



**Board of Supervisors
County of Louisa
Monday, April 6, 2026
Louisa County Public Meeting Room
5:00 PM**

CALL TO ORDER - 5:00 P.M.

Chairman Adams called the April 6, 2026, meeting of the Louisa County Board of Supervisors to order at 5:00 p.m.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Tommy J. Barlow	Mountain Road District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
Fitzgerald A. Barnes	Patrick Henry District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
Christopher C. McCotter	Cuckoo District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
H. Manning Woodward, III	Louisa County Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
R. T. Williams	Jackson District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
Duane A. Adams	Mineral District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
Rachel G. Jones	Green Springs District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM

Others Present: Christian Goodwin, County Administrator; Chris Coon, Deputy County Administrator; Wanda Colvin, Deputy County Administrator; Patricia Smith, County Attorney; William Newman, Assistant County Attorney; Alexandra Stanley, Executive Assistant/Deputy Clerk; Griff Carmichael, Director of Human Resources; Andy Wade, Director of Economic Development; Linda Buckler, Director of Community Development; Tom Egeland Deputy Director of Community Development; and Scott Raettig, Director of Information Technology

CLOSED SESSION

On the motion of Vice Chairman Barlow, seconded by Supervisor Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0 the Board voted to enter Closed Session at 5:00 p.m. for the purpose of discussing the following:

1. In accordance with §2.2-3711(A)(8), Consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by a public body regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel.

REGULAR SESSION

On the motion of Supervisor Williams, seconded by Supervisor Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to return to Regular Session at 6:00 p.m.

RESOLUTION - CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED SESSION

Voter	Role	Vote
Tommy J. Barlow	Voter	Yes/Aye
Fitzgerald A. Barnes	Seconder	Yes/Aye
R.T. Williams, Jr.	Mover	Yes/Aye
Christopher C. McCotter	Voter	Yes/Aye

Duane A. Adams	Voter	Yes/Aye
Rachel G. Jones	Voter	Yes/Aye
H. Manning Woodward, III	Voter	Yes/Aye

On the motion of Supervisor Williams, seconded by Supervisor Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to adopt the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Louisa County Board of Supervisors has convened a Closed Meeting this 6th day of April 2026, pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, §2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Louisa County Board of Supervisors that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with the Virginia Law.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED on this 6th day of April 2026, that the Louisa County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting was heard, discussed or considered by the Louisa County Board of Supervisors.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS - 6:00 P.M.

INVOCATION

Supervisor Barnes led the invocation, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

On the motion of Supervisor Williams, seconded by Supervisor Woodward, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to adopt the agenda, as amendment, with the following changes:

1. Removed presentation from Louisa County Historical Society from Information/Discussion Items

MINUTES APPROVAL

Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting Minutes – March 16, 2026

On the motion of Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor McCotter, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to approve the minutes of the March 16, 2026, regular meeting.

BILLS APPROVAL

Resolution – To Approve the Bills for the Second Half of March 2026

On the motion of Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor McCotter, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board adopted a resolution approving the bills for second half of March 2026.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

On the motion of Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor McCotter, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to adopt the Consent Agenda as follows:

1. Resolution – Adopting the 2026 Updated Emergency Operations Plan
2. Resolution – Authorizing the Louisa County Airport to Apply for Federal & State Aviation Grants for an Airport Master Plan Update
3. Resolution – Posthumously Recognizing Cynthia Sue Swann for her Years of Service and Contributions to Louisa County of Louisa
4. Resolution – To Approve and Award a Contract for Voluntary Paid Products to Include Life Insurance
5. Resolution – Recommending Re-Appointment of William Hale to the Board of Equalization
6. Resolution – To Approve and Award the Contract for Event, Wayfinding and Gateway Signage

RECOGNITIONS

(None)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Chris Coon clarified concerns about turf field costs by outlining the proposed fee structure and available discounts. The standard rate is \$30 per hour for field rental (with a two-hour minimum) and \$10 per hour for lights, applicable to non-Parks and Recreation and non-school users. However, he emphasized that Louisa County offers a community-based discount: organizations that meet at least two criteria—serving youth, serving seniors, being free and open to the public, or holding 501(c)(3) status—qualify for a 50% reduction. This lowers the cost to \$15 per hour for field use and \$5 per hour for lights for eligible groups.

Chairman Adams opened the public comment period.

Ms. Danielle Campbell, Jackson District and LASA's travel program, emphasized the importance of quality turf fields for player safety and competitiveness, noting their teams currently use inadequate fields. While there is strong excitement about the new fields, she expressed concern that the proposed fees, over a 50% increase, would be unaffordable, especially given the program's goal of keeping costs accessible for local families. She stated that, at the current pricing, LASA would likely be unable to use the fields, and urged the Board to reconsider the fees so the community can reasonably access the public resource.

Ms. Marla Regan, Mineral District and LYAA board member, expressed appreciation for the County's investment in new turf fields and Parks and Recreation leadership, emphasizing the positive impact on local youth. However, she urged the Board not to increase field fees for local nonprofit youth leagues, noting that higher costs would raise registration fees and create barriers for families. Representing organizations serving over 1,100 athletes, she stressed the importance of keeping access affordable, especially since families already support the facilities through taxes

and fundraising supports player needs. She requested the Board, establish a separate, reduced rate for local nonprofit users versus outside or tournament groups, allow play in light rain on turf fields, and partner with local leagues to support participation and cost recovery.

Mr. James Wade, Jackson District, expressed concern that increased field fees would prevent some children from being able to play. While he praised the new fields, he emphasized the importance of keeping costs as low as possible so all kids, regardless of financial situation, can participate. Speaking as both a parent and community mentor, he highlighted how meaningful sports are to local youth and urged the Board to consider affordability to avoid leaving children on the sidelines due to cost.

Ms. Libby Sandridge, Cuckoo District, raised concerns about increasing and inconsistent property tax assessments. She argued that her home is assessed far above what it could realistically sell for and noted significant year-over-year increases (over 16% and 17%) without any property changes, while neighboring homes saw much smaller increases. She expressed frustration with the lack of clear justification or comparable sales (“comps”) from the assessor’s office and called for a re-evaluation of the assessment process, suggesting it should be more transparent and tied to inflation and cost of living. Sandridge warned that rising assessments are becoming unsustainable, effectively “taxing people out of their homes,” and urged the County to ensure fairness and accuracy rather than basing values on budget needs.

Ms. Diane McCourt, Louisa District (Town of Louisa) and LASA board member, expressed appreciation for the County’s investment in turf fields but raised several concerns about cost, access, and usage policies. She noted that the initially understood fee structure would significantly increase costs for families and limit participation. She also highlighted concerns about restrictive policies, including prohibiting play in light rain and requiring reservations at all times, which would reduce availability and limit casual public use. McCourt compared Louisa’s approach to other counties, where fees are lower or waived for nonprofit youth organizations, and emphasized the need to keep programs affordable. She urged the County to partner with local leagues, reduce or eliminate fees for 501(c)(3) organizations, remove additional charges, and ensure policies support accessibility, participation, and effective use of the publicly funded fields.

Ms. Melissa Young, Louisa District (Town of Louisa), expressed appreciation for the new turf fields but raised concerns about affordability and access. She warned that high fees could make the fields inaccessible to local youth organizations, forcing higher program costs and pricing families out. She also emphasized the need for public access, noting that many other communities allow open use of similar fields without fees. She expressed concern that requiring reservations and supervision would limit availability, potentially leaving the fields underused. Young urged the County to ensure the fields remain accessible and beneficial to the broader community, not just reserved users.

Mr. Hurley Lucckese, Patrick Henry District, expressed appreciation for the Board and county staff’s efforts to increase transparency and accessibility in local government, highlighting tools like agendas, meetings, and public communications. While noting he doesn’t agree with every decision, he acknowledged the Board’s intent to act in the community’s best interest. As a student interested in a political career, he emphasized the value of these efforts and encouraged greater citizen involvement in local government, stressing that these decisions directly impact residents.

Ms. Jill Kelly, Mountain Road District, expressed appreciation for the County's investment in turf fields and the newly clarified 50% discount. She requested the Board reconsider the additional supervisor fee, noting it is not currently charged for field rentals, and allow use in light rain, emphasizing that turf fields are designed for all-weather play.

Ms. Jennifer Phillips, Jackson District, emphasized that while investing in turf fields is essential for youth sports, affordability must remain a priority. She warned that increased field fees would be passed on to families, many of whom already face high participation costs, potentially pricing children out of local programs. She highlighted the importance of affordable recreational leagues, which provide inclusive opportunities for all youth, not just those in higher-cost travel programs. Phillips also cautioned that high fees could shift field use toward outside organizations and tournaments, limiting access for local families who fund the facilities through taxes. She urged the Board to balance improvements with affordability, ensuring Louisa County continues to prioritize its youth and community access.

Ms. Kristin Barmoy, Cuckoo District, raised concerns about rapidly increasing and inconsistent property tax assessments, noting her taxes have nearly doubled since 2021 despite her home not doubling in value. She questioned the fairness of assessments, citing discrepancies with comparable properties and annual increases of 12–18%, and requested a comprehensive review of the assessment process. She also expressed concern about potential impacts from appealing assessments and suggested the County consider using revenue from the Amazon data center project to reduce property taxes. Additionally, she highlighted traffic, safety, and quality-of-life impacts related to the development and urged that residents see tangible tax relief in return.

Dr. Michael Huffman, Louisa District, urged the Board to uphold its oath to the Virginia Constitution by taking a stronger stance against a proposed redistricting amendment. He argued that the amendment is unconstitutional, citing legal provisions, and expressed disappointment that the Board changed its position from “opposed” to “concerned.” Huffman emphasized that being “concerned” is passive, while their oath requires active opposition to constitutional violations, and he encouraged the Board to restore its original position of opposition.

Mr. Jonathan Christian, Mineral District and LASA board member, emphasized the importance of keeping youth soccer affordable and accessible, particularly as players transition into more competitive levels. He highlighted LASA's commitment to keeping costs significantly lower than other clubs to ensure no child is excluded due to financial barriers, sharing examples of families who struggle to afford participation. While appreciative of the proposed fee reduction, he urged the Board to further consider true program costs and explore creative solutions to keep fees low, stressing that youth sports should not become “pay-to-play” and should remain accessible to all families.

Mr. Mike Pascarella, Green Springs District, expressed strong support for the youth soccer program and its growth. He emphasized that the fields, funded by taxpayers, should be accessible and affordable for the community, especially for families with multiple children in sports. He echoed concerns about costs and encouraged the Board to think creatively about funding solutions, suggesting the use of new tax revenue to offset operational expenses rather than placing the burden on families.

Chairman Adams acknowledged that a written comment had been received about Valley Link and asked that it be made part of the public meeting record. (See Appendix A.)

With no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Adams closed the public comment period.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Presentation – Firefly Update

Galen Creekmore and Gary Wood, provided an update on Firefly’s broadband expansion project in Louisa County, emphasizing that they are nearing completion of the countywide buildout. Also present was Lisa Jackson, Firefly/CVEC Board Member and Louisa resident.

The project has connected over 11,500 locations, surpassing initial expectations and making Louisa a state leader in broadband expansion. Major construction is largely complete, with remaining work focused on small extensions, service drops, and hard-to-reach areas (such as private roads, railroad crossings, and easements).

They highlighted that Louisa has received statewide recognition for connecting more residents to broadband than any other county in Virginia in recent years. The network continues to grow as new homes are added, and final phases (including “VATI 2024” locations) will fill remaining coverage gaps.

Firefly credited the success to strong partnerships with Louisa County, Rappahannock Electric, Dominion, and local contractors, noting the project was a significant investment involving risk but has resulted in a durable, high-quality fiber network. They also emphasized their commitment to remain a regional provider focused on long-term service, not selling the network. Board discussion acknowledged the transformational impact of broadband access, improving quality of life, education, and connectivity across the county, while noting a few remaining service challenges that Firefly is actively working to resolve.

Presentation – Louisa Clean

Ms. Jody Korman and members of the Louisa clean-up initiative presented an update on their community-led effort to address roadside litter, which began in 2022 with just a small group of volunteers. Since then, the initiative has grown substantially, collecting over 3,300 bags of trash and expanding to include more than 300 volunteers and 26 Adopt-a-Highway sections throughout the county.

The group has formalized its efforts by becoming a 501(c)(3) nonprofit and has secured grant funding from several organizations, including Amazon, Rappahannock Electric, Nestlé, and Keep Virginia Beautiful. These resources have helped support ongoing cleanup efforts, equipment, and outreach.

Despite this progress, presenters emphasized that litter remains a persistent and widespread issue, with volunteers often collecting large volumes of trash far beyond required cleanup schedules. Illegal dumping, particularly of items like mattresses, and unsecured loads from vehicles continue to contribute to the problem. Safety along roadways was also highlighted, with

appreciation expressed for the Louisa County Sheriff's Office for assisting with traffic control during cleanups.

A major focus moving forward is prevention through education, particularly targeting youth. The group has partnered with local schools to promote awareness, including creating a student-designed coloring book and engaging students in cleanup activities. They emphasized that changing long-term habits and community culture is essential to reducing litter.

Additional efforts include distributing free cargo nets to encourage proper load securing and exploring ways to reduce illegal dumping. The group also promoted their upcoming "Big Clean" event scheduled for April 25–26, aimed at tackling heavily littered areas.

The presenters stressed that while volunteer efforts have made a meaningful impact, long-term success will require a combination of community involvement, education, and continued support to change behaviors and reduce litter across Louisa County.

The Board took a 5-minute recess.

Administrator Goodwin expressed appreciation for the partnership with Louisa Clean and announced that the County is taking additional steps to address litter issues. He explained that over the next couple of months, the Sheriff's Office will have a rotating presence at refuse and recycling centers to encourage residents to properly cover and secure their loads.

He noted this effort will begin as soft enforcement, focused on education and awareness, but could transition to stricter enforcement over time if needed, as part of a collaborative effort to reduce roadside litter.

Discussion – Campground Definition

Deputy County Administrator Coon requested that the Board refer the issue of campers and RVs on private property to the Planning Commission to review and potentially refine definitions, ensuring the ordinance clearly reflects that such use is intended to be temporary and transient.

The Board agreed and unanimously approved sending the matter to the Planning Commission for further review.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(None)

NEW BUSINESS/ACTION ITEMS

Resolution – Authorizing a Budget Supplement to the Landfill New Cell Development Capital Project

The Board considered a resolution to authorize a budget supplement for the landfill new cell development project, specifically to purchase 450 acres adjacent to the existing landfill. Staff explained the acquisition would support long-term waste needs, extending landfill capacity, and noted the property had been evaluated with no major issues identified.

During discussion, Supervisor Williams recused himself due to a conflict of interest. The Board then proceeded with a vote with a motion from Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor McCotter.

<u>Roll Call</u>	<u>Vote</u>
Fitzgerald A. Barnes	Yes
Tommy J. Barlow	Yes
H. Manning Woodward, III	No
Christopher C. McCotter	Yes
Rachel G. Jones	Yes
R.T. Williams, Jr.	Abstain
Duane A. Adams	Yes

On the motion of Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor McCotter, which carried by a vote of 5-1-1, with Woodward voting against and Williams abstaining, the resolution passed.

Resolution – Opposing Mandatory Collective Bargaining Legislation (HB1263/SB378)

Current Virginia law provides a local option allowing governing bodies to determine whether and how to engage in collective bargaining based on local fiscal capacity, workforce needs, and service priorities. HB 1263 and SB 378 would eliminate this local option and impose a state-mandated, one-size-fits-all collective bargaining framework administered by a Public Employee Relations Board (PERB). This legislation shifts authority away from locally elected officials and imposes an unfunded mandate with significant fiscal and administrative consequences for local governments and taxpayers.

Virginia’s localities vary widely in population, resources, and service delivery models, and are best positioned to make decisions that reflect their unique circumstances. Mandatory collective bargaining as proposed would:

- Divert limited local resources from core services to new administrative and bargaining structures without dedicated funding;
- Eliminate local flexibility to align workforce decisions with budgets and service needs;
- Create unpredictable fiscal obligations through arbitration and expanded dispute resolution processes;
- Increase administrative burden, litigation risk, and long-term costs for local taxpayers; and

Local governments must maintain balanced budgets while continuing to provide essential services, including public safety, education, and infrastructure.

On the motion of Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to strongly opposes HB 1263 and SB 378 and any legislation that mandates collective bargaining for local governments. The Board urges the Governor and members of the Virginia General Assembly to preserve local authority over workforce and labor relations policies and directed the Clerk of the Board to transmit this resolution to the Governor and members of the Virginia General Assembly.

Resolution – Authorizing a Budget Transfer from Assessment’s Operating Budget to Computer Software Capital Project

The Assessment Department purchased a new Tax & CAMA software package and has been working on its implementation. Additional funding in the amount of \$24,000 is needed to cover the costs for other necessary modules, training, and implementation. Funding is available in Assessment's operating budget due to staff turnover that can be used towards these additional costs of the Software project.

On the motion of Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted approve a budget transfer in the amount of \$24,000 from Assessment Salaries (10012320-411000) to Computer Software Projects (30312400-480070) to cover the additional expenses related to implementing the new tax & CAMA software.

Resolution – Authorizing a Supplemental Appropriation to Children’s Services Act Funding

The Board approved a budget supplement for the Children’s Services Act (CSA) after expenses exceeded the current budget. The supplement totals \$700,000, including \$308,000 in local funding, to cover mandated services such as foster care and support for children with significant needs.

Officials noted the County is spending over \$4 million annually, approaching \$5 million, on these services.

Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor McCotter, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to authorize a supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$700,000 to the CSA fund for Contractual Services (20553500-430020). The source of funds is \$392,000 from State Revenue (0205R23-323090) and \$308,000 from General Fund Balance (0100R99-399011).

Resolution – Authorizing a Budget Transfer to the Louisa Volunteer Fire Department for Apparatus Repairs

Deputy County Administrator Colvin noted the Louisa Voluntary Fire Department (LVFD) have two pieces of apparatus, Engine 1 and Wagon 1, both of which are used regularly within the county that are in need of repairs. The cost of the needed repairs is estimated to be approximately \$54,000. LVFD does not have the funding available in their current budget and is requesting a budget transfer to cover the cost of the repairs.

On the motion of Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor McCotter, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to authorize a budget transfer in the amount of \$54,000 to Louisa Volunteer Fire Department Apparatus Repairs (10032201-433110) for the repairs needed to Engine 1 and Wagon 2. The source of Funding is a transfer from Gasoline & Diesel Contingencies (10091000-460080).

Resolution – Appointing an Assessor for the County of Louisa

Va. Code §58.1-3253 provides the governing body of any county or city may, by ordinance duly adopted, provide for the annual assessment and equalization of real estate for local taxation. Va.

Code §58.1-3275 requires every general reassessment of real estate in a city or county shall be made by (i) a professional assessor appointed by the governing body, who is either an employee qualified by the Department or an independent contractor holding valid certification issued by the Department.

Va. Code §58.1-3271 provides that the governing body of any such county or city may appoint a real estate appraiser, either (i) an employee who is qualified by the Department or (ii) an independent contractor who holds a valid certification issued by the Department to perform the actual function of determining value for real estate in the county or city for use by the board of assessors.

The County of Louisa Code of Ordinance Sec. 70-103-Office of Assessor establishes that the position of County Assessor shall be filled by a full-time real estate appraiser or assessor certified by the tax commissioner and appointed by the Board of Supervisors upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of Revenue.

Ms. Allison Carter has the required education, experience, and is licensed by the Commonwealth of Virginia. Ms. Stacey Fletcher, Commissioner of Revenue for the County of Louisa, has recommended Ms. Allison Carter for the Position of County Assessor.

On the motion of Supervisor Williams, seconded by Supervisor Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board appointed Ms. Allison Carter Assessor for the County of Louisa.

New Business – To Approve Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule and Turf Field Rules

The Board discussed the proposed Parks and Recreation fee schedule and turf field rules in detail, with Deputy County Administrator presenting the plan for the new \$6 million turf fields and explaining that the proposed \$30 per hour field fee and \$10 per hour for lights was intended to help cover maintenance, staffing, and operational costs while remaining lower than surrounding localities. Staff also emphasized the need for controlled access, scheduling priorities, and staffing oversight to protect the investment and manage high demand, noting that schools and Parks and Recreation programs would receive priority use, followed by community organizations.

Supervisor Williams began by clarifying that the fields could be used in the rain and expressed support for limiting unsupervised public access to prevent damage, comparing the fields to other restricted-use facilities like school gyms and The Jungle. He then raised concerns about the fee structure, arguing that out-of-county users should be charged significantly higher rates, suggesting figures comparable to nearby jurisdictions such as Spotsylvania. He also questioned what the fees actually covered, with staff confirming that the hourly rate largely supports staff oversight and operations, not full cost recovery.

Supervisor Barlow echoed similar sentiments and noted that the fees were minimal when spread across teams, emphasizing that taxpayers funded the fields and that costs should not disproportionately burden them. He supported higher rates for outside users and noted that the current fees do not come close to covering operational expenses.

Supervisor Jones agreed, stressing the importance of making youth sports affordable for local families and charging higher rates to non-county users, particularly to avoid pricing out local children from participating in sports.

Supervisor McCotter expressed frustration with the process, noting he had originally opposed the fields and now questioned whether taxpayers would continue to bear additional costs. He raised concerns about the lack of clarity around usage ratios and staffing needs, stating that increasing taxpayer responsibility without clear planning was problematic.

Similarly, Supervisor Woodward acknowledged the fields were a valuable asset but emphasized that some level of user cost is reasonable, noting that youth sports have long involved participation fees and that expectations of free access are unrealistic in these times. He stated that he believes the County and the two local organizations should be able to come to an agreement, whether through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or by following the proposed fee schedule as presented. He expressed that he does support local children having access to the fields, whether at a reduced cost or no cost, and emphasized that he trusts staff to work collaboratively with the organizations to develop an arrangement that will be fair and suitable for all parties involved. He also discussed the need to increase the required insurance coverage as outlined in the packet, recommending that it be aligned with the higher coverage levels already required for field use to better protect the County.

Supervisor Williams proposed a motion to temporarily waive fees for local youth organizations (LASA and LYAA) for one year (May 1, 2026, to April 30, 2027), direct staff to negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with those groups, and significantly increase fees for out-of-county users. He framed this as a trial period to allow the County and organizations to work collaboratively and determine a sustainable long-term structure.

Supervisor Barlow opposed eliminating fees altogether, arguing that even small fees help ensure users contribute to maintaining a \$7 million investment.

In contrast, Supervisor Woodward countered that while fees may seem small per use, they can add up significantly over a full season for families.

Supervisor McCotter raised concerns about approving a plan without first seeing the MOU, suggesting the Board was “putting the cart before the horse.” After discussion, the Board agreed that more work was needed.

Supervisor Williams ultimately withdrew his motion, and with agreement from the Board, the item was tabled until the next meeting to allow staff and youth organizations to develop a clearer proposal and potential MOU for consideration.

SUPERVISOR COMMENTS

Jackson District

Supervisor Williams wanted to briefly follow up on a comment made earlier this evening regarding taxes and data centers. He said he does want to clarify for the public that revenue from data centers does not occur immediately. These facilities must first be constructed and then fully operational before significant revenue is realized.

As noted at previous meetings, much of that revenue is generated from the servers housed within the data centers, not just the buildings themselves. Until those servers are installed and active, the County will not see the full financial benefit. He noted the County is beginning to see some revenue starting to come in, but it is still in the early stages and has not yet reached its full potential.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee Reports

Supervisor McCotter reported on the Lake Anna Advisory Committee. He said the plan for 2026 is underway for the lake and the Committee is making sure that all buoys are to be compliant and reset by Memorial Day weekend.

Chairman Adams stated last Friday, Louisa County hosted a summit and invited all counties impacted by the Valley Link project. All but one county were in attendance, and it was a very productive meeting. The leadership from each locality shared that they are hearing many of the same concerns from their citizens. There was a general consensus among the group to move forward collaboratively and explore options on a regional basis. As we continue this effort, I anticipate that we will reconvene in the near future, whether in person or virtually, to further develop a coordinated approach. The goal is to ensure that we are effectively representing the concerns of our citizens and constituents regarding the Valley Link project at a regional level.

Board Appointments

On the motion of Supervisor Williams, seconded by Supervisor Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to make the following appointments/reappointments:

1. Appointed Ms. Lisa Prices to the Tourism Advisory Committee to serve a One (1) Year Term

County Administrator's Report

County Administrator Goodwin directed the Board to their report and highlighted key correspondence, including planned infrastructure upgrades from Columbia Gas and Dominion Energy, both expected to occur largely within existing footprints. He also reminded the Board of upcoming community events, including Household Hazardous Waste Day on April 25 and a Special Needs and Autism Festival on June 6, before concluding his remarks.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearing – Fiscal Year 2027 Budget

The discussion began with Allison Carter, newly appointed Assessor for Louisa County, presenting an overview of the real estate assessment process and clarifying the distinction between her office and the Board of Supervisors. Carter emphasized that the Assessor's Office determines property values, while the Board sets the tax rate, noting these are separate functions. She explained that Louisa conducts annual reassessments using mass appraisal, analyzing groups of similar properties and market sales data to ensure fairness and consistency. She highlighted that Virginia law requires assessments at 100% of fair market value, and current data shows

Louisa is at approximately 96.64%, meaning values are still slightly below full market value. Carter detailed how properties are evaluated based on factors such as location, square footage, condition, and market demand, and explained that not all sales are used in analysis, such as new construction or non-arm's-length transactions, to maintain accuracy. She acknowledged that individual properties may feel over- or under-assessed due to the nature of mass appraisal but stressed that property owners have the right to appeal annually.

Board members, including Adams and Williams, asked questions about how assessments are calculated and why some homeowners feel their property is overvalued. Carter reiterated that assessments are based on broader market trends rather than individual appraisals and encouraged residents to contact her office during the appeal window if they have concerns.

It was clarified that the County's long-standing goal is to reach 100% market value, partly because certain large properties, like utilities, are assessed by the state and discrepancies can result in lost revenue.

Following the assessment presentation, Wanda Colvin, Deputy County Administrator, presented the proposed FY27 budget, providing context on how the County develops and manages its financial plan. She explained that the budget process is year-round, beginning with departmental requests and culminating in adoption after public hearings and Board review. The proposed FY27 budget totals approximately \$201 million, representing an increase of \$11.5 million in expenditures (6.58%) and \$15.9 million in revenues (8.6%), with no proposed tax rate increase. She noted that the County is projecting an operating surplus of \$14.6 million, which is largely allocated to capital projects.

Colvin emphasized that property taxes remain the primary revenue source, accounting for about 54% of total revenue, though the County continues efforts to diversify through sources such as sales tax, permits, and transient occupancy taxes. She also highlighted that real estate tax revenue is increasing due to assessment growth, new construction, and development activity, including the Amazon project, while other revenues like interest income and building permits are also trending upward.

On the expenditure side, Colvin explained that the largest portion of the budget is education at 51%, followed by public safety and health services. Key cost drivers include salary increases (3%), rising health insurance costs (16.7%), additional public safety positions, and increasing demand for services like CSA and social services. She also outlined major capital investments, including school technology upgrades, public safety equipment, facility improvements, and infrastructure projects such as landfill expansion and water authority needs.

During the discussion, County Administrator Goodwin, provided important context to frame both the assessment presentation and the FY27 budget, focusing heavily on the broader economic pressures facing Louisa County. He emphasized that the County is experiencing rapid growth, ranking among the fastest-growing localities in Virginia, and that this growth, combined with inflation, is a major driver behind increasing costs and budget challenges.

Goodwin explained that Louisa's strategic location between Richmond, Charlottesville, and Fredericksburg, along with access to major transportation corridors and amenities like Lake Anna, has made it an attractive place for new residents. He also noted that investments such as countywide broadband (Firefly), strong schools, and relatively low tax rates have further

accelerated population growth. However, he stressed that while growth is often viewed positively, it comes with significant financial implications.

A key point of his presentation was the cost-versus-revenue imbalance associated with residential growth. Goodwin explained that, on average, each new home generates approximately \$3,900 in annual revenue, but costs the County about \$4,700 per year in services, including education, public safety, and infrastructure. This creates a structural deficit of roughly \$800 per household, meaning that continued residential growth alone places increasing pressure on the County's finances.

He further highlighted that this issue is compounded by land use patterns, noting that over 70% of developable parcels are located outside designated growth areas, meaning much of the new development is occurring in rural parts of the County. This not only increases service delivery costs but also conflicts with the County's long-standing goal of preserving its rural character. Goodwin also outlined the real cost of providing services, emphasizing that it costs over \$15,000 per year to educate each student, and that the average household generates ongoing demand for services such as law enforcement, fire and EMS, and waste disposal. He used these figures to illustrate how population growth directly translates into higher operating costs for the County.

In response to these challenges, Goodwin explained that the Board has been focused on diversifying the County's revenue base, rather than relying almost entirely on property taxes, which currently make up the majority of revenues. He referenced efforts to attract economic development projects, such as data centers, as well as leveraging tools like meals taxes, transient occupancy taxes, and other non-residential revenue sources. These strategies are intended to shift some of the financial burden away from residents and onto businesses, visitors, and external users of County services.

He concluded by noting that these pressures are not unique to Louisa County, but are being experienced across Central Virginia due to similar growth trends. However, he emphasized that these realities make the Board's role in balancing the budget especially challenging, as they must weigh growth, service demands, tax impacts, and long-term sustainability while maintaining the quality of life that continues to attract residents to the County.

The discussion concluded with Board members thanking staff for their work and acknowledging the complexity of balancing growth, service demands, and taxpayer impact.

A public hearing on the budget was opened and closed without comment, and the Board indicated that adoption of the budget and tax rate would occur at the next meeting.

Resolution – Authorizing a Budget Supplement to Design and Construct Water Treatment Plant Process Upgrades at the Ferncliff Water Treatment Plant and to Upgrade the New Bridge Wastewater Treatment Plant

The Board held a public hearing on a resolution to authorize a budget supplement for upgrades to two Louisa County Water Authority facilities, with Wanda Colvin presenting the item and Andy Wade providing technical support and clarification.

Deputy County Administrator Colvin explained that the request involves funding improvements to the Ferncliff Water Treatment Plant and the Newbridge Wastewater Treatment Plant, both of

which have become priority projects. She noted that one project is mandated by regulatory requirements and the other is contractually necessary, making them unavoidable. The estimated cost for the Ferncliff project is approximately \$11.5 million, while the Newbridge project involves necessary upgrades to bring the facility up to current operational standards. She also explained a shift in funding strategy, stating that instead of issuing new debt as originally planned, the County is proposing to use funds from long-term capital reserves, as rising interest rates make borrowing more expensive. This approach allows the County to complete the projects now before costs increase further.

Andy Wade, Director of Economic Development, clarified that the Ferncliff project is not truly a new upgrade but rather the completion of a previously planned component, a clarifier, that had been removed from the original design in 2015. Due to evolving regulations, including concerns about PFAS, pharmaceuticals, and microplastics, state regulators have now required that component to be reinstated. He explained that the cost of this work has increased significantly over time, rising from an estimated \$4–4.5 million in 2015 to \$11.5 million today, reflecting broader trends in escalating water and wastewater infrastructure costs.

Wade also addressed the condition of the Newbridge Wastewater Treatment Plant, stating that when the County took over the facility, it was already understood that upgrades would be necessary. He noted that the plant has experienced operational challenges and occasional compliance issues, and that improvements are needed to meet modern standards and protect receiving waters, including Lake Anna.

During discussion, Board members acknowledged the sharp increase in infrastructure costs and the broader trend of rising expenses in the water and wastewater sector. Additional comments highlighted that the County is attempting to plan proactively by incorporating future capacity needs into current upgrades, particularly at Lake Anna, to avoid even higher costs in the future.

Chairman Adams opened the public hearing.

Mr. John Wayne, Mineral District, Lake Anna Civic Association, expressed opposition to any funding that would expand the Newbridge Wastewater Treatment Plant's discharge capacity beyond its currently permitted 99,000 gallons per day. He stated that the association was surprised by the scale and cost of the proposed upgrades and is concerned that the project may include capacity increases tied to future commercial development. He emphasized that LACA has consistently opposed such expansion and argued that any increase in discharge volume should not be approved without public input. He requested that the Board exclude funding related to capacity expansion from the current proposal and instead hold a thorough public discussion and debate before moving forward with any plans that would increase discharge into Lake Anna.

Mr. Phil Winston, Mineral District, expressed opposition to expanding the Newbridge wastewater treatment facility, stating that there is no demonstrated need for increased capacity at this time. He compared the proposal to other recent decisions, suggesting the County is planning for expansion far in advance of actual demand. Winston emphasized that while improvements to the existing facility are necessary, expansion appears to be driven by potential future development rather than current users. He also raised concerns about fairness, noting that nearby residents cannot access the system while it is being considered for commercial use. He urged the

Board to focus on fixing the plant to protect Lake Anna, rather than expanding it without clear need.

With no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Adams closed the public hearing and brought it back to the Board for discussion.

Supervisor Williams clarified that the County is not expanding the Newbridge wastewater treatment plant beyond its permitted capacity, but rather restoring it to its approved 99,000 gallons per day level. He explained that the County originally acquired the facility at a minimal cost because it was polluting Lake Anna, and the intent was to protect water quality and property values, not to pursue unnecessary expansion. Williams acknowledged frustration with the significant increase in project costs, but emphasized that upgrades are necessary because the plant cannot currently meet regulatory requirements. He also noted the importance of making improvements now in a way that avoids more costly rework in the future if additional capacity is ever needed. He reiterated that protecting Lake Anna is a priority for the County and concluded by making a motion to approve the projects as presented.

On the motion of Supervisor Williams, seconded by Supervisor Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to authorize a budget supplement to the Ferncliff Water Treatment Plant Upgrade project (30382000-481374) in the amount of \$11,500,000 and to the New Bridge Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion project (30382000-481372-C8202) in the amount of \$21,500,000. The Source of Funding is County Long Term Capital Reserves.

Resolution – Authorizing Acceptance of an Unsolicited Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act Proposal (PPEA) to Design and Construct Water Treatment Plant Process Upgrades to the Ferncliff Water Treatment Plant

Mr. Wade presented a resolution to accept an unsolicited Public-Private Educational Facilities and Infrastructure Act (PPEA) proposal for process upgrades at the Ferncliff Water Treatment Plant. He explained that the project will add an inline clarification system, including coagulation, flocculation, and sedimentation, to improve drinking water quality.

Wade noted that the proposal came from MEB General Contractors and Timmons Group, the same firms involved in the plant's original construction. The County followed PPEA guidelines by soliciting competing proposals for 45 days but received no other qualifying submissions, leading the selection committee to recommend moving forward with this proposal.

He further explained that, pending approval, the resolution authorizes the County Administrator to enter into a design-build agreement, after a required 30-day waiting period following the public hearing. Wade emphasized that timing is critical, as the upgrades are intended to align with the upcoming James River Water Authority project.

In response to questions about cost, Wade stated that while only one proposal was received, the \$11.5 million estimate is lower than the original engineer's estimate of around \$16 million, providing some confidence in the pricing.

On the recommendation of the PPEA Selection Committee, the County desires to accept the unsolicited proposal in the amount of \$11,500,000 and enter into a Comprehensive Agreement and Design-Build Contract (the "Agreements") with the DB Team. The DB Team has submitted

to the County all information required by the PPEA guidelines. The FWTP clarification process is necessary, and the DB Team's construction plans will result in the timely development and commissioning of the FWTP clarifier.

Chairman Adams opened the public hearing. With no one wishing to speak, Chairman Adams closed the public hearing and brought it back to the Board for discussion.

On the motion of Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to accept the unsolicited proposal and hereby:

1. Authorizes, subject to project funding approval and approval of the Agreements by the County Attorney, the County Administrator to enter into a Comprehensive Agreement and Design-Build Contract with the DB Team on or after May 7, 2026.
2. Directs the County Administrator to make the ratified Agreements and the procurement file available for public inspection to the extent permitted by law.

Resolution – To Approve/Deny REZ2026-01, CUP2026-01, Sec.86-321. Waivers and Modifications to the Planned Unit Development District; Owners, Dickinson Land & Properties, LLC. (Parcel 28-97D and Parcel 29-3); Ware Family, LLC. (Parcel 29-2); Dickinson Investments, LLC. (Parcel 28-97E); Applicant, Wares Crossroads Development, LLC; Agent Hirschler, Charles W. Payne, Jr.

Tom Egeland, Deputy Director of Community Development, presented the staff report for the Wares Crossroads Development in the Mineral District. Egeland outlined five requests associated with the project, including rezoning approximately 393 acres to a Planned Unit Development (PUD), a conditional use permit for multiple mixed-use components, a private road waiver for a gated internal network, modifications to allow access to cottages via easements, and a master plan amendment to allow shared infrastructure and flexibility in golf course design with the adjacent Cutalong Resort. He also explained that the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval, with 19 conditions, and highlighted concerns about Route 208 traffic, which led the applicant to proffer 3.07 acres of right-of-way for future VDOT improvements.

Board members asked clarifying questions, particularly about the location of the right-of-way dedication and how it related to existing road improvements and the proposed roundabout. Egeland explained that the applicant was seeking additional flexibility to adjust the golf course layout beyond the originally advertised holes due to the right-of-way dedication, which could shift portions of the design.

The applicant, Joe Walsh, representing Wares Crossroads Development, provided an overview of the project and his company's broader portfolio of destination resort developments. He explained that the proposal builds on the previously approved Cutalong Resort and would include a second, members-only golf course, along with a range of amenities such as a spa village, amphitheater, event spaces, glamping, agricultural tourism, and recreational features. Walsh emphasized that the project is designed as a high-end, low-density destination resort, with approximately 79 residential units and a focus on tourism and second-home ownership. He noted that the development would tie into existing water and wastewater infrastructure at Cutalong, including a system that allows treated effluent to be reused for golf course irrigation.

Charlie Payne, representing the applicant, highlighted the project's alignment with the Comprehensive Plan and its anticipated economic benefits. He described it as a low-density mixed-use development with significant open space—about 69% of the site—and minimal expected impact on schools due to the likelihood of second-home ownership. Payne emphasized that the project includes proffers to offset impacts on public services and projected that it would generate new revenue for the County, including transient occupancy taxes and other economic activity. He also noted workforce and educational benefits, including partnerships with local schools and job creation during both construction and long-term operations.

Board members engaged in discussion with the applicant, including Supervisor McCotter, who asked about the project timeline, to which Walsh responded that buildout is expected over approximately eight years in phased development. Questions were also raised about coordination with the Lake Anna Civic Association (LACA), with Walsh explaining that LACA had previously provided input on environmental considerations, including wetlands, nutrient management, and limiting boat access, and that the developer had incorporated those recommendations.

Additional discussion focused on community benefits, including affordable housing. A Board member questioned whether the project included provisions for local workforce housing. Walsh acknowledged the need and explained that the broader Cutalong development includes plans for smaller, higher-density housing options that could be more affordable for local workers, and that the developer is exploring ways to expand those opportunities.

The Board also reviewed proposed changes to conditions recommended by the Planning Commission, including adjustments to operating hours for certain amenities such as the indoor shooting range. Egeland confirmed that most conditions remained consistent with the Planning Commission's recommendation, with the primary outstanding issue being the applicant's request to extend Sunday hours.

Throughout the discussion, Board members acknowledged the applicant's efforts to address prior concerns, particularly regarding traffic impacts and infrastructure, with specific appreciation for the right-of-way dedication to support future road improvements along Route 208.

The Board voted (6-1, with Supervisor Williams voting against) to extend the meeting past 10:00 p.m. in order to proceed with the public hearing, signaling continued detailed consideration of the proposal.

Chairman Adams opened the public hearing.

Ms. Sandy O'Brien, Cuckoo District, expressed strong support for the proposed resort development. She acknowledged that growth in the County is inevitable and emphasized the importance of choosing the type of development that benefits the community. O'Brien stated she would prefer a world-class resort over other types of development, such as data centers or transmission infrastructure, and praised the investment already made by the developer. She highlighted the project's benefits, including job creation, increased tourism, and additional tax revenue, noting her own positive experience working at the resort. She concluded by stating that the project represents the highest and best use of the property and urged the Board to approve the rezoning so the development can move forward.

Mr. Jack Matthews, Mineral District, expressed strong support for the proposed Wares Crossroads development, praising Reef Capital for transforming a long-struggling property into a first-class golf course and resort. He highlighted the project's high quality, environmental responsibility, and positive impact on the community, noting it has enhanced the image of Louisa County and is attracting attention from visitors across multiple states. Matthews emphasized the project's economic benefits and low impact on schools, and encouraged the Board to continue supporting the development. Drawing on his experience as a former Planning Commissioner, he also urged the Board to follow the Planning Commission's unanimous recommendation for approval.

Mr. Jimmy Snyder, Mineral District, expressed his support for the Reef resort expansion. He shared that as a nearby resident and member of the facility, he and his family regularly use and enjoy the amenities, including golf, and appreciate having such opportunities close to home rather than traveling long distances. Snyder also noted that despite potential impacts like boat traffic, his community is supportive of the development and has benefited from it. He encouraged the Board to continue supporting the resort's expansion.

Chairman Adams acknowledged that a written comments had been received in response to this hearing, with one being in support and the other being in opposition, and asked that they be made part of the public meeting record. (See Appendix B.)

With no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Adams closed the public hearing.

On the motion of Supervisor Williams, seconded by Supervisor Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to approve the request for REZ2026-01, to allow the rezoning of approximately 393.8417 acres from Agricultural (A-2 GAOD) Parcels 28-97D, 29-3, 28-97E, and Agricultural (A-1 GAOD) Parcel 29-2 to Planned Unit Development (PUD).

On the motion of Supervisors Williams, seconded by Supervisor Barnes, which carried by vote of 7-0, the Board voted approve conditional use permit CUP2026-01, to allow permitted uses with a conditional use permit in Planned Unit Development as follows: to allow permitted uses with a conditional use permit in Planned Unit Development as follows: Agricultural Operation, Aviation Facility, Brewery Limited, Brewery Major, Distillery Major, Campground, Club, Commercial Indoor Sports and Recreation, Commercial Indoor Entertainment, Commercial Outdoor Sports and Recreation, Commercial Outdoor Entertainment, Dwelling/residence single family, Dwelling/residence two family, Golf Course, Indoor Shooting Range, Multi-Family Dwelling, Outdoor Gathering, Outdoor Shooting Range, Personal Improvement Services, Personal Services, Public Assembly, Restaurant, Special Occasion Facility, and Short-Term Rental of a Dwelling.

On the motion of Supervisor Williams, seconded by Supervisor Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to approve proffer amendments to REZ06-2005; REZ02-2015; and REZ2024-06 and subsequent administrative master plan amendments. The modification would allow for Wares Crossroads LLC., proposed Planned Unit Development to construct a large portion of Wares Crossroads golf course hole 5 and a majority of golf course hole 8 on the existing Cutalong Resort Development. Additionally, the applicant requests the proposed Planned Unit Development connect to the Resort Development known as Cutalong Golf Course at Tributer Bay, to allow for shared use of the existing Route 208 Courthouse Road entrances.

On the motion of Supervisor Williams, seconded by Supervisor Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to approve the request for Wares Crossroads Development and Cutalong at Tributer Bay share all utilities. RP20 Cutalong Consolidated, LLC consists of parcels zoned (RD Resort Development); 29-35, 29-35A, 29-35A2, 29-35A3, 29-35A4, 29-9-A, 29-11-A1, 29-11-C, 29-11-D, 29-11-112 through 115, 29-11-118, 29-11-120, 29-11-122 through 124, 29-11-126, 29-11-129 through 29-11-131, 29-11-134 through 29-11-140, 29-11-142, 29-11-146, through 29-11-149, 29-11-151, 29-11-152, 29-11-154. V&C Development CO LLC consists of parcel 29-11-157. Tributer V&C Development CO LLC consist of parcels 29-11-F and 29-11-E; and from Sec. 86-321. - Waivers and modifications to the Planned Unit Development District, to allow for Garden Cottages to be accessed from the private road via a twenty-foot (20') access easement.

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion Supervisor Barnes, seconded by Supervisor Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to adjourn the April 6, 2026, meeting at 9:57 p.m.

BY ORDER OF:
DUANE A. ADAMS, CHAIRMAN
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
LOUISA COUNTY, VIRGINIA

Appendix A

Lindsey Krstic
5491 Three Notch Rd
Louisa, VA 23093
3/30/2026

To: Project Representatives, Elected Officials, and Community Decision-Makers

Re: Opposition to Route 1 as Proposed – Request for Eastward Diversion (Valley Link Joshua Falls to Yeat Transmission Project)

Dear Project Representatives and Community Leaders,

I am writing to formally oppose Route 1 of the proposed Valley Link transmission line as currently configured, particularly as it relates to its proximity to my residence at 5491 Three Notch Road and to Moss-Nuckols Elementary School in Louisa County.

While I understand that both primary routing options involve tradeoffs, Route 1 uniquely includes a clearly defined eastward diversion alternative that would materially reduce impacts to both a school and established residential communities. The existence of this alternative fundamentally changes the evaluation before the Commission. This is not simply a matter of whether impacts exist- it is a question of whether avoidable impacts are being unnecessarily imposed.

1. Availability of a Clearly Less Harmful Alternative

Route 1, as proposed, places the transmission corridor in close proximity to Moss-Nuckols Elementary School and surrounding neighborhoods, including my home. However, the identified eastward diversion option would shift the corridor away from both the school and nearby residences.

Where a feasible alternative exists that meaningfully reduces impacts to children and residential communities, it should be prioritized. Selecting the current alignment would impose avoidable impacts that could be substantially mitigated through the available alternative.

2. Avoidable Proximity to a School Environment

The presence of Moss-Nuckols Elementary School within the impact area is particularly concerning. While both routes may involve proximity to schools, Route 1 presents a clear opportunity to reduce that proximity through the eastward shift.

Even in the absence of definitive conclusions regarding long-term EMF exposure, it is widely accepted that minimizing proximity to large-scale infrastructure - especially for children - is a

Appendix A

prudent and responsible approach when alternatives exist. The availability of a less impactful alignment makes this a matter of reasonable avoidance rather than necessity.

3. Direct and Lasting Impact on Residential Property

The proposed alignment would introduce large-scale, permanent transmission structures into a currently forested and residential setting along Three Notch Road. These structures would become defining features of the landscape for decades.

Their scale, visibility, and potential lighting would significantly alter the character of the area and may negatively affect property desirability and long-term marketability. For homeowners, this represents not only a financial concern but a lasting change to the nature of their homes and surroundings.

4. Permanent Change to Quality of Life and Rural Character

This project would transform a quiet, natural environment into one defined in part by industrial infrastructure. The addition of large transmission towers, visible conductors, potential nighttime lighting, and continuous low-level electrical noise would create a persistent presence that cannot be reversed once constructed.

These are not temporary disruptions- they represent permanent changes that affect daily life, outdoor enjoyment, and the overall character of the community.

5. Cumulative Infrastructure Impact (Air Traffic and Transmission Corridor)

My property lies beneath a frequently used flight path, where aircraft regularly maneuver at lower altitudes while preparing for landing. While aviation safety determinations will be conducted separately, the addition of very tall transmission structures in an area with existing air traffic contributes to cumulative visual and environmental impacts.

Where routing alternatives exist, it is reasonable to reduce the concentration of multiple infrastructure elements in the same area.

6. Water Resource Demand and Long-Term Sustainability

Large-scale transmission infrastructure enables continued expansion of high-demand development, including data centers, which are widely recognized as both energy- and water-intensive.

In rural areas where residents rely on wells and local water systems, increased demand on groundwater and aquifers is a valid concern. This project contributes to a broader pattern of development that may have long-term implications for water resource sustainability and rural land use.

Appendix A

7. Subsurface and Soil Stability Considerations

The construction of large transmission structures requires substantial foundations and ground disturbance. Given the variability of subsurface conditions in this region, including soil composition and drainage characteristics, potential impacts to ground stability should be carefully evaluated.

Changes to grading, drainage, and long-term land use can influence soil behavior over time. Where less impactful routing options exist, these considerations further support selecting the alternative that minimizes long-term environmental disruption.

This region is also associated with Virginia's gold-pyrite belt, further underscoring the importance of careful evaluation of subsurface conditions and long-term land use compatibility.

8. Disproportionate Impact Without Corresponding Local Benefit

The burden of this infrastructure - visual, environmental, and experiential - falls on local communities that do not directly benefit from the demand it serves.

When a less impactful alternative alignment exists, it is reasonable to expect that it be selected in order to reduce unnecessary concentration of impact on specific communities.

Conclusion

I respectfully urge the Commission to reject Route 1 as currently proposed and to require full consideration of the eastward diversion alternative.

Where a clearly feasible option exists to reduce impacts to a school, residential communities, and individual properties, selecting the more harmful alignment would impose avoidable and unnecessary consequences.

On a personal level, my family chose to live at 5491 Three Notch Road to experience the peace, quiet, and natural beauty that rural Virginia offers. This is not simply a preference- it is a defining part of our daily lives and well-being.

The proposed alignment would permanently alter that environment, replacing a natural landscape with large-scale infrastructure and resulting in a meaningful and lasting reduction in quality of life for my family and our neighbors.

I respectfully ask that this impact - and the availability of a less harmful alternative - be given full and careful consideration.

Appendix A

Thank you for your time and thoughtful review.

Personal Note

As a parent, I would like to share a brief perspective from within my own household. My child recently created the attached drawing in response to learning about the proposed transmission lines in our area.

Without prompting, she depicted a contrast between the natural environment we currently experience and the presence of power line infrastructure, alongside figures that convey sadness and distress. This was her own way of expressing how the idea of these changes feels to her.

While I understand that this project must be evaluated through technical and regulatory frameworks, I respectfully ask that consideration also be given to how decisions like this are experienced by families and children who live in the affected communities.

I share this not in place of the concerns outlined above, but to illustrate that the impacts of this project extend beyond physical infrastructure and into the daily lives and well-being of those who call this area home.

(See Attachment A)

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lindsey Krstic". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Lindsey Krstic

Appendix A



Attachment A

Appendix B

Alexandra Stanley

From: PATRICK GALLAGHER <patrick.john.gallagher@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, March 27, 2026 4:59 PM
To: Info; Duane Adams
Subject: Public Hearing - REZ2026-01, CUP2026-01, Sec 86-321

Some people who received this message don't often get email from patrick.john.gallagher@verizon.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email

Chairman Adams,

My wife, Jane, and I serve on the board of directors of the Foundation for Lake Anna Emergency Services. As you well know, our foundation was established to raise funds to support the construction and equipping of New Bridge Fire and Rescue, Station 8. Jane and I spoke at the Planning Commission hearing regarding the requests from Cutalong at Tributer Resort, where the Planning Commission voted to forward the requests to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval. Since we will be out of town on April 6, I want to pass along the following comments for the Board's consideration.

First, the developers of Cutalong have been great corporate neighbors to our foundation and New Bridge Fire and Rescue. They have hosted several golf tournaments to help us fundraise, enabling us to help the county purchase several major apparatus and lifesaving equipment over the past 3 years. The golf tournaments have become our largest fundraising event, and the staff at Cutalong have gone out of their way to help ensure the success of each tournament. They are hosting another tournament on May 19 to help us raise funds for a new tanker truck for Station 8.

Second, they have lived up to their promises of partnering with the community to protect our natural resources during construction of the Cutalong at Tributer Resort. Jane and I are members of the Lake Anna Civic Association, and from what we understand about their meetings with Cutalong staff, every question or concern was addressed with regard to protecting the environment, especially any potential impacts to Contrary Creek and Lake Anna.

Appendix B

Lastly, the neighborhood we live in, Windwood Coves, is right down the road on Route 208, so we have a personal interest in what happens along this designated growth area. We would gladly welcome another golf course community/resort built in the area under consideration. We feel this would help preserve green space along this commercial corridor.

Based on the recent history of the team developing Cutalong at Tributer Resort, we would be extremely happy to see future development of land in this area in the hands of a respected and responsible organization such as Cutalong. We have witnessed their past performance as good neighbors and are confident they will proceed responsibly.

Thank you for your consideration.

Patrick Gallagher

Appendix B

Alexandra Stanley

Subject: FW: Public Comments for the Record 4/6/26 regarding Wares Crossroads Development REZ2026-01, CUP2026-01,
Attachments: VA0093181 Cutalong at Lake Anna WWTS (8).pdf

From: valerie.bagby@verizon.net

Date: April 6, 2026 at 2:53:33 PM EDT

To: Duane Adams <lcbs_md@louisacounty.gov>, Tommy Barlow <LCBS_MRDLouisacounty.gov>, Rachel Jones <lcbs_gsd@louisacounty.gov>, Fitzgerald Barnes <LCBS_PHDLouisacounty.gov>, Christopher McCotter <LCBS_CDLouisacounty.gov>, Manning Woodward <LCBS_LD@louisacounty.gov>, Toni Williams <lcbs_jd@louisacounty.gov>

Subject: Public Comments for the Record 4/6/26 regarding Wares Crossroads Development REZ2026-01, CUP2026-01,

CAUTION: External email

Dear BOS

I offer the following citizen input on this proposal. It appears that the County reviews and approves the development proposals as individual standalone requests versus a comprehensive data driven evaluation for the Designated Growth Area factoring in roads, water and sewage. Given water and sewage are not public utilities and have limitations it leaves citizens feeling vulnerable to the long term impact to our basic needs in 10-15 years.

Given the amount of money this county is spending on capital projects, I urge the County to conduct a study that can be shared with the public and provide some needed assurances. If a study exists, please share it with the public.

Groundwater - We rely on our wells to continue to produce water to live in our homes. I would encourage you to review a recent study done by Loudoun County Preservation and Conservation Coalition revealing a concerning trend in the local water supply. The study can be found here [Loudoun County Groundwater Study – Loudoun County Preservation and Conservation Coalition](#)

This proposal does not provide confidence to the citizens with words such as "appears to be" and "supply is good: ..see below.

Pages 18/19 of the proposal states:

Appendix B

There **appears to be** adequate groundwater supply to support the Project.

The potential of obtaining desired groundwater **supply is good**.

The report also indicates a very conservative estimate of groundwater recharge indicating the estimated annual groundwater withdrawals are insignificant compared to the estimated recharge of the watershed.

The county staff proposed the following: It requires the developer to install a rainwater harvesting system for all non-residential rooftops, utilize drought-resistant plantings selected by a licensed landscape architect and prepare a water management plan by November 2027, subject to **review** by the board of supervisors. The developer would also be required to provide an annual report to the board detailing its water use.

Shouldn't there be both a review and **approval** by the Board of Supervisors of the water management plans?

I urge the County to do a comprehensive analysis accounting for all of the designated growth area that accounts for existing, approved and proposed developments residential, commercial, and industrial before approving another resort in this compacted geographical growth area.

Traffic

I urge the county/VDOT to do a comprehensive study for Routes 208 and 522 in the designated growth areas. The designated growth areas should factor in existing, approved and proposed developments residential, commercial, and industrial before approving another resort in this geographical area with two lane roads.

Regarding this proposal:

The applicant also intends to build public venues (i.e. distillery, shooting range, host events) that are not factored into the traffic study and should be.

The traffic study should also account for both the already approved resort and the proposed new resort impacts to the 522/208 roads in one comprehensive study.

Page 185 of proposal: Between 120-200 parking spaces will be provided for all non-residential uses. Since the Applicant is requesting a conditional use permit for all non-residential uses to allow for public events, the Applicant will coordinate with the County to ensure all parking impacts are properly mitigated.

Page 748 the county proposed events with 200 or more people versus the applicant proposes events with 400 or more people. This is not accounted for in the traffic analysis.

What time of year was the traffic study done? Spring-Fall are Lake Anna tourist season/surges on 208/522 two lane congested roads. Also two lane roads are highly problematic when there are accidents and construction.

Wastewater Treatment Facilities

Appendix B

Page 142 CLA Environmental, LLC, the utility company serving Tributer Resort, has designed its wastewater treatment facilities to accept and reliably treat the projected wastewater flows generated by this Project. Facility planning and engineering analyses evaluated anticipated average daily flows, peak conditions, and constituent loadings associated with the development to ensure adequate treatment capacity and operational flexibility. Based on these analyses, the facilities are appropriately sized and configured to serve the Project without exceeding permitted design limits or adversely affecting treatment performance.

In March 2024 DEQ and Cutalong (see attached) held a public meeting to discuss their upcoming application to put treated effluent into Lake Anna for their first resort/golf course community. The additional capacity included by the applicant should have been disclosed to the public at that time.

Given the already approved DEQ permit for this facility, it seems prudent the applicant has to resubmit an update to the approved DEQ permit to include revised numbers with increased dwellings, size of population and visitors and septic flow rates and projected usage.

The applicant now states they have capacity for their 2nd resort/golf course wastewater treatment facility. However, when they are at capacity and in seasons where they can't water the two golf courses the treated effluent will flow into the lake. I remain concerned about treated effluent going into the lake at Contrary Creek given the Creeks history of concerns, the drought conditions that occur (2025 is an example) and the potential of failed wastewater infrastructure and human error that can result in sewage spills into the lake.

Knowing Lake Anna is in a rural area that has materially grown since 2020, I hope the county will provide some assurances to its citizens.. I urge the county to provide its citizens an independent, comprehensive and data driven assessment before another resort is approved.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Valerie Bagby
Louisa County
Mineral District