



**Thomas Jefferson Planning District**  
**2018 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

---

Albemarle County | City of Charlottesville  
Fluvanna County | Greene County  
Louisa County | Nelson County

**December 2017**

**Genevieve Keller**, Chair  
**Chip Boyles**, Executive Director  
**David Blount**, Legislative Liaison

---

# Thomas Jefferson Planning District 2018 Legislative Program

Legislative Positions of Charlottesville City and the  
Counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa and Nelson

**Locality Facts.....p. 2**

**Top Legislative Priorities .....p. 3-4**

**STATE BUDGET and FUNDING OBLIGATIONS  
PUBLIC EDUCATION FUNDING  
LOCAL REVENUE AUTHORITY**

**Other Priority Items .....p. 5-6**

**BROADBAND  
CHILDREN'S SERVICES ACT  
LAND USE and GROWTH MANAGEMENT**

**Legislative Positions.....p. 7-13**

**ECONOMIC and WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
EDUCATION  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
GENERAL GOVERNMENT  
HEALTH and HUMAN SERVICES  
HOUSING  
PUBLIC SAFETY  
TRANSPORTATION FUNDING and DEVOLUTION  
WATER QUALITY**

**Area Legislators.....p. 14**

## About our Localities

### ALBEMARLE

**Area:** 726 square miles  
**Population:** 105,715\*  
**County Seat:** Charlottesville  
**FY18 Operating Budget:** \$274.2 million  
**Real Estate Tax Rate:** \$.839 per \$100 assessed value

### CHARLOTTESVILLE

**Area:** 10.3 square miles  
**Population:** 49,071\*  
**FY18 Operating Budget:** \$171.7 million  
**Real Estate Tax Rate:** \$.95 per \$100 assessed value

### FLUVANNA

**Area:** 290 square miles  
**Population:** 26,133\*  
**County Seat:** Palmyra  
**FY18 Operating Budget:** \$75.6 million  
**Real Estate Tax Rate:** \$.907 per \$100 assessed value

### GREENE

**Area:** 157 square miles  
**Population:** 19,785\*  
**County Seat:** Stanardsville  
**FY18 Operating Budget:** \$61.3 million  
**Real Estate Tax Rate:** \$.775 per \$100 assessed value

### LOUISA

**Area:** 514 square miles  
**Population:** 34,316\*  
**County Seat:** Louisa  
**FY18 Operating Budget:** \$106.2 million  
**Real Estate Tax Rate:** \$.72 per \$100 assessed value

### NELSON

**Area:** 474 square miles  
**Population:** 14,835\*  
**County Seat:** Lovingston  
**FY18 Operating Budget:** \$38.9 million  
**Real Estate Tax Rate:** \$.72 per \$100 assessed value

*\*2016 Weldon Cooper Center estimate*

## TOP LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

### State Budget and Funding Obligations

**PRIORITY: The Planning District localities urge the governor and legislature to enhance state aid to localities, and to not impose mandates on or shift costs for state programs to localities.**

While state general fund revenues are expected to continue their upward crawl in the current fiscal year, development of the next state biennial budget will be challenged by several factors, including the following: 1) the re-benchmarking of public education costs (likely to be over one-half billion dollars); 2) increases in Medicaid costs, which have jumped by over 6% per year since 2010; 3) more pressure on Children’s Services Act funding; and 4) replacement of some one-time “fixes” in the current budget plan.

We encourage the State to develop revenue and spending priorities that support K-12 education, economic development, public safety, and other public goals. Localities continue to be the state’s go-to service provider, despite local budgets being subject to slowly-recovering local and state dollars. State investment in local service delivery must be enhanced, as many mandated programs have been level funded since 2009. Funding levels for others, such as the Children’s Services Act and HB 599, are less than the 2009 amounts.

We take the following positions:

→We oppose unfunded state and federal mandates and the cost shifting that occurs when the State or the federal government fails to fund requirements or reduces or eliminates funding for programs. Doing so strains local ability to craft effective and efficient budgets to deliver services mandated by the State or federal government or demanded by residents.

→We urge the State to resist placing additional administrative burdens on local governments without sufficient resources or flexibility; otherwise, the quality of services delivered at the local level is jeopardized.

→We urge policymakers to preserve existing funding formulas rather than altering them in order to save the State money and/or to shift costs to localities.

→The State should not confiscate or redirect local general fund dollars to the state treasury.

### Public Education Funding

**PRIORITY: The Planning District localities urge the State to fully fund its share of the realistic costs of the Standards of Quality (SOQ) without making policy changes that reduce funding or shift funding responsibility to localities.**

The State will spend just over \$6 billion on direct aid to public education in FY18. While we appreciate additional state teacher salary dollars this past year, we believe that the State should significantly increase its commitment to K-12 education. In the past decade, overall state funding has increased just seven percent, and while the state-funded per pupil amount has jumped back above the FY09 level, state dollars do not reflect the true costs of K-12 education. Local

governments consistently go “above and beyond” to close the funding gap by appropriating twice as much K-12 funding as required by the state.

We believe localities need an adequately defined SOQ that closes the gap between what school divisions are actually providing and what the State currently funds in the SOQ. This could include recognizing additional instructional positions and, as recommended by the Board of Education, increasing state-funded staffing ratios for various, non-instructional positions. This would be a welcome change of course, as state policies that have been revised since the Great Recession have reduced the state’s funding obligations to public education.

---

## Local Revenue Authority

**PRIORITY: The Planning District localities urge the governor and legislature to diversify the revenue options available to localities, to include equalizing the revenue-raising authority of counties with that of cities, and to not restrict local revenue-raising authority.**

We support the legislature making additional revenue options available to diversify the local revenue stream, which could reduce dependency on real property taxes, rather than removing or restricting local revenue authorities. One way to do this is to eliminate the differences between city and county taxing authority, which exist due to now less-prevalent distinctions in the services provided. This would mean removing the restrictions that currently apply to county authority to levy the meals, lodging, cigarette and amusement taxes. Equalizing revenue authority for counties with that of cities also should be included as part of a needed modernization of the state’s tax system to comport with the realities of a global, information-driven economy, which will rely less on governmental spending and more on new, private sector business models. We also believe any tax reform efforts should examine the financing and delivering of state services at the local level.

We take the following positions:

→The State should refrain from establishing local tax policy at the state level and allow local governments to determine the equity of local taxation policy.

→The State should not expect local governments to pay for new funding requirements or the expansion of existing ones on locally-delivered services, without a commensurate increase in state financial assistance or new local taxing authority (see above).

→The State should not alter or eliminate the BPOL and Machinery and Tools taxes.

→The State should support the appropriate collection of transient occupancy taxes from online transactions.

→The State should revamp the Communications Sales and Use Tax (CSUT). Revenues from the CSUT coming back to localities are 20% less than 10 years ago, primarily because the tax does not reflect modern technology patterns of consumption. Accordingly, we support 1) leveling the current 5% CSUT with the state sales tax rate of 5.3%; 2) broadening the coverage of the tax to include audio and video streaming and prepaid calling services; and 3) targeting the additional revenues to be generated to support rural area broadband expansion.

## OTHER PRIORITY ITEMS

### Broadband

**PRIORITY: The Planning District localities encourage and support state and federal efforts and financial incentives that assist localities and their communities in deploying universal, affordable access to broadband technology, particularly in unserved and underserved areas.**

Access to broadband, or high-speed internet, is a critical necessity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It has become basic, not optional, infrastructure, just like roads and electricity, that is essential for economic growth, equity in access to public education, community growth, and consumer communications and information. Many communities, particularly those in unserved rural areas, need thoughtful, longer-term strategies to bridge the broadband gap. This may be an approach that utilizes both fiber and wireless technologies, private/public partnerships and regulated markets that provide a choice of service providers and competitive prices.

Accordingly, we believe state and federal support should include the following:

- Development of a statewide comprehensive plan for broadband and state support for local governments that are developing or implementing local or regional broadband plans;
- Provisions that provide for sharing utility and road right-of-way easements for expanding broadband;
- Support for linking broadband efforts for education and public safety to private sector efforts to serve businesses and residences;
- Maintaining local land use, permitting, fee and other local authorities;
- Amending the current 5% Communications Sales and Use Tax to apply to previously uncovered technologies and to mirror the state sales tax rate of 5.3%, and targeting the additional revenues generated to rural area broadband expansion; and
- Consideration of proposals that would subject broadband to stricter and more developed regulation as a public utility.

### Children's Services Act

**PRIORITY: The Planning District localities urge the State to be partners in containing costs of the Children's Services Act (CSA) and to better balance CSA responsibilities between the State and local government. The State should resist attempts to shift costs of serving children through CSA to localities and schools.**

Since the inception of CSA in the early 1990's, there has been pressure to hold down costs, to cap state costs for serving mandated children, to increase local match levels and to make the program more uniform by attempting to control how localities run their programs.

This past session, the General Assembly appropriated an additional \$85.7 million to address increasing caseloads and costs in CSA, an increase largely attributable to private special education day placement costs. The budget also included language directing a review of options

for these placements and how their cost and quality could be better managed. Localities are concerned about proposals that would move some CSA funding to the Department of Education, with any resulting shortfalls in funding for services becoming the responsibility of localities (rather than the current process where localities request supplemental state funding). Such a scenario could limit services and funding that are necessary for students who may need more intensive services at any time.

Accordingly, we support 1) local ability to use state funds to pay for mandated services provided directly by the locality, specifically for private day placements, where the same services could be offered in schools; and 2) maintaining cost shares on a sum sufficient basis by both the State and local governments. Changing the funding mechanism to a per-pupil basis of state funding would shift the sum sufficient portion fully to localities, which we would oppose.

We also support the following:

- Enhanced state funding for local CSA administrative costs;
- A cap on local expenditures (with the State making up any gaps) in order to combat higher costs for serving mandated children; and
- The State being proactive in making residential facilities and service providers available, especially in rural areas.

---

## Land Use and Growth Management

**PRIORITY: The Planning District localities encourage the State to resist preempting or circumventing existing land use authorities, and to provide additional tools to plan and manage growth.**

Over the years, the General Assembly has enacted both mandated and optional land use provisions. Some have been helpful, while others have prescribed one-size-fits-all rules that hamper different local approaches to land use planning. Accordingly, we support local authority to plan and regulate land use. We oppose legislation that weakens these key local responsibilities; this would include recent efforts to 1) restrict local oversight of the placement of various telecommunications infrastructure, and 2) single out specific land uses for special treatment without regard to the impact of such uses in particular locations.

We also believe the General Assembly should provide localities with necessary tools to meet important infrastructure needs, as current land use authority often is inadequate to allow local governments to provide for balanced growth in ways that protect and improve quality of life. This would include more workable impact fee authority for facilities other than roads, and changes to the currently-enacted proffer system. Proffer legislation approved in 2016 limits the scope of impacts that may be addressed by proffers, and establishes specific criteria for when a proffer is deemed to be unreasonable. We support changes to the law to provide more balanced and practical standards for determining whether a proffer is reasonable and to restore a climate where localities and applicants can openly discuss rezoning applications.

Further, we support ongoing state and local efforts to coordinate land use and transportation planning, and urge state and local officials to be mindful of various local and regional plans when conducting corridor or transportation planning within a locality or region.

Finally, concerning land preservation, we request state funding and incentives for localities, at their option, to acquire, preserve and maintain open space.

## LEGISLATIVE POSITIONS

### Economic and Workforce Development

The Planning District's member localities recognize economic development and workforce training as essential to the continued viability of the Commonwealth. We support policies and additional state funding that closely link the goals of economic and workforce development and the state's efforts to streamline and integrate workforce activities and revenue sources. We encourage enhanced coordination with K-12 education to equip the workforce with in-demand skill sets so as to align workforce supply with anticipated employer demands. We also support continuing emphasis on regional cooperation in economic, workforce and tourism development.

#### **Economic Development:**

- We support continuation of the *GO Virginia* initiative to grow and diversify the private sector in each region, with ongoing state financial incentives, technical support and other incentives to support collaboration by business, governments, educational institutions and communities that spur economic development, job creation and career readiness.
- We support legislation that dedicates income and sales tax revenues generated by corporations and limited liability companies within an economic development project to such locality in cases where the locality has expended local funds for such project and state grant funds or incentives were not involved.

#### **Planning District Commissions:**

- We support increased state funding for regional planning district commissions.
- We encourage opportunities for planning districts to collaborate with state officials and state agencies on regional programs and projects.

#### **Agricultural Products and Enterprises:**

We encourage state and local governments to work together and with other entities to identify, to provide incentives for, and to promote local, regional and state agricultural products and rural enterprises, and to encourage opportunities for such products and enterprises through a balanced approach.

### Education

The Planning District's member localities believe that the state should be a reliable funding partner with localities by recognizing the operational, personnel, and capital resources necessary for a high-quality public education system (see priority position on *Public Education Funding*).

#### **School Division Finances:**

- We believe that unfunded liability associated with the teacher retirement plan should be a shared responsibility of state and local government, with the Virginia Department of Education paying its share of retirement costs directly to the Virginia Retirement System in order to facilitate such sharing.
- The State should not eliminate or decrease funding for school employee benefits.

- We support legislation that 1) establishes a mechanism for local appeal to the State of the calculated Local Composite Index (LCI); and 2) amends the LCI formula to recognize the land use taxation value, rather than the true value, of real property.

**Literary Fund:**

- The State should discontinue seizing dollars from the Literary Fund to help pay for teacher retirement.
- We urge state financial assistance with school construction and renovation needs, to include funding for the Literary Loan and interest rate subsidy programs.

---

## Environmental Quality

The Planning District's member localities believe that environmental quality should be funded and promoted through a comprehensive approach, and address air and water quality, solid waste management, land conservation, climate change and land use policies. We support protection and enhancement of the environment and recognize the need to achieve a proper balance between environmental regulation and the socio-economic health of our communities within the constraints of available revenues. Such an approach requires regional cooperation due to the inter-jurisdictional nature of many environmental resources, and adequate state funding to support local and regional efforts.

**Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act:**

- We oppose legislation mandating expansion of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act's coverage area. Instead, we urge the State to 1) provide legal, financial and technical support to localities that wish to comply with any of the Act's provisions; 2) allow localities to use other practices to improve water quality; and 3) provide funding for other strategies that address point and non-point source pollution.

**Biosolids:**

- We support the option for localities, as a part of their zoning ordinances, to designate and/or reasonably restrict the land application of biosolids to specific areas within the locality, based on criteria designed to further protect the public safety and welfare of citizens.

**Alternate On-Site Sewage Systems:**

- We support legislative and regulatory action to 1) ensure operation and maintenance of alternative on-site sewage systems in ways that protect public health and the environment, and 2) increase options for localities to secure owner abatement or correction of system deficiencies.

**Dam Safety:**

- We support dam safety regulations that do not impose unreasonable costs on dam owners whose structures meet current safety standards.

**Water Supply:**

- The State should be a partner with localities in water supply development and should work with and assist localities in addressing water supply issues, to include investing in regional projects.

**Program Administration:**

- The State should not impose a fee, tax or surcharge on water, sewer, solid waste or other local services to pay for state environmental programs.

---

## General Government

The Planning District's member localities believe that since so many governmental actions take place at the local level, a strong local government system is essential. Local governments must have the freedom, flexibility and tools to carry out their responsibilities.

### **Internet-based Businesses and Services:**

- We oppose legislation that would single out internet-based businesses and services for special treatment or exceptions. Rather, the State should support local authority concerning collection and auditing of taxes, licensing and regulation. There should be a level playing field for competition among businesses offering goods and services to ensure safety, reliability and fair access to such offerings by consumers and the general public.

### **Local Government Operations:**

- We oppose intrusive legislation involving purchasing procedures; local government authority to establish hours of work, salaries and working conditions for local employees; matters that can be adopted by resolution or ordinance; procedures for adopting ordinances; and procedures for conducting public meetings.
- We support allowing localities to use alternatives to newspapers for publishing various legal advertisements and public notices.
- We support local flexibility regarding public parking regulation and enforcement.
- We oppose attempts to reduce sovereign immunity protections for localities and their employees, to include regional jail officers.

### **State-Supported Positions:**

- Localities should have maximum flexibility in providing compensation increases for state-supported local employees (including school personnel), as local governments provide significant local dollars and additional personnel beyond those funded by the State.

### **Elections:**

- As elections administration has become more complex and federal and state financial support for elections has been decreasing, we urge funding to address coming critical shortfalls in elections administration dollars. We also support state funding for voting equipment replacement, as many older voting machines are exhibiting end-of-life problems.

### **Freedom of Information Act (FOIA):**

- We request that any changes to FOIA preserve 1) a local governing body's ability to meet in closed session; 2) the list of records currently exempt from disclosure; and 3) provisions concerning creation of customized records.
- We support changes to allow local and regional public bodies to conduct electronic meetings as now permitted for state public bodies.

### **Quality of Life Issues:**

- We oppose changes to state law that further weaken a locality's ability to regulate noise or the discharge of firearms.
- We support expanding local authority to regulate smoking in public places.

---

## Health and Human Services

The Planning District's member localities recognize that special attention must be given to developing circumstances under which people, especially the disabled, the poor, the young and the elderly, can achieve their full potential. Transparent state policies and funding for at-risk

individuals and families to access appropriate services are critical. The delivery of such services must be a collaborative effort by federal, state and local agencies.

**Funding:**

- We oppose changes in state funding or policies that increase the local share of costs for human services. We also oppose any shifting of Medicaid matching requirements from the State to localities.
- The State should provide sufficient funding to allow Community Services Boards (CSBs) to meet the challenges of providing a community-based system of care. We believe children with mental health needs should be treated in the mental health system, where CSBs are the point of entry.
- We support increased investment in the ID waiver program for adults and young people and Medicaid reimbursement for children’s dental services.
- We support sufficient state funding assistance for older residents, to include companion and in-home services, home-delivered meals and transportation.

**Social Services:**

- We support the provision of sufficient state funding to match federal dollars for the administration of mandated services within the Department of Social Services, and to meet the staffing standards for local departments to provide services as stipulated in state law.
- We support changes to the Code to provide that a judicial finding be controlling of administrative findings in alleged child abuse and neglect cases.

**Prevention:**

- We support continued operation and enhancement of early intervention and prevention programs. This includes the Virginia Preschool Initiative, Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (infants and toddlers), and federal reauthorization of funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) in order to provide health coverage for vulnerable children.

**Childcare:**

- The legislature should provide full funding to assist low-income working and TANF (and former TANF) families with childcare costs. These dollars help working-class parents pay for supervised daycare facilities and support efforts for families to become self-sufficient.

---

## Housing

The Planning District’s member localities believe that every citizen should have an opportunity to afford decent, safe and sanitary housing. The State and localities should work to expand and preserve the supply and improve the quality of affordable housing for the elderly, disabled, and low- and moderate-income households. Regional planning and solutions should be implemented whenever possible.

**Affordable Housing:**

- We support the following: 1) local flexibility in the operation of affordable housing programs and establishment of affordable dwelling unit ordinances; 2) creation of a state housing trust fund; 3) grants and loans to low- or moderate-income persons to aid in purchasing dwellings; and 4) the provision of other funding to encourage affordable housing initiatives.

**Homelessness:**

- We support measures to prevent homelessness and to assist the chronic homeless.

**Historic Structures:**

- We support incentives that encourage rehabilitation and preservation of historic structures.

---

## Public Safety

The Planning District's member localities encourage state financial support, cooperation and assistance for local law enforcement (and state police), emergency medical care, criminal justice activities and fire services responsibilities carried out locally.

### **Funding:**

- We urge the State to make Compensation Board funding a top priority, fully funding local positions that fall under its purview. It should not increase the local share of funding Constitutional offices or divert money away from them, but increase dollars needed for their operation.
- We support returning funding responsibility for the Line of Duty Act (LODA) to the State. In the absence of that, there should be no new or enhanced benefits that increase locality costs.
- We urge state funding of the HB 599 law enforcement program in accordance with *Code of Virginia* provisions.
- The State should increase funding to the Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act program, which has cut in half the number of juvenile justice commitments over the past decade.
- We support funding for mental health and substance abuse services at juvenile detention centers.

### **Jails:**

- As the state prisoner reimbursement rate is insufficient to cover actual costs, the State should restore per diem payments to localities 1) for housing state-responsible prisoners to \$14 per day, and 2) for housing local responsible offenders to \$8 per day. If a state-responsible prisoner is sentenced to serve in jail for more than one year, then the State should compensate the jail for the actual cost of incarceration.
- The State should not shift costs to localities by altering the definition of state-responsible prisoner.
- The State should continue to allow exemptions from the federal prisoner offset.

### **Offender Programs and Services:**

- We support continued state funding of the drug court program and the Offender Reentry and Transition Services (ORTS), Community Corrections and Pretrial Services Acts.
- We support continued state endorsement of the role and authority of pretrial services offices.
- We support authorization for the court to issue restricted driver's licenses to persons denied them because of having outstanding court costs or fees.

### **Body Cameras:**

- We support the ability of local governments to adopt policies regarding law enforcement body worn cameras that account for local needs and fiscal realities.

---

## Transportation Funding and Devolution

The Planning District's member localities recognize that revenues for expanding and maintaining all modes of infrastructure are critical for meeting Virginia's well-documented transportation challenges and for keeping pace with growing public needs and expectations. We believe the state should continue to enhance funding for local and regional transportation needs, including the Revenue Sharing Program with localities. We also remain opposed to attempts to transfer responsibility to counties for construction, maintenance or operation of current or new secondary roads.

**Transit Capital Funding:**

- Capital Project Revenue bonds, approved in 2007 to provide \$600 million over 10 years for transit capital, are expiring. Failure by the state to provide replacement funding will jeopardize safe and reliable transit service and will result in the loss of federal funds if they are unable to be matched, which would mean a double hit for transit agencies funded primarily at the local/regional level. Therefore, it is critical that the State identify new funding sources for transit capital investments.

**Smart Scale:**

- As the State continues to implement the prioritization process established by HB 2 (2014), known as “Smart Scale,” and the distribution formula for highway construction projects established by HB 1887 (2015), there should be adequate funding, and local authority to generate transportation dollars, for important local and regional projects.

**Devolution:**

- We believe that efficient and effective transportation infrastructure, including the secondary road system, is critical to a healthy economy, job creation, a cleaner environment and public safety. Accordingly, we oppose shifting the responsibility for secondary roads to local entities, which could result in vast differences among existing road systems in different localities, potentially placing the state at a competitive economic disadvantage with other states when considering business and job recruitment, and movement of goods.

**Local and Regional Authority:**

- We support additional authority to establish mechanisms for funding transit in our region.
- We support VDOT utilizing Metropolitan Planning Organizations and regional rural transportation staff to carry out local transportation studies.

---

## Water Quality

The Planning District’s member localities support the goal of improved water quality, but as we face ongoing costs for remedies, including stormwater management and to address revised water quality criteria, we believe major and reliable forms of financial and technical assistance from the federal and state governments is necessary if comprehensive improvement strategies are to be effective.

**Funding:**

- We urge aggressive state investment in meeting required milestones for reducing Chesapeake Bay pollution to acceptable levels.
- We believe these investments include authority, funding and other resources to achieve success, and must ensure that cost/benefit analyses are conducted of solutions that generate the greatest pollution reductions per dollar spent.
- We support dollars being targeted to stormwater management, for permitted dischargers to upgrade treatment plants and for any retrofitting of developed areas, and to aid farmers with best management practices.

**Stormwater Management:**

- We request that any stormwater requirements be balanced and flexible, and that adequate funding and training be available for the State and local governments to meet ongoing costs associated with local stormwater programs.
- We support continued investment in the Stormwater Local Assistance Fund to assist localities with much-needed stormwater projects.
- We will oppose proposals that would result in new or expanded mandates or requirements, including elimination of current “opt-out” provisions, or financial burdens on local governments.

- We oppose further amendments to the regulation of stormwater which would require a locality to waive stormwater charges.

**Nutrient Allocations:**

- We oppose efforts that would require re-justification of nutrient allocations for existing wastewater treatment facilities in our region or that would reduce or eliminate nutrient allocation or related treatment capacity serving the region.

---

# Legislators Representing Localities in the Thomas Jefferson Planning District

## Senate of Virginia

**R. Creigh Deeds**  
25<sup>th</sup> District  
(804) 698-7525  
[district25@senate.virginia.gov](mailto:district25@senate.virginia.gov)

**Emmett W. Hanger, Jr.**  
24<sup>th</sup> District  
(804) 698-7524  
[district24@senate.virginia.gov](mailto:district24@senate.virginia.gov)

**Mark J. Peake**  
22<sup>nd</sup> District  
(804) 698-7522  
[district22@senate.virginia.gov](mailto:district22@senate.virginia.gov)

**Bryce E. Reeves**  
17<sup>th</sup> District  
(804) 698-7517  
[District17@senate.virginia.gov](mailto:District17@senate.virginia.gov)

## House of Delegates

**Richard P. Bell**  
20<sup>th</sup> District  
(804) 698-1020  
[deldbell@house.virginia.gov](mailto:deldbell@house.virginia.gov)

**Robert B. Bell, III**  
58<sup>th</sup> District  
(804) 698-1058  
[delrbell@house.virginia.gov](mailto:delrbell@house.virginia.gov)

**C. Matt Fariss**  
59<sup>th</sup> District  
(804) 698-1059  
[delmfariss@house.virginia.gov](mailto:delmfariss@house.virginia.gov)

**R. Steven Landes**  
25<sup>th</sup> District  
(804) 698-1025  
[delslandes@house.virginia.gov](mailto:delslandes@house.virginia.gov)

**John J. McGuire, III**  
56<sup>th</sup> District  
(804) 698-1056  
[deljmcguire@house.virginia.gov](mailto:deljmcguire@house.virginia.gov)

**David J. Toscano**  
57<sup>th</sup> District  
(804) 698-1057  
[deldtoscano@house.virginia.gov](mailto:deldtoscano@house.virginia.gov)

**R. Lee Ware, Jr.**  
65<sup>th</sup> District  
(804) 698-1065  
[dellware@house.virginia.gov](mailto:dellware@house.virginia.gov)

\*\*Richmond telephone numbers are listed. Mailing address (session only) for Senate members is P.O. Box 396, Richmond, Virginia 23219. Mailing address for House of Delegates members is P.O. Box 406, Richmond, Virginia 23218. All legislators' offices are located in the Pocahontas Building at 900 E. Main Street in Richmond.