

Foxfire Village Council: 90-Day Initial Assessment Report

Prepared by: Kevin Robbins Councilman – Parks, Streets, and Facilities

Village: Foxfire Village

Date: 24 February 2026

Executive Summary

During my first 90 days serving as Councilman responsible for Parks, Streets, and Facilities, I conducted a comprehensive review of village infrastructure assets, lifecycle risk exposure, maintenance practices, and long-term fiscal sustainability.

Foxfire Village possesses high-value public infrastructure assets that significantly exceed the scale of its annual budget capacity when viewed through a full lifecycle replacement lens. The cumulative exposure across streets, parks, recreational facilities, and vertical infrastructure likely exceeds \$20 million in total replacement value.

This level of capital responsibility demands disciplined forecasting, proactive maintenance sequencing, and unified strategic governance.

Without deliberate lifecycle planning and protection measures, deferred maintenance will overmatch Foxfire's budget structure and force reactionary, high-cost remediation.

This report outlines current conditions, risk exposure, and structured recommendations designed to protect the Village's long-term financial health and infrastructure integrity.

I. Streets

Discussion

Foxfire Village maintains approximately:

- 13.56 miles of public paved roadway within corporate limits
- 2.93 miles maintained by NCDOT
- 10.63 miles eligible under Powell Bill funding

The Village-controlled roadway system represents the single largest infrastructure liability and long-term capital exposure.

Based on current contractor pricing analysis:

- Full lifecycle replacement of all Village roads:

Estimated between \$13.5 million and \$20.5 million

- Comprehensive preservation using modern protective materials:

More than \$7 million

It is neither feasible nor fiscally responsible to attempt full preservation or lifecycle replacement within a single budget year — or even within a five-year window. The magnitude of investment requires deliberate phasing (to consolidate gains) over decades.

Failure to proactively sequence maintenance will accelerate deterioration curves, increasing rehabilitation costs by multiples and creating fiscal shock events that exceed Village capacity.

Roadways degrade predictably. Without proactive intervention:

- Crack sealing windows close
- Base failures accelerate
- Surface treatments lose cost-effectiveness
- Full-depth reconstruction becomes unavoidable

The financial overmatch risk to Foxfire's budget structure is real and measurable.

Recommendation

1. Establish a formal Pavement Condition Index (PCI) baseline.
2. Establish a multi-council advisory board (Public Safety, Finance).
3. Develop a 20-year Rolling Street Protection Plan aligned with realistic resourcing cycles.
4. Prioritize risk-based sequencing (traffic load, subgrade condition, drainage risk).
5. Adopt a preservation-first model over overlay-first practices.
6. Establish annual reserve contributions tied to lifecycle modeling.
7. Ensure all protection measures are sequenced deliberately — not reactionary.

A comprehensive lifetime roadway protection and maintenance strategy must be enduring, disciplined, and consistently managed across Council transitions.

All growth to Foxfire must be factored into predictive statistical attrition modeling.

More traffic equates to accelerated deterioration.

The growth impact factors in future years but also compounds into issues of cost inflation and must also factor into this model.

The estimated costs listed in this report are below the costs now, not in 2036. Growth accelerates deterioration while future years accelerate costs.

Can Foxfire as a village and its current structure sustain itself against these plans become the follow-on question?

This also must layer against other departments with critical infrastructure demands the same.

II. Parks

Discussion

Foxfire's Parks system — including the Village Green, trails, and pickleball courts — represents a high-value and identity-defining asset portfolio.

Key Asset Considerations:

- Village Park: 51 acres
- Original development cost (2007): approximately \$750,000
- Estimated 2027 replacement value: approximately \$2 million
- Nearly 20 years after initial construction, replacement values have nearly doubled.
- New revisions (treated as modernized improvements) increase the value and enjoyment but require increased commitment to maintaining and replacing.
- Pickleball courts: estimated \$75,000–\$100,000 asset
- How long is that asset treated as an asset before it becomes a liability or a lifecycle amenity?

- How much is it worth to maintain now and into the future?
 - 5 percent of its value in annual maintenance doubles the lifecycle of the investment

Deferred maintenance in parks creates compounding risks:

- Surface degradation
- Trail erosion
- Drainage failures
- Liability exposure
- **Public dissatisfaction**
- **Accelerated capital shock**

If proactive maintenance is not systematized, the Village will face reactionary repair demands that exceed predictable budget tolerances.

Additionally, if Foxfire does not establish systematic relationships with trusted and licensed vendors through contracts and relationships, the loss of use time is increased, costs are magnified, and elevated risk to poor workmanship is at stake. This can create unstable budgeting cycles, unforecasted triggers to budget amendment decisions in time of need, and rushed procurement procedures to resolve the issue at hand. We should not have emergency meetings and budget amendments mid-year of execution due to lack of proper maintenance cycles. Neglect should not be treated as emergency criteria.

Foxfire's parks are not small assets. They represent multimillion-dollar infrastructure investments that require professional lifecycle management.

Recommendation

1. Develop a Parks Asset Inventory with lifecycle estimates.
2. Establish documented quarterly inspection protocols.
3. Implement a 10-year Parks Capital Improvement Plan.

4. Proactively protect trails (including for fire prevention), drainage systems, and hard surfaces.
5. Maintain underbrush, vegetation, high risk trees, and other natural items regularly and under steady programming.
6. Align programming development with infrastructure protection capacity.

Proactive management is significantly less expensive than reactive reconstruction.

III. Pool

Discussion

The Village Pool remains one of the most popular — and historically contentious — amenities within the community.

Pools, in general, are capital-intensive and operationally demanding facilities.

Projected Asset Exposure:

- Total completed assets (pool + pool house + bathrooms):

\$500,000 to \$750,000

Operational Demands:

- Annual operational costs estimated between \$60,000–\$75,000. Capital budget losses estimated at \$50,000 annually when factoring beyond the offset of realistic admission fees and use.
- Excludes capital repair reserves
- Excludes major resurfacing cycles
- Excludes mechanical system replacements

Whatever direction the Village chooses regarding the pool, the decision must be made with full recognition that:

- It will be a high-maintenance asset
- It requires disciplined annual funding
- It must include long-term capital reserve planning
- **Admission revenue alone will never offset full lifecycle cost**

A pool cannot be managed casually. It must be governed deliberately. Not only from asset protection but also with regulatory requirements beyond that of a residential pool or private commercial pool.

A separate detailed report expands on these considerations and current pool situation.

IV. Strategic Risk

Foxfire's Parks and Recreation amenities are central to the character, identity, and attractiveness of the Village. However, they require substantial:

- Infrastructure maintenance
- Program development
- Fiscal discipline
- Predictable resource protection

Without real-time investment and structured oversight, loss of usability becomes inevitable — and remediation becomes financially unattainable.

Importantly, Parks and Recreation compete within a unified budget ecosystem that includes:

- Water infrastructure
- Public Safety
- Administration

These departments perform critical life-safety and governance functions. They cannot be compromised or under-resourced to subsidize reactionary infrastructure recovery elsewhere.

Strategic prioritization across departments is essential.

V. Overarching Governance Recommendations

- Foxfire Village Council must operate as a unified strategic body.
 - Transparency, communication, and disciplined governance are non-negotiable.
 - A clear framework must immediately be adopted:
-

Ends – The Foxfire Village Compass:

All efforts must align under a unified strategic vision.

A clearly articulated end state enables:

- Objective development
- Milestone sequencing
- Department alignment
- Predictable outcomes

Each department must conduct comprehensive reviews and align under this unified direction.

This is the Foxfire Village Compass.

Without a compass, activity replaces progress.

Ways – Aligning the 5 Ps

Current operational “ways” present the greatest risk to failure.

The Five Ps must be codified:

1. People
2. Process
3. Policy
4. Productivity
5. Planning

If these are not aligned under an open and transparent framework, strategic goals will remain ceremonial and degrade over time.

The 5-P structure enables:

- Collective movement
- Real-time adjustment
- Continuous learning
- Institutional resilience

Means – Budget and Communication

Budget and communication are pacing mechanisms.

They synchronize:

- Speed
- Precision
- Accountability
- Transparency

Foxfire must live within its means while fully understanding its long-term exposure.

Maximum transparency in financial forecasting and public communication is essential to sustaining trust and alignment.

VI. Internal Department Recommendation

I recommend establishment of a unified Council Program Management Portfolio.

This would:

- Eliminate disaggregated reactionary services
- Establish forward-looking infrastructure governance
- Modernize lifecycle oversight
- Synchronize planning across departments
- Increase efficiency
- Reduce resource waste
- Improve interdepartmental support

This approach does not merely optimize Parks, Streets, and Facilities — it becomes a force multiplier for Water, Public Safety, and Administration.

Conclusion

Foxfire Village is stewarding infrastructure assets with replacement exposure likely exceeding \$20 million.

This requires:

- Long-term lifecycle discipline
- Risk-based prioritization
- Unified strategic governance
- Transparent fiscal modeling
- Consistent leadership across time

Proactive management today prevents financial crisis tomorrow.

The responsibility before this Council is not simply maintenance — it is generational stewardship.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Robbins

Councilman – Parks, Streets, and Facilities

Foxfire Village