher: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Hersh.

Chris Hersh: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Kirk.

Darlene Kirk: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Thank you, guys, very much. Next one is the. Oh, amendments to the town hall facility policy. I think we went over this last time. Rhonda, you want to give a quick rundown?

Rhonda North: Sure, Mr. Mayor. Thank you. During your last meeting, you reviewed the town hall facilities use policy, and there was some discussion about amending the policy to allow applicants who wish to use one of the meeting spaces during non-business hours to do so if yourself or a Member of the Council was willing to essentially chaperon open the building be here to monitor their use and then close the building. So, the staff has proposed some language that will allow that to happen. Based on the language, we would ask that the applicants would have to submit the online application first. That's very important so that I can make sure first, under the policy, that they're eligible to use the facilities. And second, that there is a meeting space available. If they meet those two criteria's, then I would send an email to the mayor and Council asking if anyone was willing to be responsible for the opening, monitoring, and closing of the facilities for the applicant. If so, we'd approve it. If not, then the request would be denied. So, it would be for the use of the audience space in the Council Chambers the executive conference room and the admin conference room. Normally during the day, we don't let the admin conference room be used because that is used by the staff. But we would open that up and just have those three spaces which are all in this lower portion of the building. And that would allow us to keep the police and admin side still locked after hours. So, this matter just comes to the Council.

Bridge Littleton: Yep. Any questions for Rhonda on the updates to the policy? Pam.

Pam Curran: Was it any applicant or was it a non-profit after hours that we had discussed? Was it any applicant or?

Bridge Littleton: Rhonda.

Rhonda North: So, we have in our policy a list of folks who are eligible to use the facilities and nonprofits. But it's also, you know, local governments. So, there is a listing in that as to who would be eligible. Those same people would be eligible to make the request.

Bridge Littleton: Any other questions on updates to the policy? Okay. Would someone like to make a motion?

Chris Bernard: I move that Council adopt amendments to the town hall facility use policy as presented by the Town Hall staff, with an effective date of January 23, 2026.

J. Kevin Daly: Second.

Bridge Littleton: Any discussion? All those in favor say aye.

All of Council: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Opposed? Abstentions? Okay. Thank you very much. Any discussion items?

Danny Davis: Mr. Mayor and Council Member Kirk asked if I would just give a quick update on Burns Night related to the potential storm. So, we are continuing forward with the Burns Night as planned and the timeframe planned. So, doors open at 4:30. The event officially starts at 5:00 and is planned to go until 10:00. We are going to have kind of two looks at this. One is tomorrow and as the final models come in and the final guidance from National Weather Service is issued if for any reason there's a significant change in the onset of that precipitation, then we would only cancel if it looks like it was going to become a safety issue by the end of the event, but probably the solution that is going to occur is that as the evening goes on, on Saturday, if it begins to snow earlier than expected, they can wrap up the event earlier than its planned 10:00 ending time. Ali has already worked with the vendors and with the musician and the various components of it, so it can be a compressed time frame for the event if necessary. Ideally, it would stay running as long as possible

because it's not just the patrons who need to leave, but it's also the vendors and our staff who are the last ones out the door. And we want to make sure that they're out the door when it's still safe to drive. As it stands, though, right now, again, even if it starts snowing before midnight, it's the first hour or two is fairly light. The heaviest snow right now is predicted to be between about 1:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m... So again, things can change. But right now, Burns Night is still on. It is sold out and should be a good time for all those who are able to attend.

Bridge Littleton: Perfect, thanks. Real quickly too as a reminder for everybody, tomorrow afternoon, we're having our kickoff for the 250th anniversary. I know it's going to start here. What, 4:30? So, arrival 4:30 but the programing starts at five, right?

Danny Davis: So, arrive here before 4:30. We're going to begin national anthem, ceremonial flag raising and a few things here at the town hall. And then there will be a march down Marshall and Washington streets to the front of the community center. And the kind of ringing of the bell and welcoming and flag ceremony will be held on the steps of the community center beginning at 5:00 or a few minutes after, perhaps. So those who are able to come here to the town hall. Love to have you here, but the full event will be at the community center afterwards.

Bridge Littleton: Okay, so really, it's at the community center?

Danny Davis: Yes.

Bridge Littleton: Okay. Got it. All right. Good. Okay. And then the last item is General Assembly.

Danny Davis: So, thank you, Mr. Mayor. Mr. Crim and I have been reviewing bills in tandem and continuing to try to add to it as we can. What you have on your screen it obviously as soon as we print it becomes obsolete because of the way new bills are submitted. But I think what I'd like to do is just give you a high-level overview of some of the most concerning ones that we have right now. We'll provide another update prior to your next meeting. And then I believe Mr. Crim would suggest that we have a discussion about at least one of these bills in closed session at the next meeting as well. And he can tell you why in closed session. We've already identified for you that there are some zoning bills that are of concern. One is would limit or prohibit localities from having minimum parking standards. I think we talked about that at the last meeting. We obviously are opposed to that. We know that there's a need for private developers to have parking on site for both residential and for commercial properties. Also related to zoning. Similar bill from last year would require us to require or allow accessory dwelling units on single family detached properties. So, there are concerns there related to traffic density impacts on water and wastewater systems. So, we continue to oppose the accessory dwelling unit legislation. And then similarly, this one came late. If you recall, there was a bill last year that would mandate localities meet a certain threshold of growth in our housing units, and it was a 7.5% growth in the number of units in a locality. We opposed it last year. It's already been referred from a subcommittee in the House, back to the full committee, and been referred from one committee in the Senate to another committee. It doesn't appear there's any carveout for localities of a certain size, which again, we're almost I wouldn't say fully built out, but as we stand right now, it's hard to add 35 or 40 units to our mix. And so, we'll continue to watch that but likely send letters as needed as it goes to committee.

Chris Bernard: What are the repercussions if a municipality doesn't meet those?

Danny Davis: So, it can be so. Last year, the challenge was the proposal was that a developer essentially could if they got denied, they could take it to the Housing Board at the state level, who could administratively approve a zoning application, which made no sense. So now they've changed it to say they can appeal that to the Board of Zoning appeals and essentially hold us. I'm not sure exactly what the actual harm is, but there's something that we would have to, you know, either approve it or might be judicially required to do so. Because the BZA is a quasi-judicial body.

Martin Crim: Yeah. This would be a major change in zoning law that would allow a Board of Zoning appeals to override the decision of an elected body. Currently, they just hear appeals from the zoning administrator and original applications for Special Use Permits, if allowed by local ordinance and variances. So, this would be a vast expansion of the Board of Zoning Appeals Authority.

Danny Davis: Yeah.

Bridge Littleton: The town's BZA.

Danny Davis: Yeah. Two other bills specifically of concern not related to zoning. One is related to construction would require public works construction contracts over $250,000 to pay prevailing wages. So essentially, that increases your costs significantly when you're having to pay Davis-Bacon type wages. And that would apply to us on any public works project over $250,000. So that's of concern from a cost standpoint. And then there is a Senate bill that says if a locality provides liability insurance for public safety employees, such as police, then the locality is deemed to have waived sovereign immunity as a defense. So essentially saying, well, you have liability insurance, therefore you're covered by your insurance, so you've waived your sovereign immunity. Just go defend it with your insurer in court. Well, that's going to make everybody's insurance rates go up. It reduces the coverage that we have under our sovereign immunity. And it. Yeah. Right. So, it just makes no sense. And it's continuing to chip away at this idea of having qualified or sovereign immunity for our police officers who are making decisions in split seconds. So definitely we oppose this. And VML is strongly opposed as well. There are a few other bills that we're tracking, but these are the ones of most concern at this time. Yeah.

Bridge Littleton: Any questions on these? Okay. Any information items? All right. With that thanks, everybody. Meeting's adjourned.