



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Legislative Committee, Friday, January 23, 2026

Date Friday, January 23, 2026
Place Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length 1h 19m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): <https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/4020>
- Official Board of Supervisors page (Fairfax County): <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/>

Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-28. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:08] Good afternoon and welcome to the January 23rd Legislative Committee, the first meeting of 2026. I want to begin by extending a warm welcome back to our incredible legislative staff who have been in Richmond since the General Assembly convened last Wednesday. They've been working tirelessly to review over 2,000 pieces of legislation to bring us to update and we'll hear today on what is most relevant and important to our county and its residents. I was in Richmond this past Tuesday with our staff meeting with our delegation, and I can tell you that the energy on

[00:00:43] the ground was palpable. Governor Spamberger's priorities are closely aligned with ours, and we have a real opportunity to build on that momentum and put it to work for Fairfax County and its residents. In conversation with our delegates, I was reminded that we shared the same goals, to bring home meaningful wins and legislation that matters to our residents. Now is not the time for blame or finger pointing. We have real work to do, and we can only accomplish it by being a county of yes,

[00:01:18] a county known for partnership, collaboration, and results. As an overview of today, we will first review specific issues, then we will move into bills for discussion, and finally bills with recommended positions. Opportunities for comment will be after each bill topic for discussion, so please hold comments until after staff presentations. Any additional comments can be directed to Jennifer or myself. I'll now turn

it over to Jennifer and our legislative team for today's updates. Well, I hope you're all staying warm and are ready for this weekend.

[00:01:57] Jennifer Van E. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So first, we're going to start off with some updates on the budget. So invite budget staff to come up. Then we're going to talk about our initiatives, some updates on metro regional transit funding, and then some updates on housing. Albana Sanofa from the budget office. So I believe you have the state budget chart copies with the blue document. We

[00:02:35] redesigned it a little bit this year, but basically has the same information as before. It has budget categories item numbers in the state budget brief descriptions amounts that are included in the state budget and then under each item we have the local impact on the county's budget so starting with the general items for on page one for the new biennium budget 2026 2028 for compensation the governor

[00:03:10] included a 2% salary increase for constitutional officers and state-supported local employees in fiscal year 27 and an additional 2% salary increase for 28. We're estimating that the county would receive approximately \$900,000 from the state compensation board in fiscal year 27. This is the increase, and this would partially reimburse our costs for these employees.

[00:03:40] The governor also includes funding for additional positions for sheriff's offices across the state. However, based on the information from the compensation board, we do not believe that Fairfax County will be allocated any of these new positions, but we will monitor those items.

[00:04:01] The budget also includes funding to reimburse local law enforcement agencies for time spent transporting individuals under temporary detention order and emergency custody order. And it is unclear if Fairfax County would be able to access any of this funding, as the budget indicates that priority will be given to other divisions.

[00:04:25] I also wanted to note that the governor did not include any increase for HB 599 funding. This is funding for aid to localities with police departments. And as you know, our legislative program supports full restoration of this funding.

[00:04:42] We also indicated that the governor's budget includes the mandated support for the Water Quality Improvement Fund and allocate some additional funding there. It also provides \$43 million for the Stormwater Local Assistance Fund, the SLAF funding.

[00:04:59] And in the past, we've been able to take advantage of this funding for some local projects. And then turning to K-12 funding, it's at the bottom of page one. The governor's budget reflects state costs associated with re-benchmarking.

[00:05:18] And these are just routine non-policy updates of the costs for the new biennium. And that includes the adjustment to the local composite index. However, it does not include any new funding associated with the JLARC study recommendations.

[00:05:34] And as you know, this is a study that found that the state significantly under funds K-12 funding in the budget. The governor also updates the Virginia Retirement System employer contribution rates and reflects some savings from lower rates for Fairfax County public schools.

[00:05:59] That actually translates into some expenditure savings for their budget in the amount of \$52.2 million for fiscal year 27. The governor's proposed budget also includes funding for the state share of a 2% salary increase in fiscal year 27 and an additional 2% in fiscal year 28 for funded SOQ positions.

[00:06:24] FCPS would receive just \$13 million from the state in fiscal year 27, which is just a small portion of the total cost to provide those salary increases. The total cost is \$63 million approximately, and after accounting for the state share, the net cost to FCPS would be about \$50 million. So the split is 20% state, 80% local dollars for those salary increases.

[00:06:55] And then towards the bottom of page 2, we have a summary for the overall impact of the governor's budget on FCPS. It reflects state revenue increase of \$71 million as compared to the current fiscal year budget.

[00:07:14] And as you know, FCPS presented their fiscal forecast for 27 in the fall. So compared to their fiscal forecast, the governor's budget is an increase of \$53.8 million in state revenue. And as I mentioned, there are some expenditure savings as well as a result of the VRS rates, \$52.2 million.

[00:07:38] So those combined, the revenue increase and expenditure savings, total \$106 million additional relative to the fiscal forecast. and did you want me to go over the caboose items or do we finish yes okay can i ask you just a question before we move on to that so the 106 million um since the fiscal forecast um is probably too soon and probably not an appropriate question to ask you but i would just ask our staff to look

[00:08:11] at the superintendent's proposed budget came out last night um i am pretty certain it did not assume \$106 million in a combination of savings and additional revenue here. If we could just verify of the \$106 million, how much in those categories was included in the superintendent's proposed budget that was presented last night?

[00:08:37] Yes, staff is reviewing this, and we'll come back to the board with this information if these changes were reflected in the proposed budget from last night. Okay, great. Thank you. Sure. There's actually a separate document on the caboose bill, which is the amendments to the current year fiscal year 26 budget.

[00:09:00] There's only a couple of items. The governor is proposing a one-time bonus of 2% for constitutional officers and state-supported local employees, as well as a 2% one-time bonus for teachers.

[00:09:19] Basically, for FCPS, the state would provide \$10 million to go towards those bonuses, but the total cost to them would be about \$52 million. Again, the split is 20% state funds, 80% local funds.

[00:09:39] And then the governor also updates some for average daily membership and sales tax collections that support K-12 funding in the state budget. So these are just the two caboose items.

[00:09:59] Thank you very much. And we thank your office, too, for all the support you give us during session. So I'm going to go over quick the HHS, just some highlights on page 2 into 3, so kind of bottom two, top of three, you'll notice that there's a CSA item. So last year, you might remember that they put a cap on the state contributions at 5%. The governor proposed limiting that to 2.5%. VACO did some great work over the summer to kind of look at the impact of that 5% cap. And for the most part, providers stayed at it, which helped local budgets since

[00:10:38] we would absorb the extra over the 5%. The conversations has been that they would not be able to absorb going down to 2.5. So, again, that would be a local cost shift. VACO has submitted some budget amendments to do away with that. The CSA's community-based services, they reduced the community match rate to 71% statewide.

[00:11:03] This, several years ago that they had changed the match rates to encourage community-based services, So this kind of goes back on those efforts on that. The next one, and this is on page three as well, is the child care subsidy program slots.

[00:11:19] There was some savings from VPI of savings not used. They're using that funding to shift it into the child care subsidy program to open up slots there. We're keeping an eye that that doesn't become a trend in a way that's detrimental to VPI.

[00:11:36] And then the last one is SNAP administrative costs. So this is the portion that came out of H.R. 1, and the cost shift went from 50-50 to 75-25. They've apportioned the state's portion of that so that they aren't going to – that's good news that they're not going to rely on us to fulfill that.

[00:11:55] On the other part of that, there was also a little bit of money around technology trying to get that air rate down. What is not reflected in this biennium is the payments that would have to be made for the error rate if our error rate does not fall below 6%.

[00:12:12] So that is not included in the budget, but there's been a lot of conversations about both how to get the error rate down as well as the dollars around what will be needed if we do not. And then I'm going to hand it over to Noelle. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, Noelle Dominguez with Department of Transportation.

[00:12:30] The transportation sections are on pages 6 to 8. There is actually not a lot in here for that. I do want to specifically call out there is what seems to be a substantial reduction in financial assistance for public transportation. It's in the middle of page 8, but that is because we had the one-time general fund transfer to address the WMATA need in the past two years.

[00:12:53] So that is the only reason that there is a reduction there. the rest of the budget. Transportation has its own revenue sources, so a lot of these changes are just due to updated projections, and they change every year. All right, so the next topic is our initiatives. So as of today, all the bills are officially on LIS, and so we've got numbers on them. So on page 5, you'll see HB 55, which is our noise abatement monitoring system. That bill passed last year and was vetoed. So we're hoping for success on that. H, and then I'm going to say

[00:13:31] this, we have a new style report for bills. And so it's this long one that's legal. What we realized was that in making this look nice, and we did not carry over the categorization buckets. So we're working on that. So just so you know, so we'll call out the page numbers, but the order isn't as nice as it should be, and we're working on that. So on page seven is HB 250, and that's our initiative around expanding park authority to have the same authority as other localities to

[00:14:10] ban sex offenders from the facilities. And then on page 12 is HB 1376 and SB 285, and that's the Urban Public-Private Partnership Redevelopment Fund that's carried by our new delegate, Bulova, as opposed to the old delegate, Bulova, who is now the secretary, Bulova.

[00:14:34] And then Senator Aird is carrying it in the Senate. Senator Aird did get out of committee, so we're excited about that. But the financing of it is where it got held up last year, and so we're working hard on that. To that end, budget, I just wanted to give an update, too, because there are corresponding budget amendments for the Urban Public Private Partnership Redevelopment Fund.

[00:14:59] It is very hard to say those three right in a row every time. So there are two budget amendments in. Again, we did not have time. The budget amendments didn't drop until Thursday. We will do an update on that next week. But I did want to just pull and let you know, Senator Locke has a budget amendment in for that program of \$5 million, and Delegate Bulova has it in for \$10 million.

[00:15:24] So there are the two amendments in on those. Another one of the initiatives that we've done in the last several years has to do with the budget. It is the pay equity for our local finance rules. Again, they had fully funded the comp board positions for Commerce for the Commissioner of Revenue and the Treasurers, and they forgot our section since it's in three separate sections of code.

[00:15:53] So we, again, have a budget in there this year to ask for equity in positions, and Senator Bukarski has that one. We also worked with FCPS, and we have budget amendments in for the JLARC recommendation around getting rid of the linear weighted average for teacher salary, and those are carried by Senator Boisco and Delegate Keyes-Gamara.

[00:16:18] So now I'm going to turn it over to Noelle and Christine to talk about the regional transit funding. Mr. Chairman, I do not have a handout on regional transit funding yet. There are a lot of bills going out there, so I just wanted to give a broad overview.

[00:16:35] we'll come back with more details next week. But essentially, there are three different proposals that have been submitted at this point. We have HB 900 and SB 730. That is Delegate Sullivan and Senator Survelle. Those are what some people are kind of referring to as the big bill. And that has more comprehensive tax reform. It changes what gets the sales tax or what receives a sales tax. There is HB 1179 and SB 638, which are Delegate Tran and Senator Eben.

[00:17:12] Those are more focused on the SJ28 recommendations. They're a little bit more targeted, though they do both provide substantial funding for transit or transportation statewide, I would say. And then Delegate Watts has HB 978, which I believe, and again, we're still looking through all of these, deals with service delivery fees to both WMATA and the Commonwealth Transportation Fund.

[00:17:35] So with all of these going around, and they've all been sent to separate committees because why would this be not complicated, we're doing a deep dive. We're meeting with all of our colleagues who statewide, regional, from all over, and we'll come back with more information next week, I think, with more of a deep dive on what is in which bill and what seems to be moving.

[00:17:56] I think at the moment, a lot of people, at least from our region, are like, let's just focus on the end result of a package that addresses our needs and the details will work themselves out. Mr. Chairman, if I might just very briefly, I think, first of all, I think it goes without saying that our position is we support all of those at this stage. And I think we see how things evolve. I do think there will come a point in time where we'll have to take a position on one of them as the superior instrument. I think most of us feel like the bill that Rip Sullivan is carrying is the superior one, but we want to see how things transpire in the weeks ahead.

[00:18:34] So I appreciate that we'll get another update next week. But I think in the meantime, our position is we support all of these bills because they're all helpful to transit and most particularly helpful to the issues that we're dealing with at WMATA. And then we'll see where the process takes us. Mr. Chairman. Yeah, Supervisor Alcorn, but I do want to, I don't want to open this up. Like we said at the very beginning, we want to hold questions. So I'll let this one go, but like moving forward, let's just wait.

[00:19:05] Okay, the chairman spoke. I thought we were talking. Okay, thank you. I didn't understand the new process. But a couple points just to build on that that I think are really important. Thank you for bringing back the details. But we do, as you pointed out, the difference between the amounts last year and this year are significant because the one-time general funding from the state that went to Metro, that's not being made up any other way than one of these bills. And the other thing I would point out, and we've talked about this, there's also the local money that we have put in from our general fund that goes into that. So I know at

[00:19:44] least two of these bills would address that as well. And the last point I would make is Maryland is probably going to be a little later, maybe a year, than us. What I'm hearing is that they're looking at their fix probably closer to 29. So if that happens, I think it's going to be really important, and I've shared this with NVTC staff and Metro staff as well, that there be flexibility in the language, particularly for the first year, to address critical transit needs that

[00:20:21] we have in Fairfax County and in the region, in Northern Virginia, to hit some of those things. for example maybe the old Huntington garage that needs to be taken care of so I would encourage you as you're watching this to keep those in mind because this is going to be a big lift and I don't presume anything is going to pass honestly unless we really all come together and work through those details eventually but this is something we'll need to be talking more later once the details are available.

[00:20:56] Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor. Let's continue to move on, please. We're not going to ask our questions because there's a strategy here. We're trying to move forward, but there's lots to cover. We're going to let staff finish up, and then we're going to have an opportunity for questions, but we can't continue to be interrupted. Mr. Chairman, will we get to ask questions about specific bills, like what was we were just talking about?

[00:21:18] We can't just stop every couple of minutes. We're not going to get through it like that. Okay. All right. So as Noel was saying, that there's some tax reform packages in the transit funding. There are also other transit big tax packages. And so we'll keep an eye on that.

[00:21:35] Wanted to let you know, as we know, that's a big priority is tax reform. And then as I mentioned, the budget amendments dropped late Wednesday for the Senate and late Thursday for the House. So we'll have more information on those for you next week. And those are the member budget amendments. So just as a reminder, the annual process goes that the governor gives his budget in December, which is the chart we went over.

[00:21:57] Then members can submit budget amendments first week of session. Those drop second week of session, which are the ones where I mentioned a couple of. And then the week after crossover, that Sunday, each chamber's budgets drop, which is comprised of member budget amendments.

[00:22:16] And then after that, they go into conference, and the last week they come up with a state budget for the General Assembly. So that's kind of the process of that. Again, we'll keep you updated. The only other budget amendment I did want to talk about real quick, just because I picked up on it, was JLARC recommendations.

[00:22:38] There is some money in there. There will be more details about kind of the one vehicle they have for that this year. But I did want to let you know that there are some budget amendments around that. And then lastly, we wanted this in this section is to talk about housing as another one of our key priorities.

If you have been on LIS at all, or maybe your staff has been looking, there are about 400 to 450 bills dealing with housing and or land use. And so I did not bring those all back for you. What we're proposing instead, and there's a handout in here called

[00:23:14] general assembly bills, land use, and housing. And what that is, is our proposed strategy of how to mitigate that as a staff so that we're not bringing you 200 bills every week to talk about. Essentially, the thought is that we're going to break them. And when I say we, I mean the government relations team, and then we're working with the housing task force. And so we're dividing them into topics. And you can see the proposed buckets. Those might flex as we get through the bills or topics come up. But essentially, we're kind of thinking, what are the subject areas that

[00:23:47] are really kind of the big areas? And then within those subjects, rating them in a stoplight fashion of red are, this is just a no-go. This is, yellow is, we'd prefer not, but maybe there's some ways we can work with it. And then green is, we either can support it or at least we don't oppose it.

[00:24:06] And so those are kind of the categories. On the handout, we did include an example of each of some real bills that are out there. And so this is the way we'll be moving forward if it's the will of the board. This is kind of how what we're proposing to use as a strategy given the volume of bills this year.

[00:24:26] All right, all right. Well now that we're done this first part, which was the specific issues Again covered was the government's budget amendment OMADA and trend regional transit and housing strategy What I'm what we're gonna do is we're gonna allow everyone one round of questions on this part because we got to move on If you have additional questions additional follow-up obviously reach out to Jennifer or reach out to me But we're gonna do one round that way we can move on and go and take a deep dive into bills to discuss

[00:25:01] So based on the three things that I just mentioned, if you have any questions at this time, we're going to start with Supervisor Beerman, and then we'll just work our way down, and then we will continue on with the bills to discuss. So Supervisor Beerman. So I just want to make sure I understand the main differences between the three proposals related to transit.

[00:25:22] The Sullivan bill pays for it mostly through the use of sales tax reform. Is that correct? Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Bayman, I believe so.

[00:25:38] Sorry, I have lots of fact sheets on these right now. I'm trying to find the right ones. I believe it primarily comes from tax reform, changing what is taxed via the sales tax. Yes. Okay. How does the TRAN bill, which is more focused on numbers that came out of SJ28, what is the revenue-raising aspect of that bill?

[00:26:04] And I do want to clarify. I want to go back and double-check to make sure on everything. But statewide, I believe this comes from a regional package delivery fee, as well as a T&C sales tax, like on Uber and Lyft, that sort of thing. Regional, I'm seeing there's highway use fees, grantors tax, I apologize, and existing tax.

[00:26:26] Regional package delivery fee, also a 0.2% retail sales and use tax increase, commercial parking tax, and there might be another one I'm missing. So I think also a TNC sales tax. Okay, great. And the Watts bill, the primary difference between the Watts bill, aside from other, how they revenue raise, is that some of the funding in the Watts bill goes directly to Metro.

[00:26:53] Is that correct? Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Bittman, I need to double check on that one. I cannot answer. Okay, I'm just trying to figure out the main distinctions between the three bills. And so more sales tax related, more focused on SJ-28, and then the new Watts bill, which we learned about that two days ago.

[00:27:14] Okay, thank you. That's all I have. And, Noelle, if you wouldn't mind, would you say the numbers of each of those bills? Mr. Chairman, Jennifer, I'm guessing you mean the bill number? Yes, the bill numbers. Sorry. HB 900 and SB 730 are the quote-unquote big bill.

[00:27:33] That's Delegate Sullivan and Senator Survelle. HB 1179 from Delegate Tran and SB 638 from Senator Eben are the SJ28 bills. And Delegate Watts has HB 978. Noelle, it may be helpful to us to just put together for next week a chart that points out the differences to them on one sheet so that we can look at that and you have the time to do that.

[00:27:59] Looking down the aisle, Supervisor Lust. Yeah, I hope this is the appropriate place. I'm looking at HB 4. This is the Bennett-Parker bill, which addresses affordable housing, preservation, et cetera.

[00:28:16] It talks about the first right of refusal by locality. Just personally think this is certainly an interesting way for us to look at trying to preserve affordable housing in our county. I just wanted to hear if there's any thoughts, any initial input that the staff has on this particular item, HB4.

[00:28:46] The housing bills you're bringing next time? Yeah. I do not believe it's on this. Did I pick the wrong one? I'm looking at the sheet that I have.

[00:29:02] I think that's your sheet. Okay. Maybe that, it has yellow on it, and I don't have a sheet with yellow on it. Okay. So are you just asking us to bring that back for discussion next? Yeah, let's bring that one back. I'll be curious to hear where the staff is on that item, HB4, Bennett Parker, affordable housing, preservation definitions, civil penalties.

[00:29:24] Thank you. Thank you. Supervisor Lusk. Supervisor Palachuk? No, thank you. And just to clarify, the housing bills, you will start to bring us weekly starting next week with the chart and the levels. Okay, that'd be excellent.

[00:29:39] And as they don't make it through, you can cut down the list of 400-some, but I appreciate your work on that. Moving on, Supervisor Rochner-Heisner-Heisner. Thank you. Actually, most of my questions are on the funding for transportation, so I can't go by what Supervisor Beerman asked.

[00:29:55] Thank you. All right. Seeing no more questions on this, we are going to move on now on Part B, bills to discuss, and I will pass it over again to Jennifer. All right.

[00:30:10] So this is where we move on to that nice large chart. So again, I apologize that we weren't able to categorize them, but the majority in this section are actually on photo speed monitoring and violation monitoring systems, which we provided in a separate handout so it's easier for you guys to see.

[00:30:29] So we'll go ahead and start with those, as they're the majority of the bills in that section. Mr. Chairman, so there are a lot of camera enforcement bills in Richmond this year again. And some interesting things have happened over the past couple of days.

[00:30:47] So we wanted to kind of give you all a summary of what's going on and some recommendations. So first off, we had SB 297 and SB 306, both by delegate, I'm sorry, Senator Peake. And

this is the handout, the three-page handout. He has bills to repeal the ability for localities to implement speed camera as well as red light cameras.

[00:31:11] I know we've talked with the board about that in the past, how we were given the authority, it was taken away, got it back. So these bills came to Senate Transportation yesterday, and surprisingly, they were reported out. And I think everybody in the room was kind of a little bit surprised when that happened.

[00:31:28] We're hearing concerns from various people of how certain localities are implementing programs as well as privacy concerns. So I don't know how long that will last. It was a 6 to 8 or 7 to 8 vote, depending on which ones.

[00:31:44] And there were some others that did change, where the revenue went or whether or not certain areas could have speed cameras. The feeling was clear leaving that committee yesterday that there are some concerns with camera programs in general. So we do have both of these listed for oppose.

[00:32:02] The historical is HB 306 because the board has historically voted to oppose red light cameras, speed cameras, obviously the same sort of thing. You all do have programs in existence. On the going forward, the next three bills, and I'm going to take them as a pack, HB 994, HB 1220, and on the next page, SB 84.

[00:32:25] So what all of these have in common are what we referred to last year as the guardrails. And the guardrails are fairly similar, if not identical. They say what the program revenues will be used for. They talk about how long information can be retained.

[00:32:42] They increase the number of signs that require near every camera from one to two and say that for the speed cameras that the sign, one of the signs has to be one of those that tells you how fast you're going. So that being said, I think the writing on the wall is if anything gets through and programs are retained, these guardrails are going to happen. What, however, is concerning beyond that, so Delegate Siebold and Delegate Delaney bills also have language that waive locality sovereign authority in any court proceeding if something happens with these programs. And localities are

[00:33:21] very concerned about the language to waive sovereign immunity, I can tell you that much right now. So at the very least, we would recommend proposing to amend or oppose unless amended because that's a definite concern there. The other changes with the bills, Delegate Sebalds does expand the program in a way to allow the placement and operation of speed monitoring devices in safety red zones, which are kind of, you know, that would allow an expansion of the authority. Delegate Delaney's does not really expand the program. It is just the guardrails.

[00:34:00] And then going on to the last, the third bill, SB 84, which is Senator Williams-Graves, she also has the guardrails. She does not have the sovereign immunity language, but her bill does, in the same locations already authorized, your school zones, your work zones, your high traffic intersections. It allows the cameras for school crossings, the stop sign school crossing cameras as well. So those are the differences. So again, I'm happy to hear from

[00:34:38] the board, but at the very least, I think the sovereign immunity language is extremely problematic. I think guardrails of some sort are going to pass, and then some have some expansion, and some have not. And then we can go on to individual bills too. Okay, so continuing on.

[00:34:55] At the bottom of page two, there is SB 684. What this does is it authorizes special conservators of the peace and technicians to help with this. It does, however, also require a DCJS to develop, approve, and make available training course no later than 2027. The reason we are recommending amend is because the way it's written could be inferred that until that training is created, what happens with people currently authorized. So we recommend amending to put a delay in

[00:35:30] this provision until the training has been identified. There is a similar bill, SB 59, which did the same, and it actually did put in the delayed enactment yesterday to address those concerns. I am going to pass off the remaining three bills to Christine Prentice, who is our new legislative associate on transportation purposes. Hi, good afternoon, Christine Prentice.

[00:35:53] I am the government relations associate for FCCOT. We've got two bills, two additional bills that address summonses by mail, and one of them is very, you know, they each have pluses and minuses.

[00:36:14] All of them, starting with HB 311, will require the summons to be changed. So that is an operational difficulty for the police, and there will be more requirements on the police and on any vendors that we choose to use. There's, again, these bills don't go toward the guardrails totally toward the program, but they're very concerned with due process and people understanding

[00:36:42] what is happening with the bills. So HB 311, which is on page three, basically our biggest concern is what is the operational effect on the police and on traffic safety enforcement.

[00:37:03] And we're thinking about monitoring it because we believe that these bills are going to probably become one bill with additional changes to summonses and other due process things, providing more information to the person, giving them better instructions about how they can appeal. And some other things that are probably going to end up being okay, assuming that there is some grandfathering in and that there's a delay for any additional training that might be required

[00:37:40] because it's several of the bills that we've been looking at are requiring the Department of Criminal Justice Services to come up with standardized training. So they're going to need time and then we're going to need time. And the best possible thing that could happen with these bills is that that time is granted to both, all of us. SB 219 is actually really interesting.

[00:38:06] It's generally positive in that it will provide for a second summons and then notice to be provided to the DMV. So if the person does not pay the penalties and fees, that they will lose the ability to re-register their vehicle until paid. And the money would go to the locality.

[00:38:28] However, there's always a however. It will require monthly reports from DMV in the localities. So again, more guardrails. And there's a couple of other bills with the same type of procedure. And we wanted to bring them to you guys because they generally go under monitor just because we need to be careful about the operational no precedents that they would set. And then the last one is kind

[00:39:02] of, is also a good one. And we're thinking that first, you have had historical support for having school bus monitoring video systems. This bill would bring it in line with the other video monitoring systems that are already in use in allowing the retired law enforcement officer to do the certifications, which would free up a serving officer, and this would bring it into conformance with existing law, so we were thinking that this would be something you guys would like to support, and those are all of my bills for today.

[00:39:41] Well, thank you so much, and we're going to kick it off and see if Chairman McKay would like to comment first, and then we will start again at the very end and move our way up. Mr. Chairman? Yeah, I mean, obviously on the school board, on the school bus one, that's good news. I would just say on these others, first, Delegate Siebel, Delegate Delaney, did they reach out to our staff, our police, anybody, and consult about shortcomings of our existing guardrails?

[00:40:08] We have extensive guardrails in place already. I don't want anyone to think that we have a program that doesn't have guardrails. They're extensive. And so was there outreach done to understand the current program and what these potential changes would mean for it? I would say that nothing in specifics and in discussions with delegation members over the off session, it was portrayed that this is not going after us, but general concerns they've had from other parts of the state potentially.

[00:40:39] Yeah, I think it's important for us then to point out to them the challenges some of these would present for our own program. If the idea is to preserve and maybe give us flexibility to potentially expand it in the future, they need to understand what these things will do to the programs that are in the locality they represent that have been put in place successfully and have largely been supported by our community.

[00:41:03] Because there's some things in here that just are really problematic. I mean, the sovereign authority is one that you point out, but there's a whole lot of other ones. I mean, I don't know how you would limit the use of photo monitoring devices in work zones when workers are present. I mean, the workers don't switch these on and off.

[00:41:20] I mean, there's just a lot of operational problems here, and I think guardrails are good. I think these guardrails would go so far as to impede the ability of our existing program to function at a high level. And I think we should be pointing those things out.

[00:41:36] So I would say at this point, we're monitor, seek amendments to these. I think you're right. There will be guardrails passed. The closest those guardrails are to our existing guardrails in our program, the better. And so we need to be spending our time pointing out the distinctions and where those distinctions create problems for us and try to seek to get those things stripped out of the bill or amended so that we don't go backwards here.

[00:42:04] Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to start at the end. If I see anyone looking to ask a question, I'm going to go down. Supervisor Palchuk. Thank you. And it was a little bit related to the chairmen's. I was going to ask because I appreciate, I believe, for the final, the monitoring and amend ones, you shared with us verbally what some of those concerns are.

[00:42:26] I'm trying to go the list for HB 994 and HB 1220, the ones that the chairman mentioned. of I know what some of these are that aren't in compliance with what we currently do with our program, but I think both monitoring and looking to amend, but if you can help us or the FCPD staff to understand which of these have the most specific impact and changes from our existing program. It doesn't have to be today. Mr. Chairman, we can work with staff to kind of compare what is required to what the board the county already does i appreciate that thank you thank you thank

[00:43:06] you so much uh supervisor pal check supervisor alcorn yeah just very quickly um i'm going to thank the chairman for his comments on delegate seabolt's bill and i couldn't agree more let's let's uh make sure the delegate understands uh you know our concerns and i i think there's one locality in the

southeastern corner of the commonwealth that is really taking advantage of this authority for revenue enhancement purposes.

[00:43:33] So, I mean, that guardrail, I totally get. But this, okay, maybe there are two. Okay. But people going to the Outer Banks get to experience that, and that may be why Peaksville passed. But anyway, please do reach out to her. And more defined guardrails, truly, where there have been, maybe some folks going too far would be, I think, fine for all of us.

[00:43:56] So thank you. Mr. Chairman, if I may, We will definitely do that, as was mentioned. There are a couple that get referenced who have done particularly well with this camera enforcement program. I will say you'll see in here that to somewhat address that, the language now, last year's bill said the state got to keep the funding, and it went to the Highway Safety Improvement Program.

[00:44:18] This year's bills instead say the localities get to keep the funding. First, it goes to the program itself, and then the funding has to be used on certain transportation safety projects. So, and I think last year that was something we said, okay.

[00:44:37] Supervisor Stork. Is it still the same over 10 miles above the speed limit as the criteria for using, for being ticketed, if you will? Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Stork, I have not seen any changes to that. Thank you. All right, moving on, Jennifer.

[00:44:56] Yes, definitely. I'm actually going to turn it back to Noelle. The very first on here, so page one is HB 77 and SB 81, and it has to do with the GW Parkway, so I'll turn it back to Noelle and Christine. Mr. Chairman, some of these bills a lot of you saw last year, so you all may remember these. HB 77 and SB 81 essentially deal with enforcement of traffic on, well, they're intended to deal with traffic enforcement on the George Washington Parkway. As we all know, it's a federal park. It makes enforcement complicated there. What these

[00:45:35] bills essentially do is they allow local and state law enforcement to enforce federal traffic law, technically the way they're written on any highway in Planning District 8, not just the GW Parkway. But they are, and then they do also say what the summons would say that has to reference the federal statute as well as this, that grants it authority. And it says that the summonses go to, I believe, federal, sorry, to our district court, which I think one was of the concerns we raised last year. I do believe police still think there's some concerns there about training. We're not

[00:46:11] really, you know, our police generally don't enforce federal law and how to go about that training, but it is permissive. As such, we would recommend monitoring and something they can talk about more if necessary. Chairman? What is the amendment that you referenced in the last action?

[00:46:31] What was amended specifically? Mr. Chairman, that specifically, I believe, let me pull that up, it's, I think it said that the summons will reference the federal code and the state code authorizing. That was, it was a technical amendment. That's just the way it's written.

[00:46:48] Okay, thank you. Mr. Continuing on, we've already discussed HB 311. That's one of the speed monitoring bills, so I will pass it on to the next team member. So HB 387 and SB 473, I'm going to get a pitch hitter, and Chris Harrington's going to come help us discuss this bill. It has to do with the Aquacron and Fairfax County water and the unpotable water that goes into the Aquacron reserve and some complicating issues in those relationships. Chris Harrington, Director of Public

[00:47:26] works environmental services so this bill is actually a reflection of long-standing County policy it actually goes back to board resolutions from 1978 currently we have a one water system effectively where a wastewater discharge including some county wastewater from the upper Occoquan service authority goes into the Occoquan River where Fairfax water withdraws a significant amount of water for Fairfax County residents so what UOSA the upper Occoquan service authority has recently been considering is selling some of that reclaimed water So, taking water out of the system that has effectively already been accounted for in regional water supply planning by Fairfax Water.

[00:48:03] So this bill, which is strongly -- it's Fairfax Water's bill -- basically is ensuring the continuity of this system that we have invested in significantly and that is important for us as a region. So, it effectively lets the water experts manage our water and keeps the wastewater folks from upsetting the balance of that system.

[00:48:22] Well, thank you. And before I open it up for questions, I personally have to say selling water is bad for business. It's bad for Fairfax County residents. Imagine if there's a drought. We are in danger of hurting our Fairfax County residents, which includes some of our most vulnerable communities.

[00:48:43] Think about that. Some of our most vulnerable communities, the folks that we are here to protect. Let's not forget that our county puts a priority on one Fairfax policy, and this would be an attack. This would be a direct attack on the policy and the residents that rely on healthy, clean water.

[00:49:00] Again, this is bad for business, bad for our county, and most importantly, bad for our residents. And with that, I'll see if Chairman McKay would like to comment. Moving Supervisor Stork. I couldn't agree more. And I think the concerns are in the summer months, we get basically 70 or 80 percent of our water is from recycled water in the aquapon.

[00:49:22] And I'll ask you that, Chris, because we've had this conversation. I just want to make everybody aware of that. And then the other issue I have, concern I have, is the PFAS issue in general, which is from wastewater, which is a larger issue, and one that it's real because the aqua-quan has a higher percentage of PFAS than the Potomac River does, is my understanding, which means people who are drinking aqua-quan water are above, it's above the EPA threshold at the moment, is my understanding.

[00:49:50] Just very quickly, you're correct. About 90% of the water during low flow conditions is actually effluent coming from UOSA into Fairfax water's intakes mixing with Aquaman River water. So it is a significant component. That's why Fairfax Water is concerned that the balance of the system is maintained.

[00:50:08] You're absolutely right about PFAS being a constituent of concern for us in Fairfax Water. I'll just reiterate, we are collaborating in many different areas, including with Virginia Tech, to understand the PFAS problem and to coordinate with Fairfax Water to comply with federal regulations. compliance days got shifted out, but to comply with federal regulations, keep our people and our natural resources safe. Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Stork. If I don't see any more questions on this specific issue, we're going to move on to Part C, bills with recommended positions. And again, we'll... Yes, Jennifer? I believe there's one more bill we wanted to

[00:50:45] chat with you guys about around bicycle safety. Yeah, I think we might have just jumped over that one. But yeah, let's go back to that one. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, on page 2, HB 661, It has to do with bicycle operations. This is another one that many of you have seen in separate forums before.

[00:51:06] Essentially, two years ago, you all discussed a series of bills dealing with bicycle operations. One bill said that a bicycle can go on a walk signal at a red light when the person that said you can walk, the bicycle can go.

[00:51:25] And I believe after substantial discussion, the board supported that bill. There was the bill that said that bicyclists can treat a stop sign as a yield sign when it's safe to do so.

[00:51:43] Again, after discussion, I think you all just decided to monitor that bill. And then there was a third bill that talked about how bicyclists operate on roadways and when they have to move from two lanes into one lane. And that one, you all chose to oppose at that point.

[00:52:00] So why I'm saying all of that is those bills did not pass two years later. They're all now in one bill. So it has all three provisions, one part you opposed, one part you chose to monitor, and one part you supported. So we wanted to touch base with you all to see your thoughts on if or how you wanted to move forward with this.

[00:52:20] I think we have this as recommended monitor because you liked some, you had some concerns with some, but again, it was a lengthy discussion amongst members of the board, so we thought we'd bring it back. Thank you so much. First, I'm going to check with our chairman to see if he has any comments.

[00:52:38] Well, I mean, I don't have the whole bill in front of me. Unfortunately, I can't pull it up. So I think the devil's in the details here. What are the concerns we had in the bill that we opposed still paramount in this? When you say they're all combined in one bill in the exact same form of what we dealt with last year, because I know the one we oppose, and I remember the reason why, is the same problem still in this bill?

[00:53:04] Mr. Chairman, so what that bill, what this bill does, and similar to that last time, it removed language that said, you know, persons who are riding to a breast shall move into a single file formation as quickly as possible when being overtaken from behind.

[00:53:20] So they were to go into one lane. That language is being removed and it is being replaced with something saying on roadways with only one travel lane in the direction of such persons and a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour, people riding to a brush shall not impede normal and reasonable movement.

[00:53:37] So it does not say you have to move single file anymore. It says that they need to not impede the normal and reasonable movement. So that's an improvement over where we were last year. I mean, I guess the question I would have is from an enforcement standpoint, you know, how do our partners in public safety feel about this?

[00:53:59] Because obviously, you know, potentially you'd have to enforce this. I mean, I think it's probably more not something that would be regularly enforced, being honest. It's just more a standard we're trying to apply. But is this enforceable and would that be difficult?

[00:54:17] To me, the improvement that's in there to the part we opposed is helpful. There are a lot of things in here that we supported last time. And we might be able to get to support this bill if we can understand what the enforcement concerns would be. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to look behind me to see if somebody from the police department can come up.

[00:54:47] Good evening, Scott Cole. I'm the commander of the traffic division for the police department.

[00:55:04] From a police standpoint, we were opposed to this, one from the enforcement side, but also from the safety side of having people riding too abreast and not moving over when cars are coming up at speeds up to 35 miles per hour, we're just concerned of crashes.

[00:55:22] Okay. All right, well, I'll let others ask some questions. I have a follow-up, but I'll hold it. Thank you, Chairman. Supervisor Smith? Thank you. I am concerned about being able to yield at stop signs instead of having to stop.

[00:55:40] To me, that's just too dangerous, so I don't support that. Supervisor Alcorn? Yeah. Just a question. I know one of the things where we landed last year was a request or suggestion maybe that the proponents of this bill talk with us beforehand and see, I guess that didn't happen. Is that, are we, have we been engaging on this one? Mr. Chairman, I haven't personally talked with them. The bicycle community is very, you know, they do talk with our active transportation team. So conversations on operations in general have happened. I would have to go back and touch base on how much discussion happened with our bicycle.

[00:56:19] Well, it sounds like it didn't get from there into our legislative process. Okay. All right. Thank you. Supervisor Stork? I personally support the practicality of when you are riding a bike, I don't physically stop at a stop sign, dismount, or at least touch the ground, and then look both ways and then go.

[00:56:44] So from my perspective, I would rather have honest laws, if you will, are enforceable for bicyclists. And yes, I do expect that people to use good judgment and yield is appropriate for me. So at least parts of this I personally support.

[00:57:01] I think it makes sense. And I support sensible laws of what people practically do. Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Lusk. I just have a clarifying question. I'm not sure how this works, but that single wheel, that uni wheel that I see people kind riding on. Is that covered here? I just couldn't quite figure out where that uniwill is taken care of. Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Lusk, this represents a bicycle, electric personal-assisted mobility device, electric power-assisted bicycle, or motorized skateboard or scooter. So I think it

[00:57:41] matters if we consider those a motorized skateboard. Two. One. It's only one. We might have to circle back on that one. I'm just trying to make sure because I see a lot of people riding those. And I'll be frank. It makes me nervous because I'm thinking they hit a rock. They're going to go flying off of that thing. So just making a point that we want to ensure we're covering them as well. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Kaye. Yeah, I think what's recommended here, monitor, is what makes sense at this point. I think there's still a lot of unanswered questions. We should see where this goes. We should raise some of our concerns that we've

[00:58:18] had in the past with this, including the difficulty of enforcing from a law enforcement standpoint, share that, monitor it, and see where it goes from here and bring it back as changes happen. Thank you, Chairman. Yes, Supervisor. Is there any thought of advocating for a difference between motorized and non-motorized bicycles in this situation or scooters?

[00:58:38] Because I do think there's potentially difference in danger levels of motorized vehicles as opposed to the non-motorized. Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Seismore Heiser, sorry, I apologize. I don't know if there has been much of a discussion about those different types.

[00:58:54] They're usually just taken in a group these days. We can look into that. Yeah, that would be my thought. Thank you, Supervisor. Jennifer, moving on. The last one I turn back to Noelle. It's HB 549 and SB 731.

[00:59:12] It is the top page two. Mr. Chairman, this is another bill. You all saw something fairly similar last year. What this bill does by Delegate Helmer and Senator Salim would require the governing body of any county or city that contracts with a private company to provide public transportation services to essentially ensure that the employees are paid at a compensation at an hourly rate equivalent to the hourly rate of a county employee, as well as have the benefits, including

[00:59:50] health and retirement, that are at a minimum equivalent to the benefits provided to an employee of the locality. It also does something similar for transportation districts, transit systems run by transportation districts. The board did discuss this last year. We are recommending oppose. It is an unfunded mandate. As you all also know, the budget situation right now is extremely tight, and we're already looking at how to operate the connector given the current

[01:00:25] restraints. And for those reasons, we are recommending oppose. Absolutely. I definitely support that. I would just add that if this passed, there'd be a reduction in service and there'd be route eliminations, which would hurt some of our most vulnerable residents. And I think we need to share that practicality with the patron. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Supervisor Alcorn. Yeah, I agree. And I guess I was looking at an LAS and it looks like the fiscal note did have any estimated impact from Fairfax County. Are we getting that to them? Mr. Chairman,

[01:01:01] because we were trying to tread carefully in this one, we do believe it was aimed at our specific situation. So we can work to see what numbers we can get. That would be helpful. Yeah. We figured it was targeted. We didn't want to get ahead of you all. And I would just point out that this bill is not associated with the three funding bills that we had talked about earlier for transit so there's a little bit of a disconnect here so thank you thank you so much supervisor with that we are going to move now on to part c bills with recommended positions i will

[01:01:38] again pass it over to jennifer to kick us off with k through 12. this is where we're just going let me get the right color so the next section is called positions of recommended positions It starts on page five.

[01:02:00] And we're not, this year the change in format is we're not going to walk through each individual bill. I'm happy to answer any questions you might have on any, but we're going to just highlight some updates on our priorities. So the first one I wanted to highlight is there is a, I mentioned that there are K-12 vehicle for the JLARC recommendation.

[01:02:21] That is H, it's on page six. It's HB92, SB90. This is funding for the three at-risk populations, so it's at-risk add-on. It's English-language learners and special education.

[01:02:38] This is additional funding being put in per pupil for that. The original estimate had been around \$370 million. The updated budget estimate that was submitted was \$440. We feel like it will probably end up being somewhere in between those two numbers.

[01:02:57] We do recommend support. We have a position of support in there. There has been some discussions back and forth around requiring maintenance of effort or supplanting. We were able to get to

agreement with different groups and feel comfortable with this bill as is, that it will be great for these populations and our school funding.

[01:03:18] The next one is on page 10. Just wanted to update, as this was in our priority list, it is on the cannabis retail marketplace. We've had a position of several years saying we want local tax options and tax revenue as well as local land use authority maintained.

[01:03:36] All of those things are within it. The next one is page 9. So I have to flip back. So sorry. It is for RGGI. It is Bill HB 397, and it removes the may be part of RGGI to the shall be part of RGGI.

[01:03:56] And I'm going to turn it over to the chairman to say a couple words. Well, thank you, Jennifer. And look, the impacts of climate change are no longer optional, and the costs are unavoidable. RGGI makes sure our response is as real as the cost we already face.

[01:04:14] We look at the devastation of storms like Helene across communities in southwestern Virginia. I was recently, as I mentioned, in Richmond, and I was speaking with Delegate Franklin, who many of us know, earlier this week, and we were talking about the long-term damage in communities there. And what I walked away from was thinking, what's preventing that from happening here in Fairfax County? We can acknowledge how devastating these natural disasters have become, or we can take action to protect our neighbors and our residents.

[01:04:51] This legislation directs that 45% of revenue from RGGI be used for a community flood preparedness fund creating a permanent safety net for flood resilience. For context, Virginia generated an additional \$872 million in revenue in its first two years that we participated.

[01:05:12] I'll let you do the math on what kind of impact that would have on our most vulnerable communities. Again, this is about our most vulnerable communities. The storms are coming. The costs are here. Now is the time to bring Reggie back to Virginia. Thank you. All right. And the last item is on a split between page 16 and 17. And it has to do with a juvenile detention center and Senators Marsden's concerns around the number of them and the number of beds and the cost to the state for that. The last several years we have talked about and talked

[01:05:51] with him about his desire to consolidate into regional model he did not bring the forced consolidation bill this year and said he brought one which is about it is hb 469 we did and we are not recommending a position we did not recommend a position on this but it does have to do with teacher ratios the other one is affects the county and it's sb 483 again it's on page 16 and basically as a way to try to get towards the goal, it is, and we're, DJJ is required to do a

[01:06:30] biennial plan. As part of that biennial plan, he wants them to consider regional needs, consolidation, things like that. The other part of it is there are problems with some centers not, and areas of a state that do not have their own DJ center uh juvenile detention center and their children are being shipped to very far off places and his concern about that and so there's a second requirement in here that the people would be required to accept children um and if not it

[01:07:04] there is potential of funding being reduced or eliminated um we've expressed our concerns and you'll find in your packet a letter that Mr. Hill, I almost said Brian, Mr. Hill sent to Senator Marsden when he had these conversations this summer. You'll see that our position is no consolidation. So because this is towards that end, we would recommend oppose unless amended.

[01:07:32] I just want to add one other thing. I've asked Senator Marsden and his staff to provide us with The analysis, i.e. financial, I have yet to receive that. I've asked probably maybe six or seven times. So unless I have an analysis of financial terms, it's kind of hard for me to say we should do this or not.

[01:07:54] I will say that my city manager, a friend in Alexandria, as well as my county manager in Arlington are also on the same page. We are opposing this bill. Just very briefly, I've also spoken with Senator Marsden about this.

[01:08:12] I would just say on the financial impact part, if you look at that, it explicitly says that they haven't done a computation, as the county executive said. That needs to happen. I mean, we need to know what the fiscal impact is to Fairfax County here. The other thing I would just add is you've talked to your counterparts.

[01:08:31] I've also spoken with at least Mayor Gaskins about this, and Alexandria has significant challenges and problems with this on top of the ones that we have. So I would just say I think it's appropriate to oppose it at this point, but I do think we need to stress understanding what the fiscal impact is, because my concern with this transition, and I've shared this with Senator Marsden, is when this happens typically with the state and we take on more responsibility, over time the funding for that erodes and we just end up holding the bag for the whole cost of it.

[01:09:03] And that concerns me a great deal, probably concerns me more than anything, and we've been given no guarantees about future funding or future financial support for this type of transition. And so I do think we need to oppose it, and I'm curious as to why we can't get what a fiscal impact would be. All right. Those are the highlights I wanted to call out for you.

[01:09:28] As I look at the time, we're doing quite well, which makes me happy. This, I think, because we're so early, I'm going to let everyone just go through. If you have any comments or additional questions. I will start with Mr. Beerman. We'll come all the way down before we wrap up and do closing comments. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to give the board an update on page 10. HB 883 was heard in subcommittee today. This was a VDOT study bill

[01:10:04] that I worked on with Delegate Rip Sullivan. The VDOT study bill asked that the Secretary of Transportation report back to the General Assembly after looking at opportunities to cut down on review timelines, create more consistency in reviews, considering whether VDOT could hold itself to the same standards as under sections 15.2-2259 and 15.2-260 that it actually applies to our own development processes

[01:10:39] here at the local level. This bill was put together with a lot of input from county staff, from Jen Miller, from Land Development Services. I'm disappointed to report that they are not going to take up this bill. However, what did happen today is they said, essentially, that they felt that this type of review was covered in Governor Spanberger's executive orders, and that they would be sending a letter with some of the same content to the Secretary of Transportation. What I'm very

[01:11:15] pleased to report is, as I testified in favor of the bill, I argued in the alternative and said, if you are not going to have a study here, and what I liked about the bill was that it had an end date, you must report back to our committees by December of next year, that you put in your letter firm deadlines for reporting back. And Chair Delegate Dan Helmer said that the letter that would go to the Secretary of

Transportation would include those deadlines. So I don't have the letter in front of me, but I wanted to give everybody an update on that. And thank you to

[01:11:54] Jen Van E for helping me go testify virtually. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank Jimmy for his advocacy on this. Part of why this transpired is I have a chairman's task force with a lot of our building industry, and we talked about this extensively with a lot of staff help, was acknowledged in some of the recommendations. I would suggest that given what's happened here, my concern, and I know Supervisor Bierman and I talked about this, is that it doesn't get caught up now and we lose a whole year. And so what I think we ought to be doing and what I will be

[01:12:31] bringing to the board at our next board meeting is also a letter from our board to the secretary encouraging the speed that's been mentioned here and pointing out some of the challenges that we've had in conversations with industry. This is a significant hurdle for them and adds cost to housing development, which is one of the governor's main objectives to reduce that. And so I'll be working with the staff on a letter of support from our board to send to the secretary as well to reinforce what Supervisor Bierman has shared here. And I'm very happy to help. That sounds

[01:13:06] great. Thank you. Thank you so much to the chairman and Supervisor Bierman, Supervisor Lusk and then Supervisor Palachuk. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll just again reiterate my support for HB 92 and SB 90, acknowledging some of the challenges we have in my own district and I know in other districts as well. And then I'll just ask if there's a couple of bills, which I assume they might be added to the future discussions, but there's HB 594. I'd really be

[01:13:41] interested in hearing kind of where the staff and the position of the team is with regard to it and then also if I could there's a couple others but I'll just mention two here HB 143 as well just interested in where we are with the disposition and prioritization of properties that are currently owned by the state and or county.

[01:14:13] So with that, I'll conclude. Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Palachuk? Thank you. And first of all, thank you to staff and to the chairman for this very updated and speedy format. Very much appreciate that in the new way that it's displayed. I just want to reiterate and thank the chairman and Mr.

[01:14:33] Bierman for their work on this. It feels like it's a frog in the water that has slowly gotten hotter and hotter and hotter and hotter. Six years of working on these projects, and it has gotten more and more difficult, right? And VDOT, and I think it was clear in the transition teams, both on the housing work that was done for the transition for the governor on transportation, that VDOT should not be an impediment, right?

[01:14:56] They're an impediment right now to affordability, for housing, to economic development. And I know we and Jen Miller are working on our internal processes and how we improve that. But really appreciate that it's all hands on deck here. And I think the letter and the county executives work on this and communication with the Secretary of Transportation will bring us out through this tunnel of just roadblocks. It sounds got even worse with the last administration's efforts that were not thought through in a way that would really look at the

[01:15:31] process and the staffing available. So this is critical to everything we are working on. So thank you. Thank you, Supervisor. Looking down, Supervisor Stork, Supervisor Alcorn, and then we'll do final remarks. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had kind of just a broad question. Obviously,

the governor has had her speech, and we've all heard a lot of different things about what the legislature is focused on, and we're about a little over a week into it. Are you picking up some specific or broader themes that we need to be aware

[01:16:08] of or at least maybe tie into as things that we can get more things done that we know are important? Yeah, definitely. I would say the two words that you hear thrown around, well, one's a phrase and one's a word. Affordability. Every bill, they're arguing on affordability. The second one is there is no money. It's a tight budget year. Is it what? There is no money. It's a tight budget year. So those are the two themes, which can cause concern for local governments as sometimes then those things get passed on to us. The victims of it, yes. And so I would say that is something

[01:16:44] that we're definitely keeping an eye out for. I will say that there has been some issues with the state website with getting bills up in timely manners. And so I want to thank our team and the legislative review team here in the deluge that has come this week. At given times, up to 400 or were uploaded all at once.

[01:17:07] And so we will definitely bring back and keep themes in mind as we advocate and keep you abreast of that. But I would say right now we're trying to digest all that has come the last half of the week. Thank you. Supervisor Alcorn. Thank you.

[01:17:23] I've got a quick question on HB 330 at the top of page 8, and I think this may be Noel. This is basically about signs and advertisements on real property owned by WMATA. And I read the bill.

[01:17:40] I think I'm reading it correctly, but our zoning ordinance would apply. Is that your reading too? Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Alcorn, I think that is how we reviewed it. It is permissive, not required, which is why we are recommending monitor. Okay, great.

[01:17:55] It just says that signs, advertisement notices that have been authorized by the county or city. So I believe our thought is you all need to authorize. Good, and that's how I asked WMATA to do this, too. So thank you for confirming that.

[01:18:11] Thank you, Supervisor Al Cornyn, with that. First off, I'd like to thank everyone for a very productive meeting. We're going to give everyone about 35 minutes of their time back. I want to absolutely say thank you. Thank you to Mason District staff, our staff. They've been fantastic. Thank you so much to county staff. Thank you to Fairfax County Police Department.

[01:18:36] And of course, it goes without saying, thank you to our legislative team who does an amazing job given the influx of over 2,000 bills that they're trying to manage and come in front of us to give us our guidance. So thank you so much to the team led by Jennifer Van E. We really appreciate all the hard work you do. As a reminder, we're hosting the General Assembly Reception on February 19th at 5.30, and we will be reminding you again. We will be meeting next week on Friday, January 30th at 4 p.m., and moving forward, we will meet as needed. And with that, we are adjourned.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com