

The Joint FY27 Budget Work Session of the Petersburg City Council and the Petersburg City Public School Board was held on March 31, 2026, at Petersburg Public Library. Mayor Parham and Chair Board Pritchett called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. The meeting video link is <https://petersburgva.new.swagit.com/videos/380886>.

1. ROLL CALL:

Present:

Samuel Parham, Mayor -- Ward 3
Darrin Hill, Vice Mayor -- Ward 2
Marlow Jones, Councilor -- Ward 1
Charles Cuthbert, Jr., Councilor -- Ward 4
W. Howard Myers, Councilor -- Ward 5
Annette Smith-Lee, Councilor -- Ward 6
Arnold Westbrook, Jr., Councilor -- Ward 7

Absent:

Present from City Administration:

City Manager John "March" Altman, Jr.
City Attorney Anthony C. Williams
City Clerk Tangi R. Hill

Present from the School Board:

Kenneth Pritchett
Taccarri Tucker
Joyce Proctor
Bernard Lundy

Absent:

Steven Pierce
Hal Miles (Late)
Adrian Dance Sr.

Present from the School Administration:

PCPS Superintendent Yolanda Brown
PCPS Chief Financial Officer Dr. Matthias Greywoode
PCPS Assistant Superintendent of Operations Dr. J. Jacob Martinez
PCPS Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources Dr. Shamica Long-Lane
PCPS Clerk of Board Tearia Davis

2. PRAYER

Vice Mayor Hill led the Council meeting in prayer.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Parham led the Council and the citizens in the pledge of allegiance.

Mayor Parham held a moment of silence for the passing of Ms. Janet Avelsgard.

4. DETERMINATION OF THE PRESENCE OF A QUORUM

There was a quorum of the Council and School Board present.

5. PRESENTATION

a. FY2026-2027 Proposed Petersburg City Public Schools Budget

Yolonda Brown, Superintendent of Petersburg City Public Schools (PCPS), introduced members of Schools staff and administration present at today's meeting. She provided an overview of the work session agenda and gave background information on the School District's budget process. She explained how Virginia Code, state funding, and the PCPS Five-Year Strategic Plan informed their budget formulation. She also reviewed the FY 27 initiatives, including salary increases per compensation and classification, two added seats at Code RVA, one full-time equivalent (FTE) organizational program coordinator, and after school activity bus drivers.

Matthias Greywoode, Chief Financial Officer for Petersburg City Public Schools, presented information on the public schools' enrollment history and forecast, which he noted were critical for understanding their revenue and staffing needs. He explained that PCPS was experiencing a decrease in enrollment, which would impact state funding, and their strategic plan included initiatives to reverse that trend.

Dr. Greywoode discussed the K-3 Class Size Reduction Grant and their General Fund revenues. He stated that the FY 2027 revenues for PCPS totaled \$70 million, including a \$2.9 million increase in the City's transfer. He noted the \$3.2 million decrease in state funding between FY 26 and FY 27.

Dr. Greywoode reviewed the year-over-year changes in revenues for their Food Service and Grants Fund. He provided an overview of all budget funds, which included \$53 million in their Capital Projects Fund for construction of a new school, which was separate from the Schools' Operating Budget; this brought their total funds to \$139 million. He explained how Virginia Retirement System (VRS) rate reductions and Local Composite Index (LCI) changes impacted the budget.

Dr. Greywoode then discussed the main cost drivers for the PCPS FY 27 budget this year, the primary ones being the implementation of the compensation and classification study, which cost \$2.8 million, and health insurance premium increases, which cost \$2 million. He stated that in order to address the increases in health insurance, they increased deductibles.

School Board Member Hal Miles arrived.

Dr. Greywoode also reviewed their 2024 Alvarez & Marsal Financial Assessment, which identified critical issues with cash forecasts and reconciliations, staffing in Finance, position control, grants, and budget processes, and explained the steps taken to resolve those issues. He provided further information on mitigation of their budget revenue shortfall, deactivated job vacancies, House and Senate amendments that may impact state funding, and the School District's budget calendar. He summarized the PCPS FY27 Budget request was \$12,977,018 base funding plus \$2,972,333 for the new initiatives this year, for a total of \$15,949,351 requested from the City.

Shamica Long-Lane, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources for Petersburg City Public Schools, shared information regarding salary increases related to the classification and compensation study conducted in 2025. She explained how this aligned with the PCPS Strategic Plan goals and the School Board policies. She provided details on the current teacher and unified salary scales and the related

recommendations from the comp and class study, including updating the salary scales with defined ranges, providing salary grades and steps, and providing placement guidelines.

Dr. Long-Lane explained that the proposed new starting teacher salary was \$60,000, while the unified salary scales would include step increases in alignment with their continued service years. Finally, the administrative salary scale would have an open range, using a salary calculator in conjunction with review of attained education and experience. She discussed additional changes based on recommendations from the class and comp study, including position title shifts and adjustments, employee and resident teacher salary increases, and other supplements.

Jovanim Martinez, Assistant Superintendent of Operations for Petersburg City Public Schools, presented information on the Schools' 2024-2029 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). He provided an overview of the plan goals and the proposed CIP amendment to include newly requested projects. He reviewed the completed projects and indicated those that remained uncompleted. He explained that their 2026 capital projects were not completed due to lack of funding. He also noted the projects that were included in the proposed CIP amendment, which had been approved by the School Board. He explained that included in the CIP was the Walnut Hill construction, which was funded at \$45 million, but now was estimated at \$53 million due to inflation. He summarized that the total amount in the five-year CIP was \$68.582 million.

Vice Mayor Hill congratulated the School Division on their recent accreditation. He said that he had questions about categorical funding but none on the proposed budget.

Council Member Jones expressed concern about the current need to renovate the locker rooms and showers at the high school. He said that he recently was at the school and was disappointed to see there was no work being done, so he asked the School Board and PCPS administration to please make it a priority to provide adequate locker and shower facilities for their students. He also asked if some of the vacant positions were truly needed if they had been vacant for over a decade.

Dr. Martinez stated that regarding the gym, it had been assessed and was confirmed to need a lot of work, which required funding. He would note that it was included in the CIP document, and the total project cost was approximately \$2 million. He stated that if the budget was approved, they could begin renovations on the gym by this summer. He stated that they must also follow procurement processes, which took time.

Council Member Jones stated that he believed the School Division had personnel who could begin the work while they were waiting during the procurement process.

Ms. Brown explained how they prioritized capital improvements in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). She said that the Board approved it in May 2024. She said that as part of the operational committee, which included two Board members, this plan clearly outlined their priorities across the School Division. She said that it was not about individual preferences; rather, it was about what their operational advisory council and the previously presented plan had recommended.

Council Member Jones said that he appreciated the plan as it was presented, but he wanted to prioritize what could be immediately addressed in the schools right now. He stated that they had funding available that could be used to address current issues.

Dr. Martinez explained that typically, they handled those expenses through a separate budget line. He clarified that the CIP was not included as part of the budget. He stated that their maintenance and operations team was working on emergent issues and repairs. He stated that the CIP amendment was

requesting to move forward with the gym project once it was funded. He said that if Council wanted to add a special budget line to handle certain projects like that, they could do that.

Council Member Jones said that they just needed to fund it as it was presented. He asked why they were not filling the vacant positions included in the budget. He asked why they were creating new administrative roles when they could not fill the other vacant positions. He asked if the comp and class study confirmed that pay was the primary barrier to hiring.

Mayor Parham asked if it would be possible to obtain the salary scale from surrounding localities to determine the starting teacher pay and whether they utilized a step program to address retention issues.

Dr. Greywoode clarified that the vacant positions had been removed from the budget, so those funds became savings. He said that regarding the renovations to the gym, he would like to point out that there were some constraints on their budget. He said that in order to pursue that project, they would need to request the budgetary authority from Council to add the funds to their existing budget in order to expend them.

Council Member Jones asked if they had to follow that process for getting the trailers.

Dr. Greywoode replied that they had to reallocate funds within their existing budget in order to accomplish that. He said that they lost about \$3 million in total during FY25, and that resulted in eliminating that funding for their FY26 budget. He said that this was another constraint that impacted their ability to move on projects such as the gym renovation.

Council Member Jones asked what preventative measures they were taking to ensure they had adequate funding.

Dr. Greywoode said that they had proposed certain measures that would help them. He said that even if they were not on the agenda, if they were to move in that direction, they would be planning on a five- to ten-year timeline, rather than being limited to a one-year budgeting cycle. He said that they were nearing the end of the fiscal year, so they did have constraints and statutory issues. He said that if they needed to make any additional budgetary adjustments, they must obtain approval from the Council, and they could not make changes to the budget that did not have prior Council approval.

Council Member Jones said that City Council was committed to assisting the School Division in overcoming those constraints and issues.

Mayor Parham said that regarding the preliminary work that needed to be done on the high school gym, the City's Facilities Department had asserted that they could help the School Division if they needed it. He stated that there were known issues cited by the fire marshal that needed to be addressed, and the City could do that. He said that they needed to know whether their staff can handle these issues or if they needed to contract that work out to get it done.

Council Member Smith-Lee expressed her support for the new teacher salaries. She asked if the School Division was partnering with their local colleges to encourage students in education programs to work for PCPS.

Ms. Brown confirmed that PCPS was already partnering with their local colleges to recruit teachers. She noted that last year, City Council approved a bonus for fully-licensed teachers, and that had allowed them to recruit about 20 teachers this past year. She stated that they also required promissory notes to ensure teachers would commit to stay with the Division. She said that if the \$60,000 starting salary was approved, Petersburg would be leading their region and competing for high-quality talent.

Council Member Smith-Lee asked the School Division to consider contacting the Cameron Foundation for potential grants.

Dr. Long-Lane reviewed their partnerships with local universities. She said that they partnered with Virginia State University through the I Too Teach program, which was already established when she joined, and was currently in place at Pleasant Lane Elementary School. They also worked with Virginia Commonwealth University through the Richmond Teacher Residency Program, and had employees at Walnut Hill Elementary School, Vernon Johns, and Petersburg High School. They had a 2+2 program with James Madison University and Bright Point Community College, which allowed their paraprofessionals to pursue a two-year degree and then move on to a four-year degree to become teachers.

Dr. Long-Lane stated that they partnered with Grand Canyon University to offer 100% online classes for teachers, and had a direct pay service to cover the costs. This year, they were launching their own grow-your-own program, the Petersburg Alternative Certification Elementary Residency (PACER) Program, which offered a three-year commitment and covered coursework, licensing, testing, and mentorship. They also had a grant from the Cameron Foundation, worth over \$40,000, which they were using for tuition reimbursement and sponsoring teacher talk meetings. They were working to optimize this grant for long-term subs, providing a salary increase of \$210 per day for those with a degree, and establishing a pipeline for them to become teachers in alignment with the new Virginia Code regulations.

Mayor Parham stated that regarding retention of positions, he would like the School Division to consider having exit polls so they could understand the reasons why people were choosing to leave their positions. He said that the City had successfully used exit polls to inform their recruitment and retention methods for their public safety departments. He said that even with a competitive salary, there may be other factors that influenced why teachers decided to leave for other school districts. He noted that he still had not heard about how many certified teachers they had or what those teachers wanted in order to stay in Petersburg. He suggested that rather than a 3% raise across the board, they focus the raises on certified teachers in the classroom and perhaps offer a 5% or 6% raise to boost morale.

Dr. Long-Lane confirmed that they had re-implemented an exit survey this year, and each time a teacher submitted their resignation, an HR coordinator reached out to that person directly to gather more information about their concerns. She said that if they decided to leave despite signing a commitment, the School Division did hold them accountable for the clawback, where they were required to return their funds.

Dr. Long-Lane said that the exit survey allowed teachers to have a one-on-one face-to-face conversation, providing an opportunity to truly understand their concerns. In addition, they had addressed employee concerns about benefits by obtaining more information and switching from Sentara to Anthem, and this change had been successful for them. They had also implemented retention bonuses in the past, which had been successful.

Dr. Long-Lane said that to better understand the root cause of teacher turnover, they were tracking their turnover data and submitting information to the state, which would enable them to take a closer look at the data and identify the underlying reasons for teacher departures.

Mayor Parham stated that it was crucial to have stable, supportive leadership in order to retain their employees. He stated that in order for new teachers to stay, such as those coming from VSU and their other partner colleges, they needed to learn from experienced, long-term teachers and grow as leaders within the schools.

Vice Mayor Hill asked if the Schools had identified a primary reason for resignations in the exit interviews.

Dr. Long-Lane explained that there was not a singular reason that stuck out, but some were about culture, relationships with administration, and the commute to work. She said that by the end of the school year, they could analyze all of the exit interviews and deduce the primary reasons for why people wanted to leave, and then they could adjust to resolve those issues. She said that they had also re-implemented a mentoring program so that new teachers had support. They also brought back a full time HR coordinator to oversee that process and serve as a direct contact to address any concerns.

Dr. Long-Lane stated that with regard to licensed teachers, the Instructional Personnel (IPAL) report was submitted to the state each year, and they had seen a 4% increase in teachers properly licensed and endorsed, bringing their total licensed teachers up to 68%. She agreed with Mayor Parham that the culture was important and they were working to create a winning, positive experience that would encourage people to join their Division. She noted that with regard to the comp and class study, which was performed by Evergreen, they found that their starting salary was competitive but their midpoint and maximum of the range fell behind.

Mayor Parham recommended that the School Division consider looking to another company to do their comp and class study. He explained that the City had hired Evergreen to perform a comp and class study and it was done incorrectly. He said that he would not recommend they use Evergreen. He said that regarding the exit interviews, they needed to figure out how to bring teachers into the community, which was primarily based on relationship-building. He said that they needed to periodically check in with their people and learn what they needed so that they could retain them. He noted that if an identified issue with retention was because of the commute, perhaps they should partner with developers to provide housing for their teachers within the City.

Council Member Westbrook stated that he had provided his questions to the School Board for reference. He asked if they could look into having quarterly meetings with the School Board so that they could effectively address all of these various issues together. He asked for more information about the efficiency of the free lunch program and whether it was providing quality, nutritious food to their students.

Ms. Brown answered that there were concerns raised last year about the quality of the lunches at the high school, and in response they hired an outside food consultant to address the immediate issues identified, including quality, appearance, and portions of meals, while working within the constraints of the federal requirements. She said that the result of that work was a hybrid school nutrition program that was the first of its kind in the Commonwealth, keeping all their nutrition workers in-house and hiring a food service company to revamp all the menus and provide homemade cooking. She said that all students had the ability to receive free meals at school and they now had various options for each meal. She clarified that they used the same vendors for their food, but changed the way they prepared it in line with federal regulations.

Dr. Greywoode noted that in slide 10 of his presentation, it indicated that the Food Service Fund was expected to grow by 23.7% next year, with an increase of \$783,000. He said that initially, he conducted this analysis at the beginning of the year to compare participation rates before and after running the new program. He said that he could provide Council with a detailed report on this, and it was worth noting that participation rates have grown substantially.

Council Member Westbrook said that answered his question. He stated that with regard to teachers, he thought some schools had high morale among their educators, but they still were not getting enough support or felt they were not being heard. He stated that he hoped to hear more information on why their literacy and truancy rates were still low, even with more certified teachers in their schools. He wanted to

ensure that when they raised teachers' salaries, they were seeing improvements. He similarly asked if bus drivers were being paid adequately so they were not losing them to other school systems.

Dr. Martinez said that as they analyzed pay rates, they had been looking at what other school divisions were doing. He acknowledged the Mayor's dissatisfaction with Evergreen, but they were relying on their comp and class study to inform them, and they would also be conducting an internal assessment to evaluate their own practices. Currently, they were identifying the factors that had made their department more efficient, safe, and effective in achieving their mission. For example, they had recently interviewed for the open transportation director position. Two years ago, they had difficulty attracting applicants for that role, but this time they received seven strong candidates. This positive trend suggested that they were moving in the right direction. To answer the question, they were currently in the planning process and would be exploring options to address that issue.

Council Member Westbrook asked for more information about how they addressed the cash forecast and reconciliations.

Dr. Greywoode explained that as part of the A&M assessment, it identified vacant critical positions in Finance that needed to be filled. He said that they had made progress on this, but they were still working to fully staff these roles. One area they had identified was forecasting, including cash forecasting and reconciliations. He said that these processes were approximately 90% implemented, with established systems in place to account for discrepancies, but they did not hire additional people for every role and they were addressing some of the processes with their existing resources.

Council Member Westbrook asked for information about how the School Division was attracting students to their programs and providing opportunities for high-achieving scholars and student athletes.

Mayor Parham noted the many opportunities the School Division provided for their high-achieving students. He said that the main issue they faced was attracting talented teachers who could improve academic performance and get all their schools accredited.

Council Member Westbrook said that he was thinking about the students in the middle, who may not be excelling. He asked if vocational students were getting adequate funding for their programs. He said that for students that may not be in specialty programs such as dual enrollment or the Governor's School, it was important for their parents to be confident that they could graduate from Petersburg High School.

Ms. Brown replied that in terms of the budget for CTE, they leveraged a lot of federal grants to support those programs. She stated that they were currently reviewing those offerings to determine what adjustments needed to be made, including new opportunities for expanded career skills. She stated that furthermore, they were providing accelerated opportunities for their high-achieving academic students, and promoting those opportunities in their public relations materials and on their website.

Eboni Massey, Director of Elementary Education, provided additional information on the acceleration programs. These included a math acceleration program and advanced coursework in the comprehensive high school, including preparation for AP and Honors classes. To that end, they had applied for a grant from the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) to get more teachers qualified and endorsed to teach those advanced courses.

Council Member Westbrook asked if the Schools were offering financial literacy courses.

Kenneth Pritchett, School Board Chair, confirmed that the financial literacy course was indeed a requirement for all high school students. He added that when offering advanced courses and

opportunities for students, they also needed to be mindful of providing for their local families and not displace them by attracting too many families from outside the City.

Council Member Westbrook asked why the enrollment numbers were decreasing in the system overall.

Mr. Pritchett said that the School Board would like to schedule another joint work session in the summer to talk more about the specifics of the School Division, including enrollment numbers.

Council Member Westbrook expressed his appreciation for that. He said that considering Ms. Brown recently came to Petersburg from Atlanta, he would like to hear her thoughts on what this area needed that was different from other places, and what they could do to compete with other top school districts in Virginia for education and athletics. He said that he did not need an answer today but would like her to keep the question in mind.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

a. Resolution of Intent to Implement Categorical Funding of Petersburg City Public Schools

Anthony Williams, City Attorney, provided a brief summary of the item. He explained that City Council had inquired about this issue earlier, and it had previously appeared on a Council agenda, where it was tabled to be discussed with the School Board present. He said that currently, when the Council budgets funds, whether for the City or the Schools, it was done in a lump sum. He said that the City Manager or Superintendent and the School Board presented their needs and Council allocated funds accordingly. However, when funds were appropriated, there were no restrictions on how those funds were spent.

City Attorney Williams said that localities had a line item budget, where specific amounts were allocated for specific purposes. He said that this approach provided more control over budgeting, but it could also be challenging, as the City Manager may not have allocated enough funds for certain items. This process could be more complicated, as the manager must request amendments to transfer funds. He said that the State Code did not allow localities to drill down as far with respect to Schools. He said that Schools had the right to manage their own budgets once funds were appropriated; however, this Resolution would allow the Council to categorically identify specific purposes and appropriate funds within those categories.

City Attorney Williams said that if this approach was adopted, Schools would only be able to spend the funds allocated for those specific purposes. He said that this could lead to challenges if schools were short in one category and had excess funds in another. To initiate this process, the Schools must be notified that the Council intended to do so. He said that this Resolution was intended to facilitate this process. He noted that the City had had this process in the past, prior to his tenure, and it was now being reconsidered.

Vice Mayor Hill asked if the School Division staff would like to provide their perspectives on categorical funding.

Dr. Greywoode replied that their view on categorical funding was that, although the statute granted the Council the authority to appropriate at the categorical level, they preferred that it not be implemented. He explained that the Virginia Appropriations Act encouraged localities to provide School Boards with flexibility through lump sum appropriations and carryover authority. He said that this guidance reflected the General Assembly's longstanding view that flexibility supported effective educational management.

Dr. Greywoode said that the FY27 budget development was nearly complete. If categorical funding were implemented, they would have to redo the entire process, which would have long-term implications. They

believed that current oversight was already strong, and the operational impact on students would be significant. In practice, flexibility allowed them to respond immediately to enrollment increases requiring additional teachers. For example, if there were an emergency like an HVAC facility issue, they would need to move money within funds and act quickly.

Dr. Greywoode stated that in emergency situations, categorical funding could become an issue. He said that it could also incentivize the mentality of "use it or lose it," so they felt compelled to expend funds and there was no opportunity to move funds. He said that in terms of governance and accountability, they believed their current frameworks accounted for any additional detail, reporting, and visibility that Council may need. If they needed information to be available, the Schools could provide additional reporting to satisfy those concerns. He summarized that they strongly recommended continuing with their lump sums appropriations.

Ms. Brown stated that this process made it much more bureaucratic for them to get things done. It slowed down the process of all the things they had planned, requiring them to wait. She said that this delay would ultimately impact any initiatives they had put in place. She also said that the City Attorney had mentioned, categorical funding had not been implemented since 2015, according to a document she had obtained. She said that she wanted to assure Council that they were committed to being responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars. They would be transparent in their budgeting and provide the information City Council requested, to avoid unnecessary complexity. She said that she hoped that by being open and transparent, they could avoid approving a categorical funding process that would make it more difficult for the School Division to expedite purchases, emergencies, and other critical matters. It would limit their flexibility and make their processes more challenging.

Dr. Greywoode said that they acknowledged the Council's authority to make this decision, but they recommended exploring alternative approaches in the spirit of cooperation that could help achieve this goal.

Vice Mayor Hill agreed with Council Member Westbrook that Council needed to have more frequent meetings with the School Board and administration so they could understand the details. He said that Council was often held responsible for the Schools and received many questions and criticisms.

Dr. Greywoode agreed that they needed more work sessions. He stated that last year, Council mandated that the School Division Finance Department work in close collaboration with the City's Finance Department, which they had done with quarterly meetings with Finance, Budget, and the Treasurer. He said that the School Division welcomed more collaboration like that, and having quarterly work sessions would help. He said that if additional reporting was required from the finance side, he was more than willing and able to provide that.

Vice Mayor Hill said that as had been mentioned earlier, there were some issues that could be resolved in-house with efficient communication. He emphasized that the City was willing to help as much as possible, but it required collaboration and full commitment from both the Schools and Council.

Council Member Westbrook asked if they could consider the potential advantages of categorical funding in terms of the relationship between the City and the Schools.

Ms. Brown said that one thing that would be helpful on the City side was that they would have a different picture into the finances of the School Division. She said that they would receive more reporting and more detailed information, which she thought would be a positive aspect. If that provided the assurance that they were aligning their budget with their stated needs, that would be a pro that she would highlight as an initial point.

Ms. Brown said that it would also facilitate the reappropriation process from the City, as they currently had an Ordinance that required any unbalanced funds to be returned to the City, and then the School Division must request their approval to reappropriate those funds.

City Attorney Williams added that the first thing he told Council when they asked for this item to be discussed was that in the three localities he had worked in, categorical funding was often discussed but never implemented. He explained that in terms of the benefit, the Superintendent accurately noted that it forced the School Division to come before Council every time they needed to move monies between funds. The main reason it was not implemented was because as long as there was sufficient dialogue between the Schools and Council, there was not a need for the oversight provided by categorical funding. He said that however, Council had the authority to make that decision.

Mayor Parham thanked everyone for attending tonight's work session. He said that he would work with School Board Chair Pritchett to find some dates for future joint work sessions. He acknowledged the challenge of addressing the needs of the School Division, but he was confident they could meet this challenge head-on as long as they knew the obstacles.

Council Member Jones asked if the School staff could share their thoughts and takeaways from today's meeting.

Ms. Brown replied that from her perspective as Superintendent, this was a learning session for both organizations. She said that she was still learning historical things about Petersburg and understanding the perspectives of all the Council Members, which she was learning were not new issues. She said that as she learned about these issues, she could talk to her team about them and work through it. She emphasized that they all had to do it together, and she felt very optimistic that they could work together to address some of their challenges. She felt there was a willingness from Council to hear what the School Division was asking for and to understand better. She said that they still needed more time to ask and answer all their questions, but she knew they could do that and move forward. She hoped that they could build trust between the work of the School Division and the support provided by City Council.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Parham and School Board Chair Pritchett made a motion to adjourn. All members of the Council and the School Board present voted in the affirmative. Meeting adjourned.

The City Council and Petersburg Public School Board adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Adopted: 04/28/2026



Mayor, Samuel Parham

ATTEST:



City Clerk, Tangi R. Hill