



Thomas Jefferson Planning District
2019 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

December 2018

Rick Randolph, Chair
Chip Boyles, Executive Director
David Blount, Legislative Liaison

Thomas Jefferson Planning District 2019 Legislative Program

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

Locality Facts.....p. 2

Top Legislative Prioritiesp. 3-4

**STATE BUDGET and FUNDING OBLIGATIONS
PUBLIC EDUCATION FUNDING
BROADBAND**

Other Priority Itemsp. 5-6

**LOCAL REVENUE AUTHORITY
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: 107,697*
County Seat: Charlottesville
FY19 Operating Budget: \$291.7 million
Real Estate Tax Rate: \$.839 per \$100 assessed value

CHARLOTTESVILLE

Area: 10.3 square miles
Population: 49,132*
FY19 Operating Budget: \$179.7 million
Real Estate Tax Rate: \$.95 per \$100 assessed value

FLUVANNA

Area: 290 square miles
Population: 26,467*
County Seat: Palmyra
FY19 Operating Budget: \$77.6 million
Real Estate Tax Rate: \$.939 per \$100 assessed value

GREENE

Area: 157 square miles
Population: 19,985*
County Seat: Stanardsville
FY19 Operating Budget: \$63.6 million
Real Estate Tax Rate: \$.775 per \$100 assessed value

LOUISA

Area: 514 square miles
Population: 35,035*
County Seat: Louisa
FY19 Operating Budget: \$108.5 million
Real Estate Tax Rate: \$.72 per \$100 assessed value

NELSON

Area: 474 square miles
Population: 14,858*
County Seat: Lovingston
FY19 Operating Budget: \$40.6 million
Real Estate Tax Rate: \$.72 per \$100 assessed value

**2017 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 to increase in the current fiscal year, crafting amendments to the enacted biennial budget will pose a tall order for the governor and election-conscious State legislators. They will have to address tax policy changes related to the new federal budget act; requests for additional funding in human services and transportation; and adding dollars for broadband and school safety/school facilities, as well as for various state agency projects.

As State policymakers weigh these issues, we encourage them 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 and we believe state investment in local service delivery must be enhanced, as many mandated programs have been level funded since 2009. State funding for others, such as for jail per diems 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 \$6.2 billion on direct aid to public education in FY19. While we appreciate additional state teacher salary and other education dollars approved for the FY19-20 biennium, we continue to believe that the State should significantly increase its commitment to K-12 education. While overall state funding has increased above FY09's low levels, per pupil funding amounts have not kept pace and state dollars do not reflect the true costs

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

We believe localities need an adequately defined SOQ so that state funding better aligns with what school divisions are actually providing in their schools. 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 some state policies that have been revised since the Great Recession have reduced the state’s funding obligations to public education.

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 in unserved areas.

Access to broadband, or high-speed internet, is a critical necessity in the 21st 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:

→Additional state general fund dollars for localities/private sector providers to help extend service to areas presently unserved by any broadband provider. We appreciate action that increased funding for the Virginia Telecommunication Initiative (VATI) in the current State budget from \$1 million to \$4 million per year, but believe additional, significant increases in investment are still critical.

→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 and incentives that would provide 1) for the use of existing electrical and road right-of-way easements for broadband infrastructure, and 2) a sales tax exemption for materials used to construct such infrastructure.

→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.

→Consideration of proposals that would subject broadband to stricter and more developed regulation as a public utility.

OTHER PRIORITY ITEMS

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).

→In light of the Supreme Court decision eliminating the requirement for physical presence for sales and use tax collection, any statutory changes must provide for local option sales taxes to be collected from remote sellers.

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

→The State should refrain from diverting Communications Sales and Use Tax Trust Fund dollars for general fund purposes. Revenues coming back to localities from the Fund already are 20% less than 10 years ago, primarily because the tax does not reflect modern technology patterns of consumption. We also support updating the tax to reflect these new patterns.

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 governments. 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 continued its recent practice of appropriating additional dollars to address increasing caseloads and costs in CSA, an increase largely attributable to private special education day placements. Also, legislative review continues 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, services and service providers available, especially in rural areas, and in supporting locality efforts to provide facilities and services on a regional level.

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, including broader impact fee authority.

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, and 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, authority that should provide for calculating the cost of all public infrastructure, including local transportation and school construction needs caused by growth.

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.

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 the K-12 education community 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 backing, technical support and other incentives to support collaboration by business, governments, educational institutions and communities that spur economic development, job creation and career readiness.

Workforce Development:

- We support state job investment and small business grants being targeted to businesses that pay higher wages.

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.

Safety and Security at Schools:

- We support funding (both capital and operational) to improve security at local schools, to include incentive funding or reimbursement for localities and school divisions hiring school resource or security officers.

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.

Solar:

- We support the creation of stronger markets for distributed solar.

Disposable Plastic Bags:

- We support local authority to develop incentives to decrease the distribution, sale or offer of disposable plastic bags.

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 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:

- We urge funding to address shortfalls in elections administration dollars, as elections administration has become more complex and federal and state financial support for elections has been decreasing.
- We support legislation that allows localities to address concerns and discrepancies regarding voting district boundary lines.

Libraries: We support enhanced state funding for local and regional libraries.

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 support full state funding for the local costs associated with Medicaid expansion, including local eligibility workers and case managers. 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. This includes restoration of FY19 funding reduced when health care was expanded through Medicaid. While these reductions may eventually be made up due to expansion, the timing of implementation leaves CSBs with six months to make up for a year's worth of reductions in the current fiscal year, and puts them at risk of service and staffing disruptions.
- 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 and Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (infants and toddlers).

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 greatly reduced 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, jail per diem funding should be increased to levels that better represent the costs of housing inmates, and be regularly adjusted for inflation. The State should fund four quarters of payments per year in the budget, and pay for the medical costs and any necessary mental health assessments costs for inmates.
- 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, authorized 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 through the cost share program.

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 increased and ongoing investment in the Stormwater Local Assistance Fund to assist localities with much-needed stormwater projects and in response to any new regulatory requirements.
- 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
25th District
(804) 698-7525
district25@senate.virginia.gov

Emmett W. Hanger, Jr.
24th District
(804) 698-7524
district24@senate.virginia.gov

Mark J. Peake
22nd District
(804) 698-7522
district22@senate.virginia.gov

Bryce E. Reeves
17th District
(804) 698-7517
District17@senate.virginia.gov

House of Delegates

Richard P. Bell
20th District
(804) 698-1020
deldbell@house.virginia.gov

Robert B. Bell, III
58th District
(804) 698-1058
delrbell@house.virginia.gov

C. Matt Fariss
59th District
(804) 698-1059
delmfariss@house.virginia.gov

R. Steven Landes
25th District
(804) 698-1025
delslandes@house.virginia.gov

John J. McGuire, III
56th District
(804) 698-1056
deljmcguire@house.virginia.gov

David J. Toscano
57th District
(804) 698-1057
deldtoscano@house.virginia.gov

R. Lee Ware, Jr.
65th District
(804) 698-1065
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.