// A joint meeting of the Council and the School Board of the City of Lynchburg was held on the 9th day of September, 2025 at 4:00 p.m. in the 2nd Floor Conference Room, City Hall, Larry Taylor, President, presiding. The following City Councilmembers were present:

Present: Larry Taylor, Curt Diemer, Stephanie Reed, Chris Faraldi, Martin Misjuns, Jacqueline Timmer, Sterling Wilder. 7

Absent: None 0

The following School Board Members were present:

Present: Atul Gupta, Daryl Conner, Nigel Alleyne, Christian DePaul, Myke Barron, Letitia Lowery, Jibri Poe, Brenda Farmer, Farid Jalil 9

Absent: 0

// School Board Member Dr. Nigel Alleyne led the invocation.

// Vice Mayor Diemer led the Pledge of Allegiance.

// In the matter of Welcome and Introductions, Agenda Item #1, School Board Vice Chair Daryl Conner introduced new members Dr. Brenda Farmer, Dr. Nigel Alleyne, Mr. Jibri Poe, and Mr. Myke Barron, as well as returning members. He also introduced new Superintendent Dr. Kristy Somerville-Midgette, Deputy Superintendent Dr. Jennifer Davis, Chief Operating Officer Travis Marshall, Human Resources Officer Tiffany Brown, and Director of Student Services Chris Sumner. He also introduced returning staff Chief Financial Officer Sonia Jammes, Director of Technology Dr. John Collins, Supervisor of Communications Austin Journey, and Data Analyst Chuck Yarborough.

// In the matter of Strategic Plan Process, Agenda Item #2, Dr. Somerville-Midgette stated that the first item on the agenda was the comprehensive strategic planning process which is mandated by Virginia code. She said that every school division must have a unified long-range plan and explained that during the afternoon the scope of the plan and the timeline being followed would be reviewed. Dr. Somerville-Midgette expressed gratitude to Matt Marsteller and his team for their engagement and guidance throughout the process.

// In the matter of Facilities Plan Process, Agenda Item #3, Dr. Somerville-Midgette stated that the next segment of the presentation focused on capital improvement funding to support the facilities plan. She thanked City Council for agreeing to provide $10 million, $30 million, and $20 million over the next three fiscal years to support facility's needs.

Councilmember Misjuns said he had a technical question related to the funding from Fiscal Year 2022, and particularly resolution R-23-015b adopted on March 14, 2023. He said it is showing that number to be $839,856, and the letter submitted to Council was $749,856 for the "RS Payne Structural and Building Envelope Repair," along with structural analysis and repair for various schools for another $90,000. He stated that if they've appropriated those funds to the schools, they should be there and available for them to spend, and he wanted to make sure those funds are committed as they were intended to be committed. He said he would email her the letter and the resolution, reflecting the total he just described.

Councilmember Faraldi stated he appreciated the focus on students, staff, and parents. He said he did not recall plans for new roofs in the CIPs they had previously been presented with, and he was also excited to see investment in CTE for the benefit of students and the business community.

Dr. Gupta stated that nutrition and meal preparation in the schools were extremely important, but much of the equipment is old and worn out. He said that while the CIP and operating funds had already been established, he hoped they would keep nutrition and meals in mind as they move forward with future partners.

Councilmember Reed commented that the presentation was succinct and refreshing, as she knows they have needed these improvements for many years. She said she was thankful that the City Manager had included $60 million in the budget for City Council to vote to approve for the schools, enabling necessary and long-awaited improvements to begin. She stated that she appreciated the allocation of resources and expressed her excitement for the positive impact these changes would have on students. She added that many children might not immediately recognize the benefits of improvements such as a new HVAC system, but she believed they would appreciate those upgrades in time. She explained that there were other important aspects in the plan that students would notice and benefit from.

Councilmember Reed stated she had questions that she anticipated might be similar to those posed by Councilman Faraldi, particularly regarding the schools targeted for these improvements. She noted that several schools receiving funds had been subjects of ongoing conversations about potential closures, both within the City Council and the School Board, over the past few years. She said that discussions had continued back and forth, with some schools still under consideration for closure in the near future. She emphasized the importance of investing in schools while they were still operating, but also asserted that if there was a possibility of closure within one or two years, expenditures should be reconsidered.

School Board Member Ms. Lowery stated that regarding CTE, the schools have been working with Beacon of Hope, which has been helpful, and also with Legacy–Randy Dutton. She said he was invited to the academic success committee last year to do a presentation and is now working with Ms. Davis and her team to present to the entire body of EC Glass. She said they were getting updates on a regular basis from students in the workforce; for example, just yesterday she learned that a student got a job at Delta Star with a good salary who was now working on new home ownership.

School Board Member Mr. Poe stated that LCS has done a good job concentrating on AI resilience, with a focus on careers that will be around in 5–10 years. He said he hoped they could keep the focus with CTE, perhaps even at the middle school level, as well as some of the restorative programs.

Vice Mayor Diemer stated that he supported front-loading the program with $60 million, proposing that $30 million be allocated up front; however, Council decided to proceed with $10 million, and there may be a need for an additional $5.2 million.

Vice Mayor Diemer said that with respect to school closures and openings, it was essential to maintain efficiency in managing taxpayer funds. He stated that the Commonwealth of Virginia mandates responsibility for fiscal efficiency not only with the School Board but also with City Council, and both entities would need to make important decisions in the coming years. He further said that it was encouraging that the City had not lost sight of the fact that school buildings remained valuable assets and must be maintained. He stated that closing a school did not mean the building would be unused or absent of students, noting that many City buildings continue to serve educational purposes outside of functioning as schools, and if they eventually sold any of these buildings, they must not be allowed to deteriorate.

Vice Mayor Diemer stated that stewardship was one of the three principal points highlighted in the current plan, which he agreed was a priority. He said he had considered the issue of roof repairs, noting that residential roofs are typically replaced all at once, while schools often require piecemeal repairs. He stated that EC Glass had undergone repairs within the past five years and that additional repairs were imminent. Vice Mayor Diemer said the presentation was clear and easy to follow, but they needed clarity as to whether repairs consisted of full or partial replacements and the duration of roof guarantees.

Chief Operating Officer Mr. Marshall responded that they have replaced every roof on EC Glass, but it's difficult to do all of them at once with a 400,000-square-foot building. He noted that they are at a point now where they have already replaced sections, and now they're replacing the roofs to make sure there are not increased maintenance costs over the next several years.

Councilmember Wilder said when they do budget cuts and things get pushed aside, they end up with inadequate infrastructure and old facilities. He thanked the schools for their presentation and for their dedication to children and the community.

Councilmember Timmer also applauded the schools for their presentation and said it was helpful for Council to hear clear criteria for decision-making, clear priorities, a path for accountability, and common sense. She agreed with Vice Mayor Diemer in regard to wanting to "frontload" aspects of the CIP, and she looked forward to the city manager's suggestions with that, as Sandusky is an asset regardless of in what capacity it's serving the City.

School Board Member Rev. Alleyne asked for detail on how contractors are brought in and how the numbers are derived within the bidding process.

Mr. Marshall explained that with the facility study in 2022, estimates were provided on how much each project would cost; then they took those estimates, along with budgeting for certain parts of the project, and put in an inflationary number to ensure they would have enough funds to complete the projects when the time came. He noted that there is a bidding process for each of these, and the design phase for the AMEP projects is more drawn out depending on the school — but once they get the ball rolling, they send out an RFP.

Councilmember Reed said she agreed with her colleagues that Sandusky Elementary is an asset to the community, and she would support all the money allocated to it as long as it stays Sandusky Elementary.

Councilmember Misjuns asked what was included under "vehicle replacement," as there should be a fleet plan and if not, this might be the time to work with the City on that. Mr. Marshall responded that they do not currently have a fleet plan, just a maintenance plan with money put into vehicles to maintain them over the years.

School Board Member Mr. Conner stated that this vehicle replacement plan refers to maintenance trucks and vans, such as utility vans for HVAC and electricians; buses are handled separately from those.

School Board Member Mr. Poe said there are other entities outside of the City scope that do business with the City's fleet department, and he would encourage taking a look at that.

Councilmember Faraldi asked for clarification on the $5.2 million for Sandusky to be reintroduced in FY26. Dr. Somerville-Midgette explained that the Sandusky roof replacement is estimated at $1.6 million, and the AMEP costs are estimated to be $3.6 million, for a total of $5.2 million. She noted that this was the additional amount needed to move that project forward in FY26 because of the deferred maintenance at that school.

Councilmember Faraldi commented that it would be good to evaluate the long-term potential and plans for that school so they're not throwing money into something that will be torn down or unused in a few years. He also stated that the Lifelong Learning Committee, which had been approved by Council, could be instrumental in addressing these issues.

Mayor Taylor commented that there was a fence at Dearington, around the trailer area, which was needed immediately when the request was made. Mr. Marshall said there is a fence present that has a locking mechanism, but the fire marshal indicated that they cannot put a lock on that gate.

Mayor Taylor also mentioned "Life Alert" type devices utilized by teachers in Greenville, South Carolina, and he asked if that was something Lynchburg City Schools could do. Dr. Somerville-Midgette responded that the school are looking at all avenues for safety to provide teachers with those types of resources, and they are developing a more comprehensive plan that addresses the entire physical plan in terms of safety for teachers, staff, and students.

Councilmember Reed stated that she would not be in favor of putting millions of dollars into schools that might be closed in a few years, regardless of intended future uses.

Councilmember Misjuns commented that Lynchburg is leading the way on school safety, and he mentioned the leadership role that John Collins, Anitra Lee, Nick Caputo, and Don Floyd are playing in school safety via technology. He also said that the School Board needs to make the decisions regarding their properties, and it's not appropriate for the City to use funds as a way to coerce a decision out of the schools.

// In the matter of Closing Remarks, Agenda Item #4, Dr. Gupta thanked everyone for being there and said the school's primary focus is always the child in the classroom, and the superintendent has a job to lift the academics. He stated that they needed to raise test scores and would like to hear in the next meeting that those scores went up. He emphasized that they need to shift their focus away from politics and toward providing a quality learning environment for every child.

Mayor Taylor commented that he, Dr. Somerville-Midgette, Dr. Gupta, Vice Mayor Diemer, and Dr. Conner would be meeting once a month to get something going in this area.

Councilmember Faraldi noted that the Mayor had said there would be a different approach with the committee by the end of the year.

// The meeting was recessed at 5:16 p.m.

// A regular meeting of the Council of the City of Lynchburg was held on the 9th day of September, 2025 at 7:00 p.m. in the 2nd Floor Conference Room, City Hall, Larry Taylor, President, presiding. The following Members were present:

Present: Larry Taylor, Curt Diemer, Stephanie Reed, Chris Faraldi, Sterling A. Wilder, Martin Misjuns, Jacqueline Timmer. 7

Absent: None 0

// Councilmember Reed led the invocation, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

// In the matter of the Consent Agenda, Clerk of Council Alicia Finney stated that she received a request from a couple of Council members to pull all of the minutes, specifically for the meetings on June 10th, June 23rd, June 24th, June 30th, and July 8th, pending some revisions that they would like Ms. Finney to review. Councilmember Reed motioned, seconded by Vice Mayor Diemer, to approve the Consent Agenda as it is.

Councilmember Misjuns called a point of order, and stated that Section 5-2 of the rules of procedure states that upon the request of a Councilmember, an item shall be removed from the Consent Agenda. He also said that the item shall be considered separately after adoption of the Consent Agenda.

Councilmember Misjuns noted that the Clerk said there were multiple requests from Councilmembers to have minutes removed, and the point of order is that it would violate the rules of procedure to advance with adopting or approving the Consent Agenda.

City Attorney Matthew Freedman clarified that there has been an objection to the adoption of the Consent Agenda as presented. He explained that previously, the Council has removed matters and put them on General Business for consideration at the end of the meeting to be considered individually. Mr. Freedman asked the Council to specify which items on the Consent Agenda are being objected to.

Ms. Finney clarified that those would be Consent Agenda items 2–6.

Mayor Taylor asked for a motion to put the items at the back of the agenda to be discussed later.

Councilmember Reed motioned to move the items under General Business to be discussed later in the meeting. Councilmember Faraldi seconded the motion.

Councilmember Reed said they could already vote on Agenda Item #1, *“Consideration of adopting Resolution #R-25-060 amending the FY 2026 General Fund Human Services – Social Services budget and appropriating $94,909 to establish a Kinship Navigator Program”* on the Consent Agenda; then, per the rules of procedure, place items 2–6 at the end of General Business.

Councilmember Timmer asked Mayor Taylor to return to the previous suggestion, which was to hold for another meeting. She explained her request as being due to the ongoing discussions and emails to the Clerk, to ensure the minutes are aligned with the transcripts. Councilmember Timmer explained that she saw no point in adding the items from the Consent Agenda to General Business.

Vice Mayor Diemer apologized and explained he expected the Council to follow usual procedures and that a Councilmember did not need to explain their reason for requesting removal. Vice Mayor Diemer said he assumed the items were going to be removed prior to the meeting. He expressed his confusion in the moving of the items to the end of the meeting, since that is not usually how the Council handles the Consent Agenda. He requested that the Council proceed as usual, and that the Clerk had indicated that the minutes would be removed.

Councilmember Reed asked the Clerk if she had said they would be removed.

Ms. Finney clarified that she had likely said that if there was a request via email from the Council to take items off, she would bring that up during the meeting.

Councilmember Reed asked Ms. Finney to confirm that if there was a request from a Councilmember that it would be addressed in the meeting and not addressed over email, restating that the process cannot be completed over email.

Ms. Finney confirmed that she would not be permitted to remove anything from the Consent Agenda, but she could mention that there was a request to have them pulled, then Council would take action during the meeting.

Councilmember Reed restated that the action must be taken during a meeting and cannot be done in an email.

Councilmember Timmer stated that she saw no need to push the minutes through the meeting when they do not accurately reflect the transcripts of discussion. Councilmember Timmer recommended that the Council take more time for discussion to ensure the minutes accurately reflect the votes and nature of the meeting and are aligned with the transcript.

Councilmember Faraldi stated that he would vote in favor of Councilmember Reed’s motion, and further stated that this approval has now been delayed for weeks, and they needed to reconcile their obligations in their charter to pass minutes that accurately reflect the meeting. He said that he believed they did reflect the meeting and should be approved.

Councilmember Misjuns said he would oppose the motion. He stated that the minutes do not accurately reflect what was done, and there are questions to whether or not they comply with FOIA on required information for summary discussion. He suggested moving this onto the next Consent Agenda.

Mayor Taylor asked Councilmember Misjuns if what he was saying was that he does not have enough information on the items that he and everyone else participated in.

Councilmember Misjuns clarified that the minutes need to accurately reflect the statements that were made, the discussions that were had, and the actions that were taken. He said if they don’t reflect that, they are not accurate and thus he cannot support them. He said he wanted to give the Clerk more time to consider the feedback Councilmembers have provided, and until he has minutes that accurately reflect Council discussions, he cannot vote to approve them. He said that last year when they were in this position, they received a bunch of minutes over the summer to review in advance of approval. He stated that he was voting against this to avoid having to consider them one by one, and he had faith in the Clerk that she would provide accurate revised minutes that would satisfy the Council.

Mr. Freedman said that in the past when minutes have been pulled, it's typically for technical reasons that can be easily fixed. He stated that if there are substantive content changes to be discussed, General Business is the appropriate place otherwise, it puts the Clerk in an awkward position of having to decide between differing Councilmember viewpoints.

Councilmember Timmer asked if she supported the 89-cent tax rate, as the minutes said that she did, which was incorrect.

Councilmember Faraldi called a point of order that they should not be discussing the content of individual sets of minutes unless the items are put on the agenda for discussion.

Mayor Taylor asked the Clerk if she would like to have more time to dissect these.

Ms. Finney responded that she strives to provide accurate records through the minutes, but it is up to a Council majority whether these are true and accurate forms of events. She said the requests came in late the previous evening, so there has not been an opportunity to review those and she cannot speak to what those requests are. She said if she had another two weeks, she would go back to review those, but it would push August and September work back.

Councilmember Reed stated that in the spirit of transparency, she did not understand why Council wouldn't want to discuss the minutes in an open meeting rather than directing the community to FOIA emails. She said they should talk about these now, and also must be sensitive to the Clerk's workload.

Vice Mayor Diemer read a message he had received from the Clerk that morning, which indicated she "would like to pull those minutes from the Consent Agenda tonight, so that I can review their input." He said he would like to support what the Clerk has requested. He said that video doesn't lie, and at least three members have said they want to pull the minutes from the meeting tonight. He added that Council has also done a lot of work and should have that accurately reflected.

Councilmember Misjuns pointed out that his first email to the Clerk was two weeks earlier, not just the night before, and he tried to make it easier on her by providing links to the points in the video(s) where he has found issues. He reiterated that they should just give her two more weeks and then vote for them on the Consent Agenda.

The Clerk clarified that the motion on the floor, made by Councilmember Reed and seconded by Councilmember Faraldi, is to move items 2–6 for consideration under General Business on the current agenda.

With no further discussion from the Council, the following vote was recorded:

Ayes: Faraldi, Reed 2

Noes: Misjuns, Timmer, Wilder, Diemer, Taylor 5

Councilmember Faraldi moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Councilmember Misjuns called a point of order, such that upon the request of a Councilmember, an item shall be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Councilmember Reed seconded Councilmember Faraldi's motion.

Councilmember Misjuns stated that they cannot adopt the Consent Agenda because the rules are clear: Section 5-2-D, "Upon request of a Councilmember, an item shall be removed from the Consent Agenda. The item shall be considered separately after adoption of the Consent Agenda." Councilmember Misjuns said he was happy to vote for the Consent Agenda once it's been confirmed that they are complying with their rules of procedure and that items 2 through 6 have been removed from the Consent Agenda as required.

Mr. Freedman confirmed that Councilmember Misjuns is correct. Mr. Freedman suggested that a Councilmember provide a substitute motion to move items 2–6 to the next meeting for consideration under that Consent Agenda.

Vice Mayor Diemer entered a substitute motion to pass Item #1, *"Consideration of adopting Resolution #R-25-060 amending the FY 2026 General Fund Human Services – Social Services budget and appropriating $94,909 to establish a Kinship Navigator Program",* as part of the Consent Agenda. Councilmember Timmer seconded the substitute motion.

Vice Mayor Diemer stated that the Consent Agenda implies that it has been agreed to be everyone, and that is not the case in this instance. He said that his motion shows respect to members who request something be removed from the Consent Agenda, and it is specifically the way they deal with minutes. He asked that Council vote on the Consent Agenda as a sign of respect to their colleagues and the Clerk.

Councilmember Timmer commented that there is an opportunity to move forward with business and would thus be supporting Item 3.1 on the Consent Agenda. She added that she looked forward to working with the Clerk on the minutes.

Councilmember Misjuns stated that he looked forward to getting the Kinship Navigator program for Social Services going, and that along with the vote on Item 3.1 was why he would support the substitute motion.

With no further discussion from the Council, the following vote was recorded:

Ayes: Misjuns, Timmer, Wilder, Diemer, Taylor, Reed 6

Noes: Faraldi 1

Mr. Freedman clarified that the substitute motion was now the main motion, and if this one is adopted, it will adopt Item #1 and move items 2–6 to the next meeting under the Consent Agenda.

Councilmember Faraldi stated that he would be voting no on the motion and has already submitted another email that supports his position, adding that any further changes to the minutes are politically motivated to cover those officials' behinds. He also said that it is inappropriate to put their Clerk in this position, as well as delaying the business of the people. He said the minutes are incredibly important, and they appoint a Clerk to use her best judgment in interpreting the meetings and having the Council approve them. He said that any further changes to this effect other than technical would be out of the ordinary, and he would be voting against this motion.

Councilmember Timmer commented that the minutes are incredibly important, and it's incredibly important that they clearly reflect what has happened in a way that eliminates any confusion. She said in that regard, she would be supporting this motion.

Mr. Freedman asked Council to agree by consensus that the motion on the table is to adopt Item 3.1 – the Kinship Navigator program, and to move items 2–6 to the next meeting under the Consent Agenda.

With no further discussion from the Council, the following vote was recorded:

Ayes: Misjuns, Timmer, Wilder, Diemer, Taylor 5

Noes: Faraldi, Reed 2

// In the matter of Parks and Recreation, Agenda Item #7, Council held a public hearing and considered adopting Resolution #R-25-061 authorizing the restriction and dedication of approximately 1.556 acres of Conserved Open Space land for stormwater management purposes in connection with the Perrymont Park

Improvements.

Director of Parks and Recreation Wyatt Woody stated that before Council is a recommendation for the designation of conserved open space at Perrymont Park. Mr. Woody said that City Council previously approved the acceptance of grants from both the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) and the Virginia Outdoor Foundation (VOF) for improvements at Perrymont Park. He stated that the project includes construction of a quarter-mile paved trail, picnic areas, nature paths, an outdoor classroom for the school, a fenced off-leash dog area, and drainage improvements. Mr. Woody said this project is supported by both the current master plans and the comprehensive plans.

Mr. Woody said the improvements on the property will generate surface water runoff or stormwater, which will need to be managed in accordance with the City code and state law. Mr. Woody stated that conserved open space is a practice of setting aside land via deed restrictions to allow low volumes of runoff to disperse and to infiltrate, and as a state-approved measure to mitigate stormwater. He stated that to dedicate the land to stormwater management purposes, City Council will need to approve the proposed resolutions to create the necessary deed restrictions. He said these restrictions came before Council's Physical Development Committee on July 8, and there is an additional attachment tonight that was not provided during the committee, which goes into additional details regarding the mitigation process and practices.

Mr. Woody said Council has also taken similar actions in Jefferson Park and the Tinbridge Hill neighborhoods. He stated that the exhibit designates about a one-and-a-half-acre portion, which is the bottom left of the screen, of open space already in place at Perrymont Park. He added that this piggybacks on the open space that was previously recorded for the VOF grant, as well as an area where a stream restoration project was completed by the Department of Water Resources in 2016 and 2017.

Mr. Freedman mentioned that there was a change in some of the documents, and this one was now by deed versus administrative designation and that is to be consistent with a previous designation for stormwater management purposes. He said the difference is that they still have a resolution that authorizes the designation, but because they did a previous deed of restriction and dedication of conserved open space land for Tinbridge and wanted to be consistent. He added that it accomplishes the same thing but is a different mechanism.

Mayor Taylor opened the public hearing. There were no speakers in favor or in opposition to the project. The Clerk confirmed that there were no voicemails. Mayor Taylor closed the public hearing and deferred to the committee chair, Councilmember Timmer.

Councilmember Timmer said this recommendation came forward from City staff and was unanimously passed by the Physical Development Committee.

Councilmember Timmer moved to adopt Resolution #R-25-061 . Mayor Taylor noted that it does not require a second.

Mr. Woody confirmed for Councilmember Misjuns that the Virginia Outdoors Foundation (VOF) is a state foundation.

With no further discussion from the Council, the following vote was recorded:

Ayes: Taylor, Diemer, Reed, Faraldi, Wilder, Misjuns, and Timmer	7
Noes:	0

// In the matter of Public Comment, Agenda Item 8, Citizen Zachary Karnavas was not present.

// In the matter of Public Comment, Agenda Item 9, Citizen Jeff Rosner commented on “the way forward for City Council,” noting that they could move forward to more transparency and efficiency. He said one way was to minimize changes to the rules of procedure, as Council has already spent a lot of time on this with some of the proposed changes needing to be rejected. He said in the draft amendments package, Paragraph 6.7.B.4, this would make it easier to suspend the rules, which works against transparency as it would make it easier to depart from the public agenda. He said Paragraph 6.7.B.12 and 13 also allow departure from the public agenda. He said Paragraph 5.1.1.B, requested by Councilmember Misjuns, would make it easier to pass a motion in a work session, which would be undemocratic because public comment is not allowed in those sessions. He also noted that Councilmember Timmer proposed an ordinance for which a stated purpose is transparency, but it would delete Rule 6.8.6, which says, "Councilmembers shall not engage in electronic communications amongst themselves regarding a motion that is on the floor for debate." He emphasized that the public needs to know all discussion of a motion. He said that another stated that purpose of that package and the general discussion is promoting free speech, but making it easier to pass motions in work sessions without public comment would be a denial of the public's right to free speech. He stated that another way for City Council to move forward would be to avoid getting bogged down in parliamentary procedures like points of order, suspensions of the rules, and substitute motions. He noted that he would provide copies of his comments to staff for distribution.

// In the matter of Public Comment, Agenda Item 10, Citizen Greg Berry said he was speaking on behalf of the City Elders group. He quoted several Bible passages and Christian tenets, stating that institutions and laws were to be the instruments of Christian men for the good of the human family. He asked why they have fallen so far from these principles, stating that there has been a concerted effort over the last hundred years to rewrite history. He asked if it was true that the Super Rad Arcade Bar was receiving funding from the Downtown Lynchburg Business Alliance, and he asked if this was the same City governance that allowed people's taxes to rise.

Councilmember Faraldi asked that the City Manager provide a memo to City Council regarding Mr. Berry's comments and give a reminder of how the funds came from the governor.

// In the matter of Public Comment, Agenda Item 11, Citizen F.J. Jahlil spoke about AI in education, stating that history is marked by those who adapt to technological advances and those left behind. He said Lynchburg and Lynchburg City Schools must prepare youth and adults to benefit from the AI revolution. He stated that AI will transform education by tailoring lessons, gamifying curriculum, and providing instant feedback.

// In the matter of Engineering, Agenda Item #12, Consideration of adopting Resolution #R-25-062, endorsing the Virginia Department of Transportation Revenue Sharing Applications for FY 2027, City Engineer Lee Newland said staff is seeking approval for four separate projects totaling $2,737,085.

Mr. Newland said the first project is the Langhorne Road-Vassar Roundabout, which came before Council in May 2022, with the total cost of the project at $10.7 million and $9.9 million in Smart Scale funding — with that going up due to the relocation of the City's raw water line. He said they are proposing a $0.88 million additional cost above the $9.9 million, for the total cost to Lynchburg at $0.44 million. He said the next project is the Hollins Mill Road Bridge replacement, which came before Council in September 2021. He said the total project cost is $20.1 million; the request is for $3.6 million, with the City share being $1.8 million; the total cost for the City on this project will be $10.1 million. He said the next project is the Breezewood Drive reconstruction, with a total project cost of $9.8 million; the request for this application period is $9,416, with City's share being $4,708 and Lynchburg City's total cost being $4.88 million. He said the last project is the Link Road-Rivermont intersection, which came before Council in 2019; the total project cost is up to $3.08 million; the request for this project in this application is $41,862, with the City's share being $20,931; and the overall cost for the City of Lynchburg is $1.54 million.

Councilmember Timmer said this came before the Physical Development Committee today, and it was great to see the projects coming in on time and on budget. She mentioned that with the City apportionment of funding on the Vassar roundabout, $325,000 has already been spent on the project so if they were to cancel or transfer the funds with VDOT, the City would be responsible for that amount.

Councilmember Timmer motioned, seconded by Councilmember Reed, to adopt #R-25-062, endorsing the Virginia Department of Transportation Revenue Sharing Applications for FY 2027.

With no further discussion from the Council, the following vote was recorded:

Ayes: Taylor, Diemer, Reed, Wilder, Misjuns, and Timmer	6
Noes: Faraldi	1

// In the matter of the City Attorney's Office, Agenda Item #13, Council considered adopting Resolution #R-25-063 approving the City's participation in the direct settlement of opioid-related claims against the Sackler family and Resolution #R-25-064 approving of the proposed settlements of opioid-related claims against Alvogen, Amneal, Apotex, Hikma, Indivior, Mylan, Sun, and Zydus and directing the City Attorney to execute the documents necessary to carry out the participation in the settlements.

Councilmember Faraldi motioned, seconded by Vice Mayor Diemer to adopt Resolution #R-25-063 and #R-25-064.

Mr. Freedman summarized that the two proposed resolutions before Council are related to participating in settlements with the Sackler family, specific to Purdue Pharma, and eight opioid manufacturers. He said these are before them because they are national settlements that the Commonwealth of Virginia is participating in, and the City of Lynchburg has agreed to join in an MOU with all other localities in Virginia to share in the proceeds related to the settlements and participate in grants and other things with the Virginia Opioid Abatement Authority. He said with the previous settlements City Council has approved, there has been 100% participation around the state, and the state is hoping for 100% participation again because the more participation, the more funds flow to Virginia and its localities. He added that he would take the efforts necessary for the City to participate in the settlements.

With no further discussion from the Council, the following vote was recorded:

Ayes: Taylor, Diemer, Reed, Wilder, Misjuns, Faraldi, and Timmer	7
Noes: None	0

// The meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

Clerk of Council