



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, Finance/Government Operations and Economic Development Committee, Tuesday, February 14, 2023

Date Tuesday, February 14, 2023
Place Board Room, First Floor, Government Center, 1 Harrison Street SE, Leesburg, Virginia
Length 3h 39m (video)

- Official meeting video (county, Granicus): <https://loudoun.granicus.com/player/clip/7186>
- Agenda (Granicus): https://loudoun.granicus.com/AgendaViewer.php?view_id=73&clip_id=7186

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 2026-10-22. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:13:24] 13th, 2023, Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, Finance, Government Operations, and Economic Development Committee meeting. This room has a hearing loop. If you need hearing assistance, switch your hearing aids to telecoil mode. If you need a headset, we have those available as well.

[00:13:41] Please see the clerk to request one. Committee members will have three minutes to ask questions on all items with as many rounds as we need. The proposed consent agenda is as follows. Item three, award authority increase heavy construction equipment with related accessories, attachments, and supplies.

[00:14:03] Item four, award authority increase companion services. Item four, that was four. Item five, award authority increase operation of the youth shelter. Item six, contract renewal engineering services for the Loudoun County Stormwater Management Program.

[00:14:22] Item 11, Loudoun Hunger Relief Lease Extension. Item 12, proposed amendments to Chapter 252.02, bonuses of the codified ordinances of Loudoun County. And item 13, Hogan-Kent Green Braddock Road off-site resolution for reimbursement.

[00:14:43] I am going to move the consent agenda. Is there a second? Second by Supervisor Briskman. Is there any discussion on the consent agenda? All right, Supervisor Briskman, did you have a brief discussion?

[00:15:01] I did. I just wanted to acknowledge that our partners, Loud and Hunger Relief, have done a lot of great work in that building, and they do a lot of great work around our county. So, very pleased that we're renewing that lease, and just love to see the work continue.

[00:15:20] Thank you. Very good. Supervisor Letourneau. Very briefly, I'd just like to thank the committee, as well as staff, for the work on the reimbursement agreement for Braddock Road. We're covering the gap between the actual cost of the improvement and the proffer funding that's available, but that amount is still within the CIP budgeted amount. The work that we've done in this corridor both directly through proffers and with furtherance of a proffer provisions have allowed us to accelerate significantly the work on Braddock to widen the road and deal with an ongoing safety issue at Supreme and Summerall Drive.

[00:15:55] So I'm thankful for that. Very good. Thank you. All right. All those in favor, please say aye. Any opposed, say nay. And that will pass 5-0. And welcome to Supervisor Kirshner, who is here, I think, mostly for Waterford.

[00:16:13] Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. All right. Thank you. We're now going to go on to the information items. And number one is the monthly Department of Economic Development report, with buddy and colleen and siobhan and please remind me dana hammerschlag yes to see you again dana yes good to see all of you good evening everyone um a report released this morning at 8 30 showed that prices in january rose 6.4 percent compared to last year at this time but

[00:16:48] inflation is slowing slightly down from 6.5 percent in december and 71 percent is 7.1 percent in November. Data shows that labor market conditions continue to be tight despite some of the news coverage about the slowing growth and the hiring freezes or layoffs announced at some major tech companies. The January jobs report indicated a seasonably adjusted gain of 517,000 jobs exceeding expectations. Employers shed fewer jobs than is typical following the holiday season indicating ongoing reticence to cut back on workers that they competed hard to get during the red hot

[00:17:26] labor market of 2022. The unemployment rate dipped to 3.4 percent, which marks the lowest reading in more than five decades. The unemployment rate was 2.1 for Loudoun County and 3.0 for Virginia. We had a lot of wins so far this year. For this current fiscal year, 110 wins. That's ahead of the pace of the last two years, over 4,000 jobs and over \$8 billion in investment.

[00:17:57] The short-term pipeline for Loudoun remains strong overall, but current interest rates and market conditions has slowed development of office and retail, and to some extent, the housing product. Data centers and flex continue to drive the market, not just in Loudoun, but everywhere. We continue to have productive conversations around our metro sites, but there's really not much activity in the market nationwide outside of walkable developments right now. And with that, before I turn it over to EDAC, I'm happy to take any questions.

[00:18:27] Any questions for Buddy? I saw Karan first, and then Supervisor Briskman, and then Chair Randall. Thank you, Chair. Good to see everybody from Economic Development and our different committees with us again um yet again i got a call from a resident or a business owner in my district um saying that their their building that they've signed a five-year lease with um and next year their lease is up

but the building is being sold to a data center so of course they're going to be back looking for a place to stay and take their business and hopefully they stay in Loudoun and

[00:19:07] counting um is that still are those occurrences still on the rise or is this an outlier i i would say that we haven't heard a lot of that, other than what we've already discussed. But I would say that the demand for product in Loudoun County remains incredibly strong in the data center world. We're seeing a lot of deals get done at really record values. And so, yeah, we continue to see that. If anything, I would say it's been accelerated over the last six to eight months.

[00:19:44] And is there anything we can do or what are we advising those who are put in that predicament where they have to start looking for other places to take their business in the commercial flex industrial? Yeah. And unfortunately, as we've talked about, the the flex vacancy rate is under one percent.

[00:20:01] So there's not many opportunities right now, but I would say as soon as they can contact my office or reach out to me, we will work with them to try to find opportunities as quickly as we can. And there's just no other entities out looking to build new flex industrial commercial spaces in the area?

[00:20:20] We have a lot of conversations, but trying to find the land at a price to compete for flex is incredibly tough right now. All right. Thank you. Thanks. Supervisor Briskman. Thank you, Madam Chair. A lot of us just got back from the National Association of Counties conference where several White House representatives spoke, and the president actually spoke this morning, a couple of the White House representatives actually said we beat inflation, which I was really surprised to hear.

[00:20:50] But as you kind of moved up the food chain, they weren't quite saying that yet. One thing we talked about a lot in our Economic Development Workforce Committee was the CHIPS Act. And I did ask a question, you know, about how Loudoun County is trying to diversify our economy, how might we take advantage of the CHIPS Act and those sorts of things.

[00:21:10] And they said that, you know, it might not be a great place for a fab, for a facility, actually, to be building the chips, but it might be an opportunity for counties like ours to work sort of in the food chain, so to speak, for distribution or maybe parts and pieces.

[00:21:29] So my question to you is, and I'm going to have another question on a different topic right after this, but my question is, have you started strategizing yet to take advantage of the CHIPS Act? And if so, what are we thinking? Yeah, I would say that your initial comment is true, that straight-on manufacturing is probably not where we will excel.

[00:21:54] That said, the interest around the CHIP Act has been incredibly high. And we have worked with multiple prospects from really across the country and across the world that are interested in Loudoun as almost additive and putting things together.

[00:22:11] So while it might not be the actual construction of the chips, the processes that follow that, I think that in the engineering piece, we're very much in competition for, I would say there's probably six to eight projects.

[00:22:29] we've been actively working with when it comes to that. And a lot of it is depending on the CHIPS Act funding. You know, who gets it? And there's a lot of people out there that are going for it. Whoever gets it, I think that there are going to be those opportunities, and we're monitoring that very closely.

[00:22:48] Maybe we can convene offline and we can chat a little bit about some of the stuff that was happening at the conference. I'd like that. Another session I attended, of course, was on early childhood education and child care. And one thing that came up was the WIOA and reauthorizing the WIOA.

[00:23:05] And they mentioned something called workforce boards. And I kind of poked around the economic development website to see if we actually had a workforce board. And I feel like a lot of that's happening in Fairfax and Alexandria. So I just wanted to check in with you. Like, do we have one of those in Loudoun County?

[00:23:21] Is it the Workforce Investment Board, the WIB? Those are typically regional, and we do participate in the Northern Virginia WIB. And I would say that the reauthorization of that is going to be very important, I think, going forward.

[00:23:41] The workforce investment in Northern Virginia, with all due respect to those involved, has underperformed. But I think that it's something that is something we need to continue to watch and try to be involved in the best we can.

[00:23:56] We should probably advocate for that in our federal legislative program. Thank you. Wonderful. Chair Randall. Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, buddy, over the past many years, I have spent every one of my birthdays with you, and now I'm spending Valentine's Day with you. Oh! We both need to go home at some point.

[00:24:15] I want to reiterate something that Mr. Sainz hit on. Recently, I've seen a significant uptick in my emails from constituents about data centers. And, you know, I every time say, you know, the difference that would help how much they help the tax rate and equally, if not more important, how much they do for the community.

[00:24:35] But I am telling you, it is the drumbeat is getting very loud from constituents who are just like, I don't care. I don't care about tax, but I don't care. We just it's just and I'm, you know, I'm not quite sure. I have two things. One, you kind of went past this very quickly.

[00:24:51] So I do want to go back. You're not saying that there's not companies interested in flex industrial and doing flex industrial. You're saying they can't afford it because it's all being outpriced. Data centers are buying up, buying up it. If they had it, if they could afford it over what data centers are paying, they would.

[00:25:10] And so that diversifying of the economy is not because people don't want, other businesses don't want to be here. Flex industrial doesn't want to be here because they can't afford that. Is that correct? Yes, developers are finding it. First of all, there's not a ton of land left. We do think that, you know, going through the zoning ordinance, we're having a lot of really deep discussions about flex and the opportunities around flex. I would say that we're, we have a pipeline of between five and six million square

[00:25:44] feet of flex demand in the marketplace, in specific for Loudoun, and we're not able to meet most of that. Yeah, that's unfortunate. The other thing, and this is kind of sea sand on your part, Ms. Bricksman did mention NACO, and I've been listening really closely lately. In your opinion, do you feel like we're moving away from what was almost certain to be a recession? If we compare it where we were three months ago, six months ago, does it feel like, you know, this is your field that you're an expert at, does it feel like that we're stepping away from that brink a

[00:26:21] little bit? And Mr. McFann, let me ask you the same question. I would say that I'm not convinced that we're not still in danger of a recession. I do think that a recession would probably be shallow and not very long. I don't know that it would impact Loudoun's economy as much as it would in some communities. I would say that the inflation number, while better, was not where we thought it would be. We thought it was going to be closer to 5-2 than it was. So I think we

[00:27:00] still have some concerns. And I think that a lot of people still have concerns. But I think that the rate increases haven't moved the needle as quickly as what we thought it would. But I would say we are heading in the right direction. So I'm probably more encouraged today than I was three months ago. All right. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. Very good. Thank you. Anything else, Mr. McFadden? I'll turn it over to EDAC for their report. Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity

[00:27:34] to speak tonight. Dan and I are excited, along with the other commissioners, to serve the community at the pleasure of the board in partnership with the DED. Your EDAC this year is a diverse and committed group of business leaders working together to support economic development in the county. We are putting together a work plan for the commission, but in the meantime, we're off to a great start for the year with the commissioners active in three key areas. First, we have the vast majority of our members working directly with the cluster representatives from the DED. Your item tonight talked about the clusters that the DED is targeting, and EDAC members are supporting the

[00:28:11] managers through mentoring, advising, and supporting their outreach efforts. Each DED development managers working directly with one, and in some instances, two commissioners, and it has been a very powerful partnership. Second, the small and minority-owned business ad hoc has been working with the DED on programmatic strategies to support the needs of small businesses. Last week, the department and commissioning launched a needs assessment for small and minority-owned businesses.

[00:28:38] We encourage all small businesses in Loudoun to take the survey. Businesses can either talk to an EDAC member or take the survey at biz.loudon.gov. Dana? And on that item, I would just add that we look forward to providing the board a report on the small business and minority business ad hoc in a few months. I think that's scheduled for April. Correct me if I'm wrong there.

[00:29:04] And the third update is our work on the zoning ordinance rewrite ad hoc. So EDAC continues to review and provide feedback on the zoning ordinance rewrite process. We recognize that we are coming towards the end of this process, hopefully for all of us.

[00:29:21] So we have been working to monitor all the changes coming through both staff and the planning commission, and we'll continue to provide our perspective from EDAC on the zoning ordinance. EDAC views this as one of the most important things that we can do to ensure the future growth of economic development in Loudoun. We really appreciate Mr. Yud and the staff working with us to receive the feedback and respond to that feedback from the business community. All these three items in support of the mission of EDAC, which is to support

[00:29:58] the long-term growth and economic development of the county. So with that, we'll take questions. Very good. Any questions? All right. I am not seeing any, so it looks like you guys did a superior job thank you so much we are going to move immediately to item number seven because this is um what oh seven okay i'm sorry seven which is the sister cities because buddy is handling that so chair randall would you like a full presentation or do you want to i i don't need a presentation i

[00:30:34] actually um well buddy you know this is what we're doing is pretty important if you i i'm fine with the presentation. I don't need one. I actually only had a couple of questions to ask you, but I don't need a presentation. I don't have a presentation. I have some opening remarks, if that is okay, just for context. We're here to suggest to the committee three new sister cities, Greater Noida, India, Canelones, Uruguay, and Temagana, to seek the recommendation to authorize the chair to sign agreements with officials from these locations. These are cultural, educational, social, and business reasons that we pursue sister cities. From a DED

[00:31:13] perspective, sister cities are one of the most important tools we have to enter international business development. The relationships give us a strong landing place, credibility in those markets. In particular, we've seen business opportunities and wins come out of our partnerships in Germany, South Korea, and most recently through our outreach interactions in India. We actually began discussions with India in 2019. And while the partnership only recently solidified because of COVID, we've been very pleased with the opportunities that have come out of those

[00:31:47] relationships. We don't present these communities without a lot of consideration. These are data-driven suggestions that we have for you. We start by looking at major world cities. They're surrounding areas that could be closely aligned with Loudoun County. We consider relevant data including information on foreign direct investment, gross domestic product on a per capita basis, human development and index scores.

[00:32:14] We look at everything on economic, social, and cultural trends. So after this research, we feel very strongly that the three communities that we have suggested would be great partners for Loudoun County. And with that, I'm happy to take questions. Madam Chair. Thank you, Madam Chair.

[00:32:31] First of all, thank you. I am very excited about the sister cities that are coming online and the visits we're about to make, you know, to the question I asked before. You know, when we started talking about Ghana, I didn't know that Ghana is one of the main producers in the world of cocoa beans.

[00:32:52] And so we talk about a chocolate manufacturing and other things. And I certainly hope we don't go there and they have no place to put one if we get one to come back here. That would be an issue. I do have two questions. One, we have a sister city in Turkey. For the most part, it has been fairly inactive.

[00:33:12] It was somewhat inactive during COVID, just for a quick sec. But at that time, we had thought about sleeping that sister city. And it's not that I don't want sister cities everywhere, but I don't want them if we're not going to be active and engaged with, I'm sorry, not Turkey, New Taipei, Taiwan.

[00:33:30] I'm sorry, I said the wrong word, New Taipei, Taiwan. If we're not going to be active and engage with them, I don't want to keep them just because we've had them. So I want your opinion on sleeping the sister city in New Taipei, Taiwan. In Turkey, where our sister city is, of course, they have just had a major earthquake.

[00:33:49] I remember when I first started off saying they have 2,000 deaths. They're at now 40,000 deaths. Have we reached out to them? Should we reach out to them? I'm more than happy to do something. Is there help that we can offer as our sister city? Because when we have things like this, I don't think it's just the economics of the sister city.

[00:34:09] I think it's also the humanitarian of the sister city. And so they are a sister city. They're experiencing a horrible crisis. Is there something we should do, I should do, we can do together to help

them? So should we sleep Taiwan? Can we help Turkey? And I'm excited about the three that we're adding.

[00:34:27] And you're right. Noida has been, we've been working on Noida. Mr. Letourneau, we started talking about one in India in 2018, I think. And we've been working on NOIDA for a long, long time. Went over there.

[00:34:42] They weren't ready yet to sign it. Came back kind of empty-handed, a little disappointed. So I'm glad we're doing that. I do know how much time you and your staff have put into, as have other people. My staff, Mr. Matt Rogers, has been very, very involved in doing this and very helpful.

[00:35:00] Kings Leo Bhaji for Ghana and other people. And so we, Jasmine, in India, we really do appreciate all the community partners we've had in this area. But what do you think we should do with Taiwan? And do you think we should do anything to address the humanitarian crisis in Turkey?

[00:35:18] Yeah, I think, first of all, on Taiwan, they were a great partner to us during COVID. If you remember, they sent us a lot of masks and were very, very good. They very much value the partnership, even though it hasn't been overly active.

[00:35:35] We work all of our partnerships to differing degrees. We are in touch with them and send when, you know, on holidays we reach out or send little trinkets and gifts. But Taiwan has not been very active from a business development standpoint.

[00:35:53] So, I think my suggestion would be to not sleep it just out of the value of the partnership, but maybe try to understand from them what their expectations are a little bit. I'd prefer to have that conversation with them, but obviously we'll follow board direction.

[00:36:11] As far as Turkey, as soon as this happened, we reached out to our partners in Turkey. Fortunately, the community that we are actively engaged with is not very close to this, but it is a nationwide issue for them.

[00:36:27] And we have offered help as much as we can. And they were gracious and said that they would let us know if there is anything that they need from us. But I think knowing that we are there to support them, I think, is something that they value very much in Turkey.

[00:36:48] And I do think that maybe when they have a better understanding and recovery is done, that there may be some requests for some assistance there. All right, I look forward to the trips we're about to take, and I look forward to really bringing back some economic development and maybe some chocolate.

[00:37:04] There you go. Buddy, thank you very much. We're going to go to a motion. Madam Chair, I know you would like to make the motion. Would you like me to read it? I've got it right up here, unless you also have it. I think I have it. All right. I move the Finance, Government, Operations, and Economic Development Committee recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the creation of three new sister cities, partnerships in the following location, Greater Noida, India, Canalotis, Uruguay, and Timah, Ghana.

[00:37:31] I further move the Finance, Government, Operations, and Economic Development Committee recommend the Board of Supervisors grant the Chair of the Board of Supervisors authorization to sign agreements which are sitting right here in front of me with the approval of the sister city locations. Second by Supervisor Briskman. Madam Chair, any discussion? Nothing else but to thank you and thank your staff. Thank Robert especially for all the work he has done and I I know that Mr. Mr. Turner, are you going with me to Ghana?

[00:37:59] I do know some supervisors are going to be going with us on some of these trips and I look forward to them. So and I thank you. Thanks a lot. Thank you very much. All right. No other discussion. All in favor, please say aye. Any opposed, say nay. All right, and that will pass 5-0.

[00:38:17] We're going now, Buddy, thank you very much. Colleen, thank you very much. We're going to go now to information items part two, which is Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act Funding Strategy Overview. John Sandy, Megan Cox, thank you for coming.

[00:38:44] Good evening, committee members. This evening, we're going to be talking and providing insight into the county's strategic plan or recommended strategy around the IIJA, which is, of course, a large grant program, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

[00:39:11] We're going to be outlining a number of different clear goals that the staff has been using to guide our work on this important grant program and all the grants that are associated with it. With me at the table is Megan Cox, who's our Program Evaluation Research and Grants Manager, and we have other SMEs in the room, if necessary, and online to answer any questions about specific projects.

[00:39:38] As the committee knows, the administration and Congress had funded the IAJA at a \$1.2 trillion level. \$500 billion is dedicated to new programs, and 60% of that money is earmarked for states.

[00:39:57] 60% of it will be delivered as part of formula or categorical grants, and 40% through competitive means. Only 50% of all those opportunities have been provided yet by the federal agencies, and most of the grants require expenditures by 2030.

[00:40:22] So we have a presentation for you this evening to kind of walk you through the strategic plan and have you be able to provide feedback if necessary. Yeah, please go ahead. This is fairly important and complicated. Thank you. All right, so just to begin with some of the plan's purpose, We do know that as the IIJA rolls out throughout the nation, the federal agencies will be looking at complex projects that have really large price tags.

[00:40:54] And one of the issues that we wanted to make sure we got ahead of was that we would have multi-departmental plans that would help us maximize the organization and the structure of these applications and also to put those plans into funding goals. So to be able to actually take the hard work that's gone into the CIP, gone into other board-approved plans, and ensure that we have some funding goals that are associated with those that are through grants.

[00:41:23] We also wanted to make sure that we had broad enough goals that we can support infrastructure improvements in future years. So this wouldn't be limited just to the current CIP, but could actually influence funding in future years. A little bit about the timeline.

[00:41:40] we began conversations with the departments who would be most impacted in April of 22 and continued those conversations to narrow down the focus for these goals and narrow down the specific projects to a small list of examples that we'll be sharing with you this evening. We also then conducted just some brief strategies and planning with the group to request feedback from departments.

[00:42:06] So the funding priorities are listed on your screen here, and one of the cornerstones that we have to look for in terms of funding priorities for the IIJA, as well as for future grants that we may receive for the Inflation Reduction Act, is equity. So one of the major cornerstones with any project that we apply for is going to be to have an equity lens for low-moderate income neighborhoods or projects that would

impact residents who are disadvantaged we also have another cornerstone within the IIJA that would be innovation and so when looking at the funding

[00:42:44] priorities across the board adopted strategies and plans already that's where we wanted to start was in what ways can we introduce equity and in some ways innovation without increasing the cost of the overall projects. So in order to do that, we came up with four funding goals. The first is to maximize funding for the infrastructure projects through the CIP, and in order to help offset or decrease local tax funding. And so really, this is a focus on projects that include

[00:43:16] and support equity, not only in transportation, but also in multimodal types of transportation, linking sidewalks, making sure that our bus shelters are ADA compliant, ways that we can support large projects but without funding large projects. We also want to make sure that we have some preliminary studies that can help us cost these innovations. So one of the other pieces of this would be the innovation and how can we make sure that we are not adding to the overall cost

[00:43:50] of a project. So in order to do that, we are talking about and kind of have plans for the strategic partnerships with VDOT and with NVTa to help support innovations that may be something that they are already planning for or is something that's experimental through VDOT.

[00:44:13] That would be a deviation from standard, but we would want to make sure that it's tested first and be able to have some preliminary studies that not only cost out the project but also show the effectiveness of the innovation. So goal two is really to support economic development through two main objectives. The first is to increase traffic through main thoroughfares but also ease that congestion. So in what ways can we help to support areas around large heavily trafficked areas by

[00:44:48] supporting specific initiatives that would be potentially pedestrian safe walkable areas increasing the accommodations for bridges etc so we also want to make sure that we can identify funding that offsets costs to development around metro and one way we can do that is looking at some of those multimodal options for green space, for other types of life-enhancing

[00:45:21] projects that add costs to the development of the project, but grants can accommodate. And there will be a significant proportion coming out for active infrastructure and transportation, so we'll be looking at those. The third goal is to apply for funding that would increase pedestrian safety, and this is really an area that will be heavily discussed over the coming months.

[00:45:53] DTCI was awarded a Safe Streets and Roads for All planning grant earlier this month, and they will be working on a comprehensive safety plan as a requirement of that grant. With these grants, many of them have contingencies attached, so you would have to have a prerequisite of a planning grant award, an actual plan, and then an implementation grant. So this is step one in many new opportunities for grants. We also are interested in how we can coordinate

[00:46:27] the Safe Routes to Schools program, which is now moving into a different type of program. But we are looking at how we can connect sidewalks and trails and make pedestrian crossings safe around schools. And those infrastructure grants are offered every two years, and so the contingency is that we expend those funds in two years in order to apply for new funding. And goal four is to decrease the energy and carbon footprint for the county. And there are several ways within the

[00:47:01] energy strategy that that was proposed, and the work in grants will actually support the infrastructure that goes around things like the fleet transition. So the federal dollars, the federal grant

applications may not allow the county to purchase vehicles per se, but they allow for the purchase and development and implementation of charging stations and charging facilities. So what we are looking at is how to build the infrastructure that can then offset the

[00:47:32] cost for developing the ZEV options. So in that way, we can actually look at a more eco-friendly environment. We also will receive an energy efficiency and conservation block grant, which is about \$390, \$500 this year. And we're looking at how we can employ energy audits for the government buildings so that when new projects or new grant applications, funding opportunities become available, we're ready with that audit to use for specific data.

[00:48:11] We did want to point out that there are some staffing considerations and some communication strategies that we have in place. The first is to be really deliberate about how we employ this strategy, and specifically looking at a 6- to 12-month planning window per project.

[00:48:28] This helps to get everything in order. It helps to decrease the burden on staff who would be pulling together this information, working with consultants on narratives, et cetera. So we also want to make sure that each of the four required data points and preliminary studies is completed prior to any application.

[00:48:53] And you can see those on your screen. They are environmental studies, purpose, benefit cost, and then community engagement. And all of these will require a heavy amount of data in the application narratives, so we need to make sure that those are appropriately implemented and that the board is able to see the results prior to application.

[00:49:17] We also are planning for a series of issue papers, so when we do have a project identified and a grant identified, what we want to do is we've worked with Mr. Freeman to identify the key questions that the delegation and our representatives may ask, and we're going to put that into a one-page brief for each of our projects for the IIJA.

[00:49:39] We will make that available to our lobbying firm, Mr. Freeman, and the board so that you all have the same information and the same information on the grants. This also can help on the other side where if grant funds are not available or we've not received a grant, this could be used to help inform things like earmarks.

[00:50:04] That was a direct comment from the lobbying firm. With that, we will take questions. Wonderful. Megan thank you all right I saw Supervisor Letourneau then Supervisor Briskman so you'll never guess what I'm going to ask about the um the North Star project no not so that's Ron Meyer I should ask a question for Ron in his absence but um no I was excited to see the North Star project here and we had long talked about how we thought that that project may qualify for some

[00:50:38] special type of funding because we included the pedestrian underpass component of it under North Star. What I'm trying to understand a little better, though, is exactly how this works. So we got a Safe Streets and Roads for All grant for \$460,000. That was just sort of for planning.

[00:50:55] So what we're saying is there's a round of funding available in July of 23 that we're going to apply for. What exactly are we asking for around that project? Because it's not funded in the CIP until quite a ways out but you said we had to use the money within the two-year cycle so for the safe streets and roads for all that's going to be a 12 to 24 month planning window so DTCI will be leading that effort specifically we also will have the newly transitioned safe

[00:51:34] routes to schools program that we will partner with LCPS and and start to kind of pull that information out. Specifically, we have to work with the departments to identify a subcomponent of the project that would fit with the funding opportunities that come available.

[00:51:53] So it could be, I'm looking at Jim in the back there, because he knows this project really well, and Mark, but especially Jim. So it could be something like the right-of-way or a design component or something like that. We would be breaking it up into pieces and looking for a subcomponent. I hope it would be more than \$464,000. You can't do much for that, but that's the idea. Yeah, typically with these grants, we're going to be targeting either component parts of projects or smaller projects as opposed to large. But if we were able to get, say, a few million

[00:52:31] dollars handling design of the section or something, then that's money we can take out of the overall project and maybe we can get it done a little sooner up in the cip or something like that that's the idea we're going to be very deliberative though in terms of making sure that it's it's part of the board cip you know yeah so that's that's one that's our first goal is to make sure that we work toward your work as members yeah and this has been a project that's been around a long time that we finally got to the cip but it's not getting funding for another four or five plus years, I think. Okay, thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Briskman. Thank you, Madam Chair. I

[00:53:08] might need two rounds. So you mentioned an equity lens, and it's my understanding that in these sorts of big bills that we are more competitive if we can show that the projects will serve underserved communities, right?

[00:53:32] That's correct. Okay. So, you know, COG has the equity emphasis areas, and so I would think that projects within the equity emphasis areas would probably qualify, be more qualified in that process. Are we looking at, and I can think of two projects, the missing sidewalk links perhaps, and then even the recycling project, And then also our Parks and Rec master plan, all of those I would think could be, this would be applicable to all three of those.

[00:54:07] So will we be looking at those things? Yes. Okay. Excuse me. Short answer is yes, we will be looking at all of those. Okay. Because I noticed that Parks and Rec wasn't a referral agency when you were doing the consultant report. So that made me curious.

[00:54:23] Yes, so actually we engaged parks early on in the process, and their diverse interests kind of fit within that green space that we can look at for a proportion of the IIJA.

[00:54:38] Well, we have an opportunity to sort of steer staff in a direction that we think more matches the direction of this board. For example, school security, I really have no interest in further hardening our schools.

[00:54:57] And so I would actually like us not to look at those sorts of grants. And also, I saw there were some things in economic development. And so I think that with the CHIPS Act coming down and some other opportunities that perhaps the Infrastructure Act may not be the right place for sort of economic development projects.

[00:55:18] So this is an information item, but are we actually going to be sort of voting on the direction of any of this? So our item does list that we will bring back quarterly progress reports as well as take direction from the committee.

[00:55:35] Okay. The committee only or the full board as well? I want to be clear, too, is that we are going to work toward what the entire board, the corporate board, has agreed upon at the board level.

[00:55:50] We'll be providing information updates in terms of our progress. But we have a lot of good guides out there, the adopted CIP, the comprehensive energy strategy. So you'll get situational awareness in terms of what we're applying for.

[00:56:09] and be able to provide comment but we will be working toward uh where the board wants to go overall okay thank you very good oh uh supervisor saints thank you madam chair and just to clarify to ease supervisor brisbane's mind a little bit and i think that mr sandy got to a little bit in of his comments is most of this will be coming correct me if wrong from already approved items that are on the cip lists um so you have for example in sterling we have the wod trail sterling boulevard um project that they they're going to look at so it's all items that have already been

[00:56:46] approved in our cip that we've all put on there that's where they're pulling majority of the items from um because the goal again correct me wrong is to where we already dedicated funding but then they're like okay let's see if we get federal grants if we get the federal grants then they'll take the funding that we have and allocate that to other projects that we can vote on if that happens.

[00:57:08] Is that the plan? Yeah, that's correct. And we certainly will be looking at all the compliance guidelines for all the grants because there could be some grants that do not allow supplanting. But I will say that we will be really looking at the CIP.

[00:57:24] That's our first goal. And some of those other goals that we mentioned, the board has had a lot of deliberations on those efforts. So we're pretty clear our agencies that we're working with, DTIC, DGS, parks was mentioned, and others are pretty clear on what the board's programs are and what the strategies are.

[00:57:46] So we're going to be focused on the board's work. Anything else? Okay. Julie. Okay, just one other question I wanted to explore then. And because I know that IJ also is looking at clean water projects and lead pipes and that sort of thing. So has the county ever done sort of a survey of the county to see if any of our older communities, maybe in Leesburg or Sterling Park, Sugar Land, if there's actually a lead pipe issue in any of our communities? I would have to get back to you

[00:58:25] on that, Supervisor Brisman. I know that certainly for some communities that do not have public water, the county made a concerted effort to study those as part of the water and wastewater project, which the board funds every year. And one of those applications and discussions is before you tonight.

[00:58:45] So, but in terms of a comprehensive survey, we'd have to get back to you. And it would likely have occurred through Loudoun Water. Okay, thank you. All right. Thank you, John, Megan, thank you very much. All right, we're going on to action item number eight, an update on Town of Percival projects.

[00:59:06] We've got Mark and Jim. Nancy, Scott, anytime you guys are ready, Mark.

[00:59:29] We're ready. Thank you. Good evening, committee members. As we have for the past several months, we're giving an update on Town of Purcell projects. And since we have talked about a lot of these projects in the past, I'm not going to reiterate things that we've already talked about.

[00:59:48] I'm just going to highlight some of the new issues that have come up since the last month's meeting. I'm going to start with the legislative applications that have been before the town, specifically for the Western Loudoun Park and Ride and the Fields Farm Park developments.

[01:00:07] The town council remanded those applications back to the Planning Commission at the end of December, and then the Planning Commission again looked at those in January and provided their recommendations to the town council on January the 19th.

[01:00:25] And as they did previously, the Planning Commission recommended denial for all of the applications. I will also say that as part of the recommendations, the Planning Commission did say, did provide some proposed conditions for the park development if the Town Council were to consider going against their recommendation and actually approve it.

[01:00:54] But they did not provide any recommended conditions for the park and ride, which we'll discuss in a minute. The next thing that occurred is, as you all know, the board approved last week a purchase agreement being issued for approximately 143 acres just to the west of Percival.

[01:01:23] And then on the next day, on February the 9th, or sorry, February the 8th, the county then withdrew our special use permit application for the Fields Farm Park development. And right now, the town council has scheduled a public hearing for the remaining legislative applications, which would just be for rezoning and the park and ride on February the 21st, a week from today.

[01:01:55] and currently they're scheduled to take a vote on it two weeks from today on the 28th and we will plan to be in attendance at those meetings. Regarding the the other thing I want to talk about is the Route 7690 interchange. Since our last update there was a public meeting that was held on January the 25th at the town hall to provide the public an update on what are all the design elements and how did we get to where we are over the past 10 years of development

[01:02:32] for that project to bring things in perspective as well as into context of how this process has gone to just make sure that sort of the facts have been laid out to the public. Since that meeting, we have been working to try to schedule a separate meeting just with the HOA, the Catoctin Meadows HOA, and we're still working to find a date for that.

[01:03:03] I'll just add that the HOA leadership is offered a date in late March. Now, one other item that we've pursued formally is we have written a formal request to VDOT.

[01:03:25] We've asked for them to help us in the land acquisition and in providing some relief to some of the smart scale funding deadlines that are currently being displayed on the dashboard given the unique circumstances that we've come into.

[01:03:43] And we have heard back from VDOT they are working on a response to our request. They're having the Attorney General's office review some of the issues before they provide us a formal response back.

[01:04:00] But they're working on a response. And the one thing I do want to point out that was listed in the item is for the 7690 interchange project, we're pursuing how to deal, how to move forward in a sort of a sequential order of things.

[01:04:24] First, as I had mentioned, we had made some requests to VDOT to see if we can obtain some of their assistance, both on the land acquisition and some of the smart-scale deadlines. At the same time, if

for some reason those efforts aren't as fruitful as we hope, we would look at potentially exploring some way of backfilling the smart-scale funding if we had to pull it because of inability to keep the project moving at a pace that VDOT is willing to support.

[01:05:03] and in order to continue working with the HOA in the town. And, you know, if, again, for some reason, after going through those efforts and if we're not able to make sufficient headway at that point, then we would come back to the board and discuss potential phasing of the project or redesign.

[01:05:29] So, I mean, we're pursuing it in multiple sort of cascading ways. to try to come to a successful conclusion. And as mentioned in the item, we will continue to give monthly updates to the Finance Committee just so that you're apprised of how that process is going.

[01:05:50] If I could just add, to clarify, the potential redesign option that we would consider is removing the eastbound off-ramp from 7 to 690. And if we were to do that, it is a relatively minor movement for that interchange.

[01:06:09] And the thought there is that the interchange itself, the predominant movements are the other movements, is so important to the regional kind of transportation, the regional transportation network, that, you know, a delayed implementation of that eastbound off-ramp or just removing it entirely, we could make it potentially into a later project if we wanted to add the fourth leg later.

[01:06:34] but that was one of the ways that we considered moving forward if there was no other way to move forward with the bulk of the project. Thanks, Nancy. Any questions for staff? Supervisor Letourneau. So what exactly is the purpose of the HOA meeting?

[01:06:54] When we held the public information meeting at the town hall, there were a fair number of residents within that HOA there. We have been working with the HOA board with respect to our land acquisition needs, but had not been successful in actually scheduling a meeting with the membership itself.

[01:07:15] But there was an interest in the attendees of that meeting in January in having a meeting with the homeowners. And so we did volunteer to go ahead and schedule the meeting with the HOA. But they're not available until late March. Yes. So it's just that busy out there.

[01:07:31] They couldn't find any time for us between now and then. They cited that they needed to provide adequate notice to them. Well, sure. I mean, I can understand that. But you started the engagement in January? Yeah. Okay. Well, I mean, again, I just have the risk of having to lose the funding the longer this goes on.

[01:07:52] And I think, as I understand, there's not a defined time when that happens, per se. But, you know, do you feel the risk is increasing every month? Go ahead, Mark, if you want to ask. So in our sort of informal discussions with VDOT, we've talked about this quite a bit and sort of reiterated to them at least verbally that part of, in addition to assistance on the actual land acquisition, part of what we're really requesting is some relief on

[01:08:26] whatever the deadlines are or what the, you know, the established schedule is on the dashboard for smart scale and what we what one of the the head of their local administered projects program mentioned is that their push with localities on some of these smart scale projects has more to do with inactivity as opposed to those who are actively pursuing and having problems and okay

[01:09:00] yeah they they said that they are very confident that we are actively working okay well yeah we They certainly are. They're very aware of what's going on. Let me just move on real quick because I'm running out of time. So we did withdraw the Fields Farm Park application, right?

[01:09:19] Okay. So, but there's still public hearings scheduled for those? So there were two different projects that were being processed concurrently. One was the Western Lounge Park and Ride. Park and Ride, yeah. And the other was the park. So the Park and Ride application is still active.

[01:09:35] So no longer a public hearing on that. It's only the Park and Ride lot. Yes. And that also, but that also requires a legislative application. So if we're going to withdraw that, why don't we just do that now and not bother with the public hearing? Well, they're recommending.

[01:09:51] That is one of the alternatives that was discussed in the item. No, it's not what they're recommending. All right. Supervisor Briskman. Thank you, Madam Chair. Well, I mean, if we do it, if we recommend it tonight and then we vote on our next board meeting, that's, anyway, yes, I agree.

[01:10:12] I think that we should withdraw that one as well. But I'll stick with that for just a second. How many commuters are actually using the lot right now? Because staff is also recommending that we discontinue the service from the park and ride lot.

[01:10:28] Do we know how many people are using it? Between the Hamilton and the Percival lot, it's under 100 right now per day. Under 100. And prior to COVID, it was overflowing multiple hundreds in each location.

[01:10:46] But currently, it's dozens in each location. Dozens. Okay, okay. So under 50? Under 50 in each location. Okay, all right. That makes me feel a little bit better. Let me just ask one more question about the smart scale and the interchange. So the smart scale funding is for the interchange project, yes?

[01:11:05] There's currently smart scale funding for the interchange and the commuter lot department. And the commuter lot. If we decide that we're not going to do the commuter lot, does that threaten the smart scale funding at all? So if we were to not advance the park and ride lot, we would need to return the smart scale funding for that project.

[01:11:25] We would have to return some of it. Okay. And then you mentioned that perhaps we take the eastbound ramp, remove that from the interchange. Would that be, and then you also said this is a regional issue, and that's probably why we got the smart scale.

[01:11:44] But if we were to remove the eastbound ramp, wouldn't that also put in jeopardy some of the smart-scale funding? Because I'm sure that they look at this as a complete project that could alleviate regional issues. And that would be a topic for discussion with VDOT.

[01:12:01] And part of the reason why we've been working in partnership with them to see what the alternative ways forward would be, and part of the reason we asked for their assistance in that last letter was because we're going to need some flexibility in terms of schedule, or in terms of project scope moving forward.

[01:12:19] Okay, thank you. Supervisor Kirshner. Thank you, Madam Chair. So just a couple of follow-up questions. One follow-up question to what Ms. Letourneau said. In terms of the smart scale, well, let me ask it this way. Do we anticipate getting a letter back soon from the Attorney General as to the smart scale, or are we thinking a week, are we thinking a couple weeks?

[01:12:41] I spoke with Mr. John Lynch, the head of the regional VDOT office here just today, And he indicated that it was still under review. I think we're expecting it to take another couple of weeks. And do we, I know this predict, but do you get any sense of that it's going to be favorable to us?

[01:12:57] Hey, yeah, we're going to give you more time. We know you're working with a difficult issue with the town. Or do we have no idea at all? I'm hearing indications from staff that they feel like they cannot accept right of way that is encumbered in any way. But they wanted that confirmed by the AG. Okay. So part of the, so I want to kind of then adjust.

[01:13:16] Part of this interchange, in large part, is issues that are occurring with the interchange at 287 and 7. Is that correct? So if we abandon, at some point, this interchange project, we're also now putting in jeopardy the traffic issues that are happening at 287 and Route 7.

[01:13:33] Am I correct? That's correct. And so it's not just the park and ride. If we abandon the park and ride, that puts in jeopardy the SmartScale funding, potentially the project there. And therefore, am I understanding that correctly? Just to be clear, there's two separate allocations for smart scale funding.

[01:13:52] One is to the park and ride, and one is to the 7690 interchange. Oh, there are two. Okay, thank you. So stopping the one would not stop the other. I see. Okay. That wasn't clear from Supervisor Brisbane's question, but thank you for clarifying that.

[01:14:08] That helps a ton. And then the final question I have in my last minute is the commuter, the ridership. I know we saw a significant fall off during COVID.

[01:14:24] Are we seeing any of that creeping back? I mean, I guess my thought process is if we abandon this and we have kind of ridership we had in 2019 when COVID hit, we kind of shot ourselves in the foot by not maybe pursuing this or at least allowing to the end of the month to see what the town does on this.

[01:14:44] Yeah, unfortunately, just enough time hasn't passed where we're seeing a trend that we can actually project from right yet you know we're hopeful you know because workplaces are still sort of going back to a new normal and we're just not there yet to see that trend we're seeing a creep up but yeah so even if we everything went smoothly the town proved gave us the approvals that we needed what kind of time frame are we working looking at before we could even complete that commuter lot in terms of schedule for completion time time schedule it would probably another three years so another three years ridership could very well easily be up above that

[01:15:22] okay thank you all right we do have a motion um and i'm going to read it uh i move that the finance government operations and economic development committee recommend that the board of supervisors direct the county administrator to withdraw legislative application for the western loud and Park and Ride lot from the town of Percival should the town council fail to act by the end of February 2023. I further move that should the town council either fail to act or deny the county's application on the western Loudoun Park and Ride lot the finance government operations and economic

[01:16:02] development committee recommends that the board direct the county administrator to begin the process of ending commuter bus service to the current Percival Park and Ride lot located at the former Virginia Regional Transit Facility and notify the Loudoun County Public Schools that the county no longer requires use of the lot. Is there a second? All right, second by Supervisor Letourneau. Is there discussion? Supervisor Letourneau. Yeah, so your recommendation is that we wait to see how it how it plays out and then withdraw the application if it's denied but if

[01:16:40] it's denied can we even withdraw it no if it's if it's denied then you're right you're correct we can't so wouldn't we be better i think we kind of talked about this wouldn't we be better to go inactive or just withdraw it because we can't if it's denied we can't bring it back for a year right tim so i think the thought process on this is that the the transit service you know the lot that's out there is about half full and so as uh uh drawing a blank on the last name but as nancy

[01:17:19] said earlier the uh the boy is boyd as ms boyd said earlier the the issue is not enough time has passed for us to really know if the if the the demand for service is going to return and so at this point what we're recommending is if the town goes ahead and gives us our approvals for lot by the end of February, we should go ahead and, you know, have our approvals a lot. We will have time at that point to wait and see if we actually have ridership that returns. We can progress the design and then make a decision before we build it, depending on what ridership

[01:17:54] looks like at that time. If the town doesn't act by the end of February, then we're suggesting we withdraw the application at that point, just because that's the timeframe we've kind of been giving uh to the town and to but what if they deny the application by the end of february then the application is dead and then we would go ahead and cancel the service because we don't have a we don't have a future site for the lot yeah i mean i'm but then i can't come back for a

[01:18:26] year for a year all right okay seeing no other comments all in favor please say aye any opposed say nay. All right, that will pass 5-0. We have, normally right now, I would ask the committee members if they want a break for dinner. I know I do have a committee member who does want a break for dinner. I shall not say who, but this would be a logical time. Oh, Nancy, Mark, Jim, Scott,

[01:19:05] thank you very much. Good work, and thanks for working so hard on this. How many people do we have here for the fire and rescue system strategic work plan and how long do we anticipate chief johnson how long will this take 15 minutes can you hang in there for 15 all right chief we'll take you now madam chair can we just go straight to motion on this one um yes we certainly could

[01:19:41] go straight to a motion on this, and people can ask questions inside the motion. So, Mr. Sains, do you have a motion up at this time? Sure. All right. I move that the Finance, Government, Operations, Economic Development Committee recommend that the Board of Supervisors endorse the Loudoun County Combined Fire and Rescue System Strategic Work Plan for 2022 through 2027.

[01:20:09] Is there a second? Second by Supervisor Briskman. Comments, Mr. Sains? All right. Chair Randall? Thank you, Madam Chair. Good evening, everyone. How are you doing? So, read through this in its entirety and talked to some of our firefighters.

[01:20:36] I do have some suggestions about, and it's actually about the strategic work plan session in the book that I would like to put forward. One, when you are talking about your SWAT overview, you're talking about your strengths. When you do the strengths, you mention the support from the administration.

[01:20:52] You do not mention the support from the elected officials. I'd like to see that in there, actually. I'm not kidding. I'm dead serious. That's on page three. On page 11, the mission statement is to provide residents and visitors with effective cost-affection prior protection.

[01:21:17] I think you might want to add businesses in there. I think that might be something that might be good to add in there. When we have further conversations on this, I do want to maybe offline have a question about how the LOSAP is going as it relates to the volunteers, how many people are still in the

books, how many people are not in the books, when was the last time we had an audit of that, who collects points, and who gets that retirement on the LOSAP.

[01:21:48] That would be something I, when we, because I think this is just to send it to the next, So when we come back the next time, those questions are something that I will ask. And then there is just a general question about when the volunteer companies who are doing a great job, and as I say all the time, the system is so seamless, but when they're coming into the facility, So is it the same equipment that's being used, or does equipment have to be changed out and other equipment has to be loaded in?

[01:22:28] Is there, like, volunteer equipment and career equipment that changes out when the volunteers come in? So no, ma'am. We utilize each other's equipment. Okay. So in volunteer stations, they may own some of the equipment. We ride on their equipment. They ride on ours.

[01:22:43] There's no prohibition. All right. All right. So there's no issues with staffing models to load things and unload things? That's all there? Okay. All right. So I wanted to make sure. I'll ask about the LOSAP questions later, but those two smaller suggestions, I'd appreciate them. Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor Letourneau and then Supervisor Bresman.

[01:23:02] It seems like a good time to say that I sit on the LOSAP committee, and I'd be happy to provide a – we had a – our last meeting, I think, was in December. It's going pretty well, investment-wise, but we can – there's definitely good financial accounting, and we've got great people in the county that are involved in that, so we can share that information.

[01:23:23] Anyway, there were two things that stuck out with me. One of them concerning was the lack of EMS culture, and I wanted you to kind of elaborate on that, and then I guess I'll get my other question out since I only have three minutes, which was the real challenge with the volunteer staffing issues are having to backfill that coverage.

[01:23:45] And I know one of the things we were trying to do with some of the shift changes and things like that were to be more orderly so we knew what we needed and we weren't putting some of our career staff in a position of having to fill at the last minute shifts that are abnormal, which then create scheduling issues overall.

[01:24:02] So I wondered if you could give a bit of an update on kind of how that transition has gone. I know there was some pushback when we first did it, as we expected, but I think we've kind of, you know, hopefully smoothed that out a little bit. So those two questions. If you just elaborate on what exactly do we mean by EMS cultural issues, Is it that there's not a lot of desire to serve that specific function, or what do we mean?

[01:24:25] So I'll defer the EMS culture question to Chief Williams here. And your question about the staffing, you know, if a volunteer corporation is short on staffing at a certain point in the day, they notify our battalion chief, and at that point we fill it either with existing staff or on overtime if we have nobody available.

[01:24:46] That really works well. I mean, typically we ask that they give us an adequate notice. But sometimes it's like we all have at our work sites, right? People call in sick, people get. Yeah, I mean, when we went to, when we changed our shift schedule, we heard a lot from the volunteers that there was going to be problems with that.

[01:25:04] And there were, I mean, initially we were getting, but has that smoothed out? Yeah, absolutely. I mean, we went from the four-tier shift to a three-tier shift, went 24 hours a day. To be honest, I don't hear any concern about that. We are staffing some volunteer shifts, and we have some folks that, you know, in the evening get detailed to other stations because the volunteers may come in, staff a unit, or folks are then either utilized at that station or in other places to upstaff units, EMS unit, rehab unit.

[01:25:34] So I believe it's going very well. Okay. Those concerns that we first heard and have been dismissed, in my opinion. So Chief Williams, EMS Culture. Good afternoon, folks. The first thing I want to assure you of is that the EMS care and the EMS system that we have in Loudoun is very strong.

[01:25:54] You read about and learn about some of the significant incidents and the whole blood factor program and the successes that we've had, which is, I think, over 30 in that program. We have some exceptional providers in EMS. I know that firsthand.

[01:26:11] Yes, sir. And that's both career and volunteer. And the work that Dr. Morgan does along with the EMS division, you should have no concerns about the delivery of care that our system provides to the residents and visitors of our community.

[01:26:28] That said, the EMS call volume can be high, and it can be demanding, and it can be all through 24 hours of the day. It's not unusual in a fire-based EMS system to have a more pervasive fire culture.

[01:26:47] There's a lot of action. There's a lot of adrenaline associated with fire responses. So that's a tension that is, again, not unusual in a fire-based EMS system. We do not want a two-separate system.

[01:27:04] We have had some challenges with recruiting ALS providers. in our system, and we have executed some good strategies to increase those numbers, which should come to bear really probably more fully at the beginning of the summer, late summer.

[01:27:24] But that's just a tension that, again, we work through. We promote it. It's clearly the highest percentage of our call volume. But I'm not worried about it, but it's certainly unchecked is a threat to any fire-based system.

[01:27:44] Very good. Supervisor Briskman. Thank you, Madam Chair. And this looks great. I'm glad that you guys actually do this when you're supposed to on time. I think you said it's every five years or something like that. I was encouraged to see that you put something in there as far as recruitment, that you're going to be looking at diversity and inclusion in recruitment.

[01:28:12] I don't think I saw that really anywhere else besides recruitment. Like, for example, in your mission statement or in your training goals and those sorts of things. And when we were at the volunteer graduation the other night, Chief Johnson, you mentioned the Tyree Nichols case and that there were actually EMS and firefighter folks that have been charged, I believe, for not rendering care in that case.

[01:28:38] And I don't think at all that this would happen in Loudoun County, but I think that having something like that in your mission statement and maybe identifying it in your training just to make sure that we don't end up in a situation like that in Loudoun County might be something to consider.

[01:28:56] So if I could offer two things. One, we take this so seriously, diversity, equity, and inclusion. We are in the final stages of developing a diversity, inclusion, and equity policy just for fire and rescue. Awesome. Our rush has helped us with that. And I will offer that before we did this, I had reached out through all my contracts nationally and statewide, and there are no policies within fire and rescue.

[01:29:20] We received one really good policy from San Diego, and that's it. There are no policies around this topic within fire and rescue. I can say that. Very few. So we are setting the pace, I believe, with this policy, which is pretty extensive on how we treat diversity, equity, inclusion in our fire stations.

[01:29:40] It speaks to things like the things on a daily basis, showering, bunking, and all those things that we're getting into some pretty deep details of how we operate. And that's in the final stages of that policy. So, yeah, I'm proud about that.

[01:29:55] Oh, that's really, really great to hear. I didn't know that. So that's really great to hear. And I think that we could be really proud in Loudoun County if we're nationally leading the way on that. So thank you so much for sharing that. Just one more quick thing. We call it pride training where we go back for EMS refresher training every year.

[01:30:14] All of our EMS providers have to go back for this refresher training. And we refresh our skills on patient assessment, new techniques and tools and equipment that we use in EMS field. One of our scenarios that we're doing this time is first and foremost that we've ever done is a behavioral health scenario. So this came about about some of the things that you've seen on the news where what happens when we go to the scene of a behavioral health emergency where that may not be a medical emergency, but there's a behavioral health emergency.

[01:30:42] What are we supposed to do as firefighters and EMS professionals? We are developing a policy where we're allowed to administer medicine to a person rather than waiting for police to do something or law enforcement. We have actions that we can take to help calm a patient down and relieve that behavioral health emergency so then other things can take place.

[01:31:02] So this is a training scenario that we've initiated during this year's PRIDE session, what we call it, and it's being really beneficial. We have crews that have gone in there and really, you know, have done from one gamut to the other, and we have constant communication.

[01:31:19] So we're looking to continue those efforts because that's what we're all facing, right? a lot of behavioral health emergencies, and we want to be prepared for those things. That's awesome. Thank you. I almost wanted this on consent, and so I'm so glad it wasn't now. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, and Chief, thank you.

[01:31:34] One of your career professionals rendered service to a member of my family recently and did a superb job, came back to check in the ER on my family member and just really impressed with what you all do.

[01:31:52] Okay, we have a motion by Supervisor Sane, seconded by Supervisor Bristman. All in favor, please say aye. Any opposed, say nay. That will pass 5-0. Thank you all very much. Okay, we are going to break for 15 minutes, and so everybody be back here by 7.36.

[01:32:21] 7.36.

[01:40:31] Lisa, are we good to go?

[01:53:27] All right.

[01:54:17] We're going to come back out of recess, and we are going to take up item number 10, which is the Waterford Water Feasibility Study Findings, and Mr. Brown is here. Dennis Cumby, Scott Fincham, got all you guys.

[01:54:41] It's a complicated issue. I asked Mr. Brown because I knew we'd have a lot of long issues tonight to go through it, but emphasize the highlights, and then committee members can ask questions.

[01:54:58] - Thank you, Chair Olmsted, members of the committee, and I appreciate you allowing us to present this this evening. This is a study that's a long time in the coming, and I think in the outcome, it has been a quite impressive study, thanks to the community and our team that's been working through this.

[01:55:15] As you mentioned, Mr. Cumbie's here with us this evening, and Mr. Fincham's here, so if we go deep into some technical stuff, have I have top cover so as as requested I will hit some highlights and if we need to go deeper we can we can do so just for for sake of time if that's acceptable to you yes okay slide number two so in 2019 the village of Waterford applied for and what the application was accepted for water wastewater program feasibility study it was approved and then it was subsequently completed and the highlight of that was that there are notable potable or drinkable water

[01:55:54] problems within the village proper and that looks if you go to the next slide we're showing the the next like what that looks like is in the in the the yellow area was really the original proposed study area through the work of staff and with the community the decision was made to go and expand it out to the existing wastewater a service area and that allows for flexibility of either decreasing it at a later time as more more study is performed. But there

[01:56:29] are 154 parcels that are considered. 145 of those are fully within the boundary. Next slide. Next slide. So what you see here on this slide really tells the story. The area in red is the worst area for groundwater yield. And then in the, I guess that's technically orange, it gets a little bit better and then the yellow it gets better and the blue is is pretty much a high yield scenario but you'll see at the heart of the community there are significant challenges for yield these are

[01:57:07] less than two gallons per minute and some of them are much less than that there are a number of existing wells that are hand dug wells uh they're whether or not we haven't confirmed them they're up to uh could be up to 25 hand dug wells many of them if not most of those are still very active So you'll see that there's concerns with the sanitary elements of the potable water.

[01:57:30] And there are properties that actually have to bring in water to bathe and to drink and to cook. So the study identified some very clear issues with potables. So the feasibility study identified several options to look at.

[01:57:47] There were five options that they looked at in a high level. Some of them were non-starters, but as part of a feasibility study, you do have to evaluate those. Option three, which is the communal water system, was not only selected as one of the two recommendations, but it is the preferred recommendation, and we'll highlight some of those elements on slide 10 right here.

[01:58:11] So what a communal system really looks like, and if I wander too far, Scott will start looking at me nervous, and he'll correct me. but this is a community that is served by community wells and so in this scenario approximately six wells would need to be drilled to then go to a treatments treatment facility and then redistributed throughout the community where those wells are and where the actual treatment facility is is notional at this point this is just a conceptual layout it could pretty much go anywhere that it you get the greatest yield to accomplish the end goal of providing

[01:58:48] potable water to the community. As I mentioned, approximately six wells would be needed to service this particular area. A point of importance here is the capital cost. Now, these are random order of

magnitude costs. The preliminary engineering would need to be pursued in order to really pin that down, but this is what the preliminary random order magnitude number was talking about to service this particular project of approximately 10.4 million on average. So in summary of the feasibility study itself, the consultant and

[01:59:26] staff working with the community identify the communal well system, which was option number three we just briefly highlighted, as the preferred choice. And after we go through the feasibility studies, we work very hard to try to get through surveys the input from the community. The surveys came back with approximately 80% of the community that agreed there needed to be a potable water solution. Seventy percent of the community said that the option three was the preferred solution if we were to do a water solution. So with that information, we did move forward with that as

[02:00:02] our recommendation. There are a couple of factors that we looked at, one of which was viewshed. This is a very unique place. Waterford is a very unique place in our landscape. And so preserving that viewshed is an important factor. So where you place pressure tanks, things of that nature for potable systems is important, but the other thing we looked at was opportunities to save, well, just create economies of scale, and as you may recall, just down the road, 2.4 miles down the road is another project that we're working on in Peonian Springs. Now, the board has approved

[02:00:40] \$3.5 million through the ARPA funds to begin the pre-construction and design work for Peonian Springs. Peonian Springs is a dual project, meaning that it has water and wastewater needs there. So that project is exploring both of those avenues. And that is, again, random water magnitude approximately \$31 million to accomplish both of those. With Peonian Springs, the initial concepts, we're looking at an independent water system with a water treatment facility and an independent wastewater system with the associated plant for that as well.

[02:01:18] Through this particular study, Peonian Springs, there was some additional work that was done in 2022, which is what we call a technical memorandum, to look at some issues deeper. And in that technical memorandum, they proposed a potential interconnected communal system to solve the public health needs in the villages of both Waterford and Peonian Springs.

[02:01:41] So we spent some time with our Department of Planning and Zoning peers to see if this was really viable and the determination was made that yes because they are two communal systems they're not connected to the central system two communal systems that have public health known quantifiable public health issues that the connecting of those two is allowable under the rural policy so the next step to that was for us to look at is that really viable for these two communities so if you can go to the next slide so we started exploring the the viability of an interconnected communal system that would do a number of

[02:02:16] things. One, first and foremost, as it relates to this feasibility study, is solving the potable, the drinking water problem in Waterford, and then potentially mitigating the challenges with drinking water in Peonian Springs. The other thing that comes to bear on this is, and I know there's a lot of details that I'm throwing out in here, is over the next several years, Loudon Water is going to be upgrading and improving the wastewater plant in Waterford. That provides an opportunity to potentially, through exploring it through preliminary engineering, whether or not we could

[02:02:54] connect the Punion Springs community to the Waterford wastewater plant. Now, why is that important? Because when you're in the rural environment, creating infrastructure is a significant lift. And if you looked at these two communities in isolation, you would essentially have a total of four plants

constructed in the rural community. You'd have the existing plant for Waterford's wastewater and a new water plant for Waterford's water. You'd also have

[02:03:30] a new wastewater plant for Peony and Springs wastewater and a new water plant for Peony and Springs water. I did that without tripping up. That was pretty good. So looking at them individually, recognizing that we have public health concerns at both locations, we would have a net of four plants. If we looked at the concept of interconnectivity, it could legitimately reduce it down to two plants which is just not only a significant savings in the construction side of things but it also is a significant savings for loud and water from an operational perspective long-term operational so with this information we felt it was important to to bring

[02:04:08] this conversation to the board as part of this waterford water project recognizing that is the focus of this feasibility study and solicit the committee's consult and recommendations as it relates to pursuing this interrelated work i already mentioned the uh the waste the wastewater plant at waterford so at a high level staff is asking for a number of of of uh pieces of direction first and foremost is whether or not the uh the the committee is is interested in recommending to the board that we continue investigating this potential interconnected communal system to serve

[02:04:48] both communities uh the second is that we're requesting that the uh the committee and the and the board consider applying 1.5 million dollars from the existing water and wastewater fund to uh to fund the pre-designed work and cost analysis of this potential interconnected communal system now if that pre-design shows that it's not viable we certainly have the option of result of of reverting back to the two independent systems but those are the those are the two major asks that are before you today is do you want us to continue to pursue that interconnected system and

[02:05:25] the receptivity for utilizing 1.5 million dollars from the existing water wastewater fund to create a new cip project to move forward with this so that is the nutshell thank you thank you ernie that was really well done um chair randall and then supervisor briskman um thank you madam chair um first of all it's interesting what what after you do this position you find fascinating right so you know the least romantic reading in the world is wastewater system management reading, which I'm getting in my bed at night with.

[02:05:59] It was a fascinating item, so thank you. And I never thought I would understand all these things, but I do. So I have a couple of things. First of all, I think it's funny that only Waterford, only Waterford, 80% results on their survey, 80%, only Waterford, nobody else, you can never, that's an incredibly high number.

[02:06:23] What I don't know is this. All that you said makes sense. Why you should do a communal system makes sense. Having good infrastructure in the West, in rural areas, period, makes sense. The cost savings makes sense. All that makes perfect sense. And if it were just that, I would go, obviously, yes, do it.

[02:06:41] My question is this. I've never really bought the argument that roads alone bring housing. I've always thought that infrastructure, especially water and sewer, bring housing. And so intercommunal system, and this may be a question for planning and zoning staff, could it be possible that you get more by-right uses that pop up now because you have this both wastewater but potable water, more importantly, that is safe, stable, and filling in the gaps?

[02:07:18] That's my, I don't want to see homes. I don't want to see buy right homes. I don't want to see growth. So that's, and obviously I don't want to spend extra money either. That's my only thought. And that might be, again, it might be a question for planning and zoning. But do you, with your background, what are your thoughts about that type of infrastructure growing buy right homes where we may not want them, where I definitely don't want them?

[02:07:44] Certainly. And I think that's probably a legitimate concern of many policymakers when it comes to this issue. And it comes down to the planning effort associated with the commission permit, the planning commission permit, and those service districts.

[02:08:02] And the attached memo from planning and zoning really does dive into that a fair bit. And I would say that under current policy, they have stated that no, it does not allow for that, the additional connections, except those connections that are in those service areas, which would be the boundaries within Waterford and the boundaries within Peony.

[02:08:23] Boundaries within the village of Waterford? Yes, ma'am. That I'm not really concerned, wouldn't be as concerned about. The straw between the two, the lines between the two of them, the 2.4 mile run? That would not. That would not. It would be only in the villages, which wouldn't, well, I don't believe it would happen anyway.

[02:08:42] Under current policy, that is correct. Okay, so that's a great answer, and I'm absolutely fine. Thank you. Thank you. Supervisor Briskman. Thank you. So you're asking for us to endorse \$1.5 million in the CIP for a project.

[02:08:59] What I'm curious about is how much do you think the project will cost in the end? Because we have already, I believe, committed ourselves to \$31 million for Peonian Springs. No? Well, walk me through this. So, and that's actually an integral part of this because the board has only committed 3.5 of the ARPA funds for Peonian Springs.

[02:09:24] And that's pre-designed. And that's really important because the pre-design or the preliminary design work doesn't commit the board to any project. What this does is, in this particular case, it allows the \$1.5 million out of the approximately \$11 million that's in the wastewater fund, gives us more data to make an informed decision.

[02:09:44] We actually can get more realistic costs. We can get more information about land acquisition, survey work, utility locates. Could this project really work, and what is the true price tag on that? I mean, the random order of magnitude estimates are just that.

[02:10:01] They're estimates. And until you do the preliminary engineering, you're not really going to be able to refine that. At that point, the board can make a decision as to whether or not they want to fund the project. Now, in this particular scenario, there's a lot of conversation, you heard it today, about the infrastructure bill.

[02:10:17] There are enormous opportunities out there for grants to pursue those. And I can tell you Waterford, unlike any other community I've ever seen, is uniquely and powerfully positioned to assist in pursuing grant opportunities for infrastructure. And if the board were to choose to establish that as a project, that would be something that a partnership could be crafted through the county being a fiscal agent for such an endeavor.

[02:10:43] Okay. So are you saying that the Peonian Springs project was not estimated to be \$31 million? It is estimated to be \$31 million. We have not committed to the \$31 million. Okay. That's the estimate. Yes, ma'am. And then we didn't have an estimate yet for the Waterford project.

[02:10:58] We do. It's on average \$10.8 million. \$10.8 million. Right. Okay. So we don't have an answer yet if the combined project will basically be more than \$41 million. We do not, and that's what we think that the existing ARPA project that is going on now in Peony Springs, and should the board choose to allocate this \$1.5 million, those two projects together will give us a much better feel for what the individual projects will be and the collective projects.

[02:11:27] You know what I don't know? We know we have to spend our ARPA funds by 2026, I believe, but do we know if there's a time limit on the IIJA or is that project-specific and grant-specific? I don't have that.

[02:11:43] Anybody know? Tim. John. Thank you. Mr. Sandy always comes in with his cape to save me.

[02:11:59] I think it gives us a good amount of time. Thank you. Supervisor Kirshner. Thank you, Madam Chair. So first of all, I find it ironic we're talking about a water system for Payonian Springs and the village of Waterford.

[02:12:18] I don't know what went wrong, but something, I don't know if it was in the naming, I don't know if it was what we did, but obviously we don't have the springs and not enough water in Waterford, but thank you, not only to this committee, who I think is about ready to pass this motion, it sounds like there's no real opposition, just some questions, and really good questions, actually.

[02:12:39] Thank you, Ernie, and your team. I thank you for the Village of Waterford who's here and some folks from Peonian Springs and all those who have reached out to my office in the time that I've been in office. And I think this started slightly before my time. Great work.

[02:12:55] Thank you for those who came out last night and kind of briefed some of the stakeholders there in the Village of Waterford last night on the staff. I think we have a really good product in front of us. And I hope that what we plan to happen, that is I'm assuming, Mr. Brown, that we in all likelihood are expecting some economies of scale for this kind of joint program.

[02:13:18] We don't really have that dollar figure yet, but that's kind of what this seed money will help us determine. Is that fair to say? That is very fair to say. And just to give you an example, when we were looking at, in the Peonian Springs scenario, just running the wastewater up to the Waterford facility, Loudon Water estimated that that could save as much as 25% on the wastewater side for Peonian Springs.

[02:13:45] Again, high level, preliminary estimates, random water magnitudes, but that is taken into consideration because building a new plant and maintaining a new plant is significant. Right. And we're going to have to fix that wastewater system in Waterford already. That's already being budgeted through Loudon Water.

[02:14:01] Through Loudon Water. So connecting to that from Peony and Spings just makes a lot of sense. So appreciate it. Thank you very much. I won't take any more time. Thank you. All right. Ernie, everybody, thank you very much. That was really well done. I appreciate it. I'm going to make a motion.

[02:14:18] I move that the Finance, Government Operations, and Economic Development Committee We recommend the Board of Supervisors endorse a communal water system in the village of Waterford and

direct staff to continue evaluation of potential interconnected communal systems to address water and wastewater needs for the villages of Waterford and Paonian Springs.

[02:14:39] I further move that the Finance, Government, Operations, and Economic Development Committee recommend the Board of Supervisors create a Village of Waterford communal water system capital project and direct staff to move funds in the amount of \$1.5 million from the Capital Improvement Program Water and Waste Water Fund, CO-2091, to the new project in order to complete preliminary design work for a village of Waterford communal water system.

[02:15:09] Is there a second? Second. Second by Chair Randall. Any discussion on this? Chair Randall? Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, it would be my intention to put this, if it passes unanimously, on the consent agenda so we don't have to come back here when it comes up because I'll put in a consent you know first of all thank you this is very very well done the items very well done this was never a question of what that we have to do was a question of how we're going to do it because you can't have people that don't do not have drinkable water and when you look at that map it's really shocking I mean you know when I first heard about it you know I thought it was you know maybe the same number of people who were having issues that weren't having issues but it's

[02:15:48] not that there are a lot more people who are having issues with you know drinkable safe water than not and no matter who you are you can't you can't buy enough water to to cook with and bathe in it's just not even possible and so this this you know Waterford is just a gem of Loudoun County and and quite frankly a gem of the entire Commonwealth and so it's tough when you have a historic place because you don't want to do so much with it so much to it that you disturb what is historic and so unique about it.

[02:16:21] At the same time, we have to keep it up. And this is not the only thing that needs to be done in Waterford to make sure it's a safe, wonderful place for people to stay. But I do want to say thank you. And I want to say thank you to citizens of Waterford because we were never discussing if.

[02:16:37] We were always discussing how and how we could afford it. So I appreciate all the efforts. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I will put this on consent. Thank you. All right. All in favor, please say aye. Any opposed, say nay. That'll pass 5-0. Thank you very much. Have a good evening.

[02:16:52] All right. We're going to move on to item 14, the American Rescue Plan Act, ARPA, update recommendations for ARPA reserve funding. So I think we have John Sandy and Megan Cox again.

[02:17:10] Val Marie's coming down. Did you put 11%? Yeah. I think I asked for that one. Okay. Thank you all for being here. And we are ready when you are.

[02:17:27] Well, good evening, Madam Chair, members of the Finance Committee. This item provides staff recommendations on how to program the remaining \$7.5 million of ARPA reserve funding left from Trunch 2. The item details the process that staff took to explore potential projects and funding.

[02:17:49] Recommendations included, including, excuse me, a community survey and internal and external outreach. And the funding categories that we're recommending are in child care funding, transportation, capital infrastructure, transformational initiatives for resident support, and small business support, and finally, a housing system.

[02:18:11] Staff has prepared a presentation, and I can turn it over to Megan Cox and John Sandy, or we can take questions. We do have a number of subject matter experts on the line as well. Do you all want a

presentation?

[02:18:29] You've had it, Matt. All right, could you just, could we go to questions then? Yes, ma'am, we're ready. Valmarie, thank you. Any questions? Julie. Thank you very much.

[02:18:46] I actually wasn't in favor of doing the survey at first, but I'm really glad we did. I think it gave us a lot of really valuable information, and so I appreciate that the survey occurred, and I'm impressed that we had 800 respondents to the survey.

[02:19:03] I just did want to note that, although I know staff provided links to our previous ARPA spending during the survey, that most people probably did not know that we had already spent or that we had already allocated a good amount of money to rental assistance and housing and that we had already operated an award-winning business interruption fund grant program.

[02:19:29] So I think we should look at the responses with a little bit of an eye with understanding that. But I was really glad that, of course, that child care came up as a critical need in our community. As I said earlier, you know, I learned even more when I was down at NACO over the weekend about the critical need for that in our communities.

[02:19:56] There was actually recently a Forbes article that said child care is basically like an economic threat to the entire United States because it's \$122 billion that it could basically take out of our economy because we don't have child care happening.

[02:20:18] And that's Forbes saying that. And, you know, we lost 80,000 early learning and child care workers post-pandemic. So I'm really glad to see the staff is recommending the \$250,000 for the child care for nonprofit work.

[02:20:37] And it's my understanding that about \$75,000 of this will go to actually the countywide child care needs assessment, which is fantastic. I'm so happy. And I shared that with some of our NACO partners while I was down there this weekend, and they want to hear more because we really worked closely to do that.

[02:20:56] And then it's my understanding, and I want you to maybe expand on this just a little bit, that the other 125,000 in this, I'm sorry, I'm talking about the nonprofit items. I'm on the wrong item. Well, anyway, my question on this, and I'll go back to that other question later, but my question on this, you're suggesting a million, I think, in the first year to draw down costs and then a million to respond to the child care needs assessment.

[02:21:24] How many families do you think we'll serve or how many parents do you think we will serve in that first section or that first million? Do we know? So it really does depend on the cost to the provider and to the family.

[02:21:40] So if they have one child or two children in child care, it would make a difference to the number of families that we could serve. So yet to be determined. Correct. Okay. All right. I will save my other question for the other item. Thank you.

[02:21:55] Chair Randall. Thank you, Madam Chair. Again, thank you. This is a lot of work on this item, and thank you. I do have a lot of questions. The two items are kissing cousins, so I can understand how you would think, because they're very, very close. You know, some of the answers were really perplexing to me.

[02:22:12] If you go to page 8, the transportation capital infrastructure preference, you know, and the question was how they would be ranked. And 37% of people ranked that they went more in transit, which really shocked me since we have buses that are going out empty.

[02:22:31] I mean, so what I see on the ground and what I saw in these answers just didn't mesh with me. I would have never thought that transit would be so highly ranked because our transit, as important as it is and as much as we want to fix all parts of it, it's not used.

[02:22:50] It's not utilized nearly to the degree that I would think it would be for people to say that that's a very, very important issue. Also, in that same one, you know, there's such a clear concern about green space and rural infrastructure, as we just discussed.

[02:23:07] And I was also, I don't know what the word is. I don't know if I want to say please, surprise. I don't know what I want to say. The people who are doing these jobs, who are so aware of the mental health challenges and the behavioral health challenges in our county and, I guess, everywhere, was also really, really interesting to me.

[02:23:31] The people really realized that the mental health substance use crisis is fueling everything else and how it's fueling everything else and what we need. And finally, I thought that who responded was interesting. You know, 54% of responders were women. Wow, right? That kind of goes to who, I mean, not that everyone doesn't care, but who is doing the work and seeing the issues sometimes. I thought that was really interesting.

[02:24:01] There will be more questions I have because, you know, I do think, Ms. Turner, it's a fair question to explain maybe if there wasn't some miscommunication of when money was going to be released. I think that's a fair question to explain because I do think, I don't think, I think nothing happened, I think there's some miscommunication.

[02:24:22] So I think some of that stuff being talked about is important to say. this item is it took so much time and so much community involvement and and my only so first of all thank you secondly how much money what we have had to have to complete all the things that we that were being asked for that we that we wanted a ballpark so for this item or for the nonprofit well well I guess for the nonprofit for the nonprofit item we received requests over 11 million for

[02:25:02] the \$2.5 million that we had. I want that on the record. I want that on the record. Thank you. Thank you for all the work you've done on this. And thank you for everyone taking, taking, responding. It's been pretty amazing. Okay. I'm going to make a motion. I move the Finance, Government Operations, and Economic Development Committee recommend to the Board of Supervisors the recommended uses of funding for \$7,500,000 of the American Rescue Plan Act for the following as outlined in the February 14th, 2023 Finance Government Operations and Economic Development Committee action item.

[02:25:40] Is there a second? Second. Chair Randall got in there ahead of you, Supervisor Briskman. I'll give it to Chair Randall, but good try. I'm picking the next one, too. Andy. Discussion on the motion, Chair Randall.

[02:25:56] No, I don't have any discussion. Just thank you. Supervisor Briskman. Thank you. No, I just wanted to say thank you one more time to staff and I'm super excited about the early learning and childcare initiatives and really appreciate everyone's work on it I can't tell you how excited I am thank you

wonderful all in favor please say aye any opposed say nay that'll pass 5-0 thank you all very very much all right we move now on to item 15 American Rescue Plan Act update recommended

[02:26:29] recommendations for tranche two non-profit grant program val marie well good evening again madam chair members of the finance committee this item provides staff recommendations for funding awards of 2.5 million to non-profit organizations through arpa tranche two funds staff followed a competitive grant application process for non-profit organizations that provided a program or service addressing safety net services. Again, it was a competitive application cycle where we received

[02:27:02] over \$11 million in requests for the \$2.5 million that we have available. Staff went through a thorough and thoughtful and deliberate process of reviewing the applications and ultimately making funding recommendations. Staff provided two funding scenarios in the item. However, staff is recommending funding scenario one staff again has a presentation and I can turn it over to Megan Cox and mr. John Sandy or we can take questions and again we do have some such a subject matter experts in the room and on the

[02:27:40] call right with the committee like a presentation I'm sure for this one I would all right okay all right so as miss Turner stated

[02:28:09] These are going to be some just brief outlines of the process that staff took to come to the recommendations, both scenario one and scenario two. So the purpose of the tranche two funds was to support sustainable recovery from the pandemic, specifically for those who were disproportionately impacted.

[02:28:32] And the way that disproportionately impacted is stated in ARPA is low-moderate income as well as historically underrepresented or disadvantaged groups. We also requested from organizations, nonprofits, that they have long-term sustainable outcomes in the areas where there could be emergency services requested.

[02:28:56] And if they had a sustainability plan that included sun-setting programs, we would also want to hear about that. So if the need decreases, we would anticipate that that would decrease as well. Our original funding categories did include rental assistance. And with the passage of the January 17th ARPA update for housing and community development, we reabsorbed those funds and redistributed them across the other categories.

[02:29:25] so we didn't want to leave any funds on the table if we could help it. We did include the child care needs assessment as part of this tranche. We anticipate that it will go to a nonprofit, while none have been identified yet. We do want to make that clear. We anticipate that, you know, this really is an immediate need for the child care providers who will be required to participate in the Virginia Quality Measurement Improvement System, VQB5, and could use the supports to be more successful in that program.

[02:29:59] So just a quick note, across the years of the pandemic, the board did fund 105 organizations throughout this. These are all nonprofit organizations that were funded, and you can see the totals there for the general fund, community development block grant, ARPA, and CARES.

[02:30:19] We also, as a result of using tranche \$2, switched, needed to, there was a necessity to use the funds in a subrecipient status rather than a beneficiary status for ARPA. And essentially what that means

is as a subrecipient, the organizations would be responsible for all of the compliance that is associated with federal funding.

[02:30:45] That includes reporting, that includes uniform guidance, et cetera. It also means that any of these organizations who receive over \$750,000 from any federal source could be subject to a federal audit. So we did look at the compliance and reporting for past performance.

[02:31:04] That was a part of the scoring criteria, but it was not an area where anyone was screened out of the process. So in addition to some preliminary screening, making sure that they had their 501c3 status, SEC, good standing, past performance, and data, we did have a number of application criteria that were listed and assessed by a panel of subject matter experts.

[02:31:34] The necessity for this is really data. We had to have adequate data to then defend the decision to recommend funding for each of the organizations. And in part, this really is a requirement for ARPA to be able to collect reliable and valid data that supports the outcomes that were listed as part of these criteria.

[02:32:00] We also, under ARPA, are required to report on the use of evidence-based practices where applicable. And so this really does cross each of the funding categories, and we needed to ensure that the appropriate practices were being employed.

[02:32:17] And finally, we wanted to ensure that the organizations we chose had the appropriate capacity to partner with their other organizations and had the capacity to be a referral from smaller organizations who may not have the capacity to administer these funds.

[02:32:38] And so, really, partnerships was very important to make sure that not only they're reporting adequately from multiple sources, but also that they have the capacity to support large groups within the population. So, as I mentioned, step one was a screening process that DFB staff performed to just verify SEC status and tax filings, review of the funding request and the associated data, and then whether or not their past performance was compliant with federal reporting.

[02:33:12] And step two, very similar to our annual human service nonprofit grant program, we convened and trained subject matter experts who then used a standardized review form, scored independently, then came together and went through consensus scoring to make sure that, you know, one or the other didn't miss something.

[02:33:33] in the application. We also consulted with human service departments to make sure that the need was confirmed and that we were able to fund appropriately given the number of organizations that were applying. So as Ms. Turner said, we do have two scenarios. We are recommending scenario one that awards eight organizations who scored 85% of the points possible or higher, and this would include 42% of their request. These are life-sustaining emergency services, and really

[02:34:12] we focused on those disproportionately impacted groups that are low-moderate income as well as may have other risk factors. So we were looking for a combination of low-moderate income and reduced fees certain to population. So scenario two awards 13 organizations who scored 75% of the possible points or higher and those who were scoring the highest we provided the 42 percent there were two organizations who performed very well so we allocated 42 percent of their request

[02:34:51] and then the remaining 11 received 27 percent of their request and so this expands a little bit beyond the life-sustaining services, but still is providing emergency services. So, really, this expands those targeted populations beyond low-moderate income and associated risk factors.

[02:35:15] So, this could be, you know, to help clear wait lists or to help clear and maintain services. So, funding scenario one, which is staff's recommendation, is on the screen. And this would allocate roughly \$2.468 million.

[02:35:36] We do include the child care needs assessment in this allocation as an allocation for Scenario 2. And as you can see, the recommended percentage is roughly 42%. Scenario 2 would allocate roughly \$2.495.

[02:35:55] And again, you can see the allocations from the PowerPoint. And with that, we will take questions. Thank you very much, Megan. Questions? Supervisor Letourneau. So would it be accurate to say that if we were to apply the methodology and standards that we use for our nonprofit grant program as part of the budget process, that would line up with the Scenario 1 recommendations?

[02:36:25] It would in some respects. So if we're looking at the human service nonprofit grant process, we would have allocated a higher amount to those that scored higher. um and then correspondingly the lower scorers those who got closer to 85 percent would get a lower amount so it would be proportional and what we did wasn't across the board 42 percent because they all scored 85 percent or higher but if we were to go to scenario two that would be even further away than from that approach that's correct how did you factor and so this is one-time

[02:37:00] money you know this is money that needs to be used for essentially i would think we would want the organizations to use it for one-time purposes. So how did we factor that into the evaluation process? We requested, actually it was a requirement of the application, that they submit a sustainability plan and that they could indicate which services may sunset or any other areas that would include donations or other grant opportunities that they could use to fill in the gaps long term. And so those sustainability plans were evaluated by our reviewers. Okay. And were there some organizations

[02:37:40] that perhaps they didn't score as well because some of those requests were for things that there wasn't a sustainability plan for? That's correct. Thank you. Supervisor Bristman and then Chair Randall. Thank you. So I think I'll just go to the child care needs assessment and then I have another question about the overall project. I think the, aside from the 75,000, the rest of it's going to be used so that the providers can be up to date or in line or compliant with state

[02:38:17] law, if that's, if I'm saying that correctly. So I think helping them be successful is a little bit of a nice way of saying, I mean, they could literally go out of business if they are not compliant with the state law so this is a very very critical thing that we're doing with this with this money um so thank you again for that i really appreciate it um and then uh my other question is that staff had said something um i think in the item and maybe when we were briefed

[02:38:49] that the concern about going to scenario number two um might be that the organizations would not be able to be compliant maybe with the ARPA requirements for getting funding through ARPA.

[02:39:09] And I guess what I'm wondering is, please confirm that that's the case. And then secondly, what are the consequences if, you know, there's probably an audit process that happens after we allocate ARPA

funds. So what's the potential risk to the county? What could be the consequences if one of the nonprofits is not compliant with the ARPA requirements?

[02:39:40] So to answer the first part of your question, we did take into consideration past performance. During CARES, as well as the first tranche of ARPA, we dedicated DFB staff time to technical assistance, as we will with tranche two.

[02:39:57] But in some cases, organizations took three quarters to become compliant with financial reporting. And so that is one piece that we wanted to make sure, based on past performance, they could be compliant with federal reporting under ARPA.

[02:40:13] The second would be for some of the implications or the concerns that it would bring up in an audit. They could also be audited as an individual organization, and there could be repercussions for, at worst-case scenario, giving back funds.

[02:40:35] Madam Chair, Supervisor Brisbane, just so we're clear, we do provide, we're required to provide quarterly reporting to the U.S. Treasury. We're required to provide an annual report to meet those compliance guidelines. And we also, as you know, we're also audited. So that could show up on our audit as a finding that we were not in compliant in addition to whatever Treasury sends to us of

[02:41:07] not being in compliant. So it'd be, it'd be a risk. A high, high risk or just a moderate risk or a low risk? Thank you, Madam Chair. Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Madam Chair. So, so with due respect to Mr. Letourneau's question, I think the difference right now that we're talking about is I don't think we can compare this moment with our regular grant funding process because I do believe in this moment, COVID changed a lot. This is not, we're not just going through the regular, The needs are higher, the needs are greater, the needs are more severe.

[02:41:42] The acuity is much, much higher. The acuity is much higher. And so when we have, like, normal grant funding times, I have never gone against the staff recommendations. I have so much respect for what you all do and how you make the recommendations.

[02:41:57] This is not normal times. This is different time. That's the first thing. Second time, this is one-time money, but it doesn't have to be used for one-time needs. We have to show that the nonprofit can sustain if they start something. They have to be able to sustain them. So let's not confuse one-time money with one-time needs because they're actually not the same thing.

[02:42:16] Thirdly, and with great respect, I don't believe that some of the ones in scenario two, all the ones in scenario two, maybe not all, but very close, are not life-sustaining. I think that at this moment, life-sustaining is more than just you can eat and have clean water and have food.

[02:42:34] I think with the mental health issues that we're seeing, when we know that one-third of all young, young ladies between 10 and 25 are considering suicide, when we know that suicide amongst our elderly, our 12% of the population is elderly, they're committing 18% of suicides.

[02:42:51] We know suicides among African American men are growing. We know the opioid use, the anxiety use. These are life-sustaining issues right now. And because mental health is health, we can't just look at what will keep you physically alive. We have to look at what keeps you kind of mentally and emotionally alive.

[02:43:08] And when I look at some of these nonprofits, when I look at a place to be, and I know what they do, when I look at Loud Education Foundation, and I know what they do, I would make the case that these actually, in this moment, post-COVID, and with needing the social connectivity that we have not had for the past three years for very good reasons, for very good reasons, I'd make the case that these are right now life-sustaining.

[02:43:29] Maybe they were not three years ago. Maybe they won't be three years from now. But in this moment, these are life-sustaining nonprofits, and I would actually lean toward, in fact, I will be voting for scenario two. I know these nonprofits. We've seen their records. We know that their work they've done.

[02:43:45] We've encouraged them, begged them, asked them, cogealed them, almost threatened them to go get nonprofit grant writers, and they did. They've done what we've asked, and now this is the result of them doing what we ask. And so these are not people who are fly-by-night that we don't know.

[02:44:00] These are solid nonprofits who serve our community every day. So I so respect what you all are saying and why. But knowing the mental health crisis in this country right now, I want to make this money go as far as possible. And the first two nonprofits, Loud and Hungry Leaf and Tree of Life Ministries, which do feed people, they'll get the same amount of money no matter what.

[02:44:20] So I'm going to go with scenario two. I do want, like you, Miss Turner, to explain the slight mix-up, if you could do that, with when the money was going to be released. So the applications went out in October, and they came back in, I believe, in November.

[02:44:38] You can correct me if I'm wrong, Ms. Cox. And we had an opportunity to review the applications. We also put out the survey. The survey came out and ended in December, and we had an opportunity to go through that in January to do an analysis on the survey.

[02:44:58] Um, it was my understanding that we thought that we'd be able to come to the second meeting in, um, well, the finance meeting, um, in January, but we were not able to make that deadline, which is why we're here in this meeting here. Very good.

[02:45:16] Um, vice chair Sains. Thank you. So how many organizations originally applied? We had 27 applications. 27. Okay. And so in one scenario, we're looking at eight. Another scenario, we're looking at 13. So explain real quickly, why didn't you just use the regular process?

[02:45:35] You said it's a little bit different than the regular grant. Yes, so the human service nonprofit process, quite frankly, there was a bit of discrepancy where some organizations, if we're looking at it proportionally, wouldn't get as much, but they still scored 85% or higher.

[02:46:00] So we had between 85% and 95% for the eight organizations in Scenario 1. And so rather than do a proportional score, it was just a flat apportionment because there were so few.

[02:46:16] And you feel either the 8 or the 13, what they're proposing to do is they qualify for the one-time use. And, you know, to Chair Randall's point, yeah, but obviously we definitely know all these organizations, and I don't think nobody's questioning what these organizations do day in and day out for our community.

[02:46:42] They definitely go above and beyond. We're all very familiar with all of them. So why not just say scenario two because it hits more of the organizations than the first one, scenario one?

[02:47:01] So we were also looking at the amount of funding it would take to have a meaningful impact for the population that they were serving. So that is an assumption from staff that with additional dollars, a larger impact could be made by each organization.

[02:47:22] We can use the argument of larger impact with the more organizations selected to receive funding. Okay. All right, thank you. I'm actually torn, but all right, thank you. All right. I'm going to make a motion, and I would anticipate that Chair Randall may have an alternate motion, but I am going to make the staff motion.

[02:47:46] I move that the Finance, Government Operations, and Economic Development Committee recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the board fund Scenario 1, which provides larger awards to fewer organizations that have demonstrated adequate performance related to ARPA outcomes, are in compliance with federal reporting requirements and support emergency services for residents disproportionately impacted by the pandemic.

[02:48:13] Second by Supervisor Letourneau. I'm going to support the staff recommendation for a couple of reasons. One, I appreciate staffs looking out for the nonprofits that may not be able to meet the federal standards.

[02:48:35] That worries me because that money could turn into a tremendous cost and potential penalties to organizations that just don't have the wherewithal to meet federal standards with this money.

[02:48:53] In addition, I agree with staff that the higher amounts for a fewer number of organizations are going to have more of an impact on the populations, the vulnerable populations served.

[02:49:12] Every single applicant is a superb applicant, but I'm worried about the ability of some of these organizations that would be funded under Scenario 2. I'm worried about their ability to meet all the paperwork and verification requirements that the federal government puts on this program.

[02:49:38] I'm also worried if they don't, if they are not able to meet these requirements, then the county itself is potentially accountable. So for those reasons, I'm going to support scenario one. Chair Randall.

[02:49:54] Thank you, Madam Chair. So I'm not going to make an alternate motion because were I in your place, I wouldn't accept my motion. I would consider it an out-of-order motion because it's literally another motion. entirely i'm not going to support the motion but i'm not going to make another motion i am going to say this and i and this is a big thing for me to say i'm going to lobby the hell out of this item and i don't lobby i don't lobby so me saying i'm going to lobby i'm going to lobby for a couple of reasons one they are different vulnerable populations it's not like the money is all going to the same vulnerable population and so if it's more here and more here these are very different vulnerable populations that's the first thing secondly i know for a fact i know for a fact

[02:50:34] that some of these organizations have reached out to supervisors to meet with them, and they haven't been able to get on our books or the books of our staff aides. And so we can't ask them to prove something to us if we don't have time to sit down and meet with them. We can't. So I'm going to ask that my colleagues find time or have your staff find time to sit down and meet with them so they can show you their books, so they can walk you through.

[02:50:58] Because I've done that. I'm not arguing for something I don't know up here. I know these organizations, and I know their books. So sit down and meet with them, talk to them, go with them, go

through them with them. And if you have concerns when you finish that, then, hey, I get that and I'll support that.

[02:51:14] But right now, Scenario 2 really does cover a lot of mental health services needs. And there is a difference between food service, which is obvious, life-sustaining, and someone who is having other issues that might be covered by Mobile Hope or A Place to Be or Loud Education Foundation that does, by the way, more than just education.

[02:51:42] And so those mental health issues at this moment are life-sustaining. Again, if we were further away from COVID or before COVID, I might think differently. But having just dove deep into COVID numbers and what the mental health crisis that we're in because of COVID, I believe this is one of these times we have to do the most good for the most people in the most way as possible.

[02:52:12] And I think scenario number two does that. And I'll go talk to staff as well. If you can show me that any of these nonprofits, you really do not think that they can pay this back and make them, you show me, then I'll come back with something else. I promise I will.

[02:52:27] But you've got to show it to me because I've done my homework on this item. I've done my homework five times. So you've got to show me. You come show me and you're happy. But as of right now, I know what I've looked at. I know what I've seen already. I know these nonprofits. And I'm not saying I know they do good work.

[02:52:44] Of course they do good work. I'm saying I know their numbers. I know their books. And so I'm not going to do an alternate motion. I'm not going to vote for this motion. But I am going to work this issue and lobby this issue before it comes back. Thank you, Madam Chair. Very good. Thank you. Supervisor Letourneau and then Supervisor Briskman.

[02:53:02] Yeah, so if we're looking specifically at the mental health category, there's one additional organization that's funded in Scenario 2 versus Scenario 1. However, it's at the direct expense of the two organizations that are funded in Scenario 1.

[02:53:17] The problem is it's not like this is extra money. This is money that's coming from other organizations. So to support scenario two, you have to support a cut in IMEDS funding from 418 to 269, a cut in laws funding from 228 to 146, and then in a different category, a cut from Loudon Cares as well as cuts to Dulles South.

[02:53:40] So I think you could make a very valid argument one way or the other about how you serve more people effectively. And at the end of the day, for me, I have been really adamant for a long time that I don't think that the Board of Supervisors is necessarily the best arbiter of that.

[02:53:59] And that's why we set up that staff process. I don't want to be in a position of having individual organizations come lobbying me for money as part of this process. I would not take those. I didn't say you did, Madam Chair. But I don't want to take those meetings specifically because that's why we have you guys doing this.

[02:54:19] So if you are saying that there are gaps in the information that was coming in some of the applications, then those organizations need to address that with you, not with us. So that's why I want to stay out of that process because it's impossible.

[02:54:36] This is a terrible choice to have to make because they're all wonderful organizations. And I could very easily sit here and advocate for one just as much as the other. And I can't be in that position. So that's why we have a process. We've asked you to do it. You've made your recommendations. And for me, unless there's something truly egregious that's come up in the process, I'm not going to override it. I just don't feel that that's my, I don't think that's the right thing for me to do. I think it's to review the process, make sure it's following some logical train of thought, make sure that the money is going out, make sure we're meeting all

[02:55:13] the requirements, which I think you've done a good job with. But at the end of the day, I do trust with recommendations, and I don't see compelling evidence to override them, especially because there are implications to overriding them. It's not as if, you know, those other organizations wouldn't suffer some if we do override them. It's a tough, you know, that's what happens with these kinds of situations. So I will support the chair's motion. Thank you, Supervisor Briskman.

[02:55:43] Thank you, Madam Chair. Yeah, this is really, really hard. I'm going to, what I'm going to do support this motion knowing that Madam Chair Randall is going to vote against it, which will force a discussion at the business meeting. And in the meantime, I'll have a couple more conversations with staff about the implications of potentially organizations not being able to meet the ARPA requirements, and that that is a higher standard than our normal nonprofit funding

[02:56:20] process. So I just want to understand what the implications are if we were to go to scenario two and, you know, what the consequences would be if someone runs afoul of the ARPA guidelines. So I'm still open to scenario two. I'm just going to vote for scenario one tonight and then have some further conversations and definitely be having some conversations with Chair Randall.

[02:56:45] Thank you. Thank you very much. All in favor, please say aye. Any opposed, say nay. And that will pass for one with chair Randall voting nay thank you very much all of you all right we move now on to item 16 the FY 2024 budget development addition of a crisis receiving and stabilization center to the capital improvement

[02:57:15] program Megan Margaret this is the crisis and stabilization center 16 yeah Good evening. We are here to present on the addition of a crisis receiving and stabilization center to the CIP.

[02:57:39] I have a presentation, but I can just offer a few opening comments and ask you if you want the presentation. This item is being presented tonight because it is a little atypical of our budget process, which is staff's recommendation is to add this new facility to the first year of the proposed CIP.

[02:58:00] The proposed CIP, as it's being recommended later this evening, fully funds the facility. But we wanted to take this item to remind the Finance Committee what this crisis receiving and stabilization center is and why we are recommending it for addition to the CIP in the first year.

[02:58:22] So Ms. Graham is with me from the Department of Mental Health, Substance Abuse, and Developmental Services. This facility has featured prominently in your discussion of your legislative program this year, but if Ms. Graham wants to make a few comments about what the facility is, and then we can answer any questions you might have.

[02:58:44] Thank you very much. Good evening. Just to kind of give you a little history, back in July of 2021, DBHDS closed the state inpatient psychiatric hospital care for a period of time. They have since restored operations to all but about 20% of the system.

[02:59:01] So roughly 200 beds remain offline. As a result of this, there is a waiting list to gain access to inpatient psychiatric hospital bed care. And this results in a situation that we've referred to as boarding, which is time spent in an emergency department awaiting transfer to an inpatient psychiatric hospital bed that right now can run anywhere from eight hours to six or more days.

[02:59:29] So the individuals who need inpatient care are in the emergency departments sort of jamming up the emergency departments and are very often in the custody of law enforcement who is remaining with them for a very long time.

[02:59:47] At the same time, Virginia has been building out community services and moving in the direction of the Crisis Now model, which aligns with the National Guidelines for Behavioral Health Crisis Care as published by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, otherwise known as SAMHSA.

[03:00:09] And this model has at its core a couple of principles and then a couple of categories of care. The first three are anyone, anywhere, anytime, and then the categories of care are someone to call, where that's 988, which launched back in July, which is the suicide and crisis lifeline that anyone can call anytime from anywhere and receive assessment for suicidality and also emotional support.

[03:00:46] and the answers of that call in our regional call center can then work with that person to either resolve the issue in the call or refer the person to the next right service. That can include someone to respond, which is a mobile crisis team that we have operational in our region.

[03:01:08] And tonight I'm here to talk to you about the third thing, which is a place to go. A place to go under this model is a crisis receiving center. A crisis receiving center is some place that's open 24-7 that you can just go to, similar to an urgent care center.

[03:01:28] And upon walking in, everyone will receive an assessment, a bit of a conversation, and you can also go to what we call the 23-hour assessment recliners, or you can go into the Crisis Stabilization Unit. The facility that we're seeking to build will be operated 24-7 to provide adult services to anyone who walks in either by a 23-hour assessment bed or crisis

[03:02:03] stabilization stay. Sometimes it might refer the person back to the emergency department, but by and large, this model will reduce our over-reliance on the emergency department and it will be what we call the emergency custody order drop-off location so law enforcement will be able to drop individuals off and then go back about doing community law enforcement so um i really that that's the overview of what the service would be i'm open to any questions wonderful um

[03:02:38] any questions supervisor briskman thank you um so this is not the year that we're supposed to be adding items to the cip that's correct okay so go ahead sorry this this is an amendment you're you're you're you're right yeah um and this is the reason why we're bringing this item to to have this discussion of why we're recommending it yeah yeah i i understand the need um but right now we are

[03:03:11] experiencing the fallout of saying yes let's build a brand new parkview high school in the 24 year of the CIP, and now all these other projects in the school CIP are suddenly getting delayed to TBD or year 27. So what I would like to understand is if we put this in the very first year of the CIP, what projects are going to be delayed? The proposed CIP for the county and transportation side of the house, there were no delays with accommodating this facility. If you recall in

[03:03:51] the fall the board increased the annual debt issuance guideline and that additional debt capacity in year one was available for this facility on the school side my understanding is there are some changes and delays that were needed to be made for their capital renovation and renewal program and I think that's what you might be referencing we can have further discussions with LCPS on what exactly needed to be delayed to accommodate their CIP proposal.

[03:04:26] I think I know the list. So what you're saying is because we increase the debt limit, we will be able to basically issue bonds or borrow money for this project, and it's not going to bump any projects. So recommended funding is debt, yes.

[03:04:43] Okay. Does that mean we have to pass a bond referendum? I believe the debt is appropriation-backed bond, so no, that would not go to referendum. Interesting. Okay. All right. So my only other concern with doing this is we've been pushing really hard for the state to build one of these.

[03:05:02] And won't the state just say, oh, Loudoun County just went and built it with their money, so we not only don't need to build one, but we won't need to even reimburse Loudoun County for building it. Tim? Yeah, so the budget is made up of both revenues and expenditures, and so in order to get the facility built, it needs to be a part of our capital budget. The timing on this is, from our perspective, is critical. The mental health crisis out there and the ability to

[03:05:35] support the community with a facility like this is, it's an emergent need. We are flexible, certainly, on the revenue side. So as you have stated, we have asked the General Assembly to fund this crisis stabilization receiving center for a couple of reasons. One is that the facility itself requires a license from the state to operate. The second issue is the facility would become part of the state's mental health response system, which means they are likely, as part of our licensure, to require us to accept patients from throughout the Commonwealth and not just in

[03:06:14] Loudoun County. So in that situation, the right thing to do is for the state to fund the building as well as to fund the operations of the facility, particularly if they're going to ask us to accept residents and patients from other localities. Now, certainly Ms. Graham can elaborate on what we've done regionally. And so this facility is being proposed in conjunction with our other regional partners who are also taking a similar perspective on how to get these things constructed.

[03:06:46] So while the revenue that we're proposing, the revenue stream we're proposing right now is primarily allowed and funded, our intention, once it's a part of the CIP, is to continue to seek the state funding that is necessary, primarily because it's an addition to the state system, but then also to seek grant funding through the various federal opportunities that are out there.

[03:07:08] Thank you. I'll have a few more questions in a second round. All right. Chair Randall. Thank you. This is, you know, it's tough because all these things are so needed. They really are in the Crisis Stabilization Center. Right now we have our law enforcement sitting in emergency rooms for up to, is it up to 48 hours? Days, days, because they can't leave.

[03:07:31] And what that is costing, I don't even know what the numbers are, but it's costing us. And they're also out in the streets doing, you know, what they're, well, I won't say their job, but what they're more trained to do.

[03:07:47] So that's an issue. And I'm going to go back to what I said before. You know, it is hard to explain if you haven't been inside the numbers. the mental health, behavior health crisis, COVID has shifted us all

in. We have never seen this before. We're not in normal mental health times. We are in break glass mental health crisis times with these numbers. And people will lose their lives if we don't have this. They just will.

[03:08:26] They will lose their lives if we don't have this. You know, 988, I learned over the past couple of weeks that it took 911 years to be fully integrated and fully stood up. 988 is years from being fully integrated and fully stood up.

[03:08:43] You call 988, and you don't always know what you're getting or not what you're getting, but where you're calling into. Any 80% of 988 calls are resolved over the phones, but the ones that are not, we don't have in Loudoun County a mental health crisis team that goes out to a 988 call.

[03:09:02] It's our Leos that go out and then go to the room with them. So the other thing is, if I'm not mistaken, this is probably a Charles and John question, John Freeman, but I think the General Assembly this year passed this over because they didn't want to put anything in their budget.

[03:09:23] And so there will be no money, I think, this year for crisis receiving center in this region. Is that correct, Margaret? They didn't specify to the region, but currently, and I had to take a few days off, so I lost track and I haven't had a chance to talk to John Freeman.

[03:09:39] but there is a proposal from the Senate and a proposal from the House that ranges somewhere between \$80 and \$85 million to build crisis receiving centers. I think the one from the House was stripped. The Senate may not have been, but I think the one from the House was stripped. But they also come with considerations for equity and urgency across the state.

[03:10:01] The problem is with this, this is a pay me now or pay me later and pay me in lives moment. It really is. Thank you, Madam Chair. Very good. Thank you. supervisor Letourneau. So Mr. Hemstreet, if I heard you right though, if we have to go through a state licensing process for this facility, which means we're going, it's going to have to be a regional facility, even if we don't actually ever get any state funding for it. So I'm going to defer to Ms. Graham on that, but that is a possibility based off of my understanding.

[03:10:42] If I may, at present, DBHDS has not made official plans to add the crisis receiving center beds to the state bed registry that we currently have. As a region, Prince William, Loudoun, Fairfax, Alexandria, and Arlington, we've run numbers.

[03:11:05] And it's more important that these beds stay filled than that they be exclusively to Loudon or exclusively to Prince William or exclusively to Fairfax. In the item is a breakout of the kinds of beds that we're looking to build up.

[03:11:20] And based on the calculators, even by building up all of those beds we've identified, it's only 76% of what the model calculates is needed for the population in this area for crisis stabilization and 68% for 23-hour crisis assessment.

[03:11:37] Well, I was going to ask, so why don't we build a bigger facility? So, bigger isn't always better, and having these in Loudoun and the Prince William and Fairfax and then figuring out where we need to build next is, I think, sort of the approach we took.

[03:11:57] okay what is this nobody here may be able to really answer this but what is the strategy for trying to get state funding is this something the general assemblies don't i know what they are discussing this during this session but is this is there a possibility to get an allocation is it in either budget or is this really going to be a discussion for next year so right now we're pursuing the funding on the capital side

within the state budget yeah but is it if we don't now Obviously, we're proposing to move as quickly as we can on the construction of this.

[03:12:32] We got that. I think we're all supportive regardless. There is a larger issue out there, which is respect to the second piece of funding, which is for the operations of the facility. And so that is also a part of our budget request to the Commonwealth for when the facility is actually operational.

[03:12:51] But is there money in the Senate budget for allowed a facility? So it's, as Ms. Graham had indicated, there was an amount that was allocated overall. But was it an amount sufficient to actually fund the facilities that we know are in the pipeline?

[03:13:09] So I don't know what the rest of the state is asking, and they did. I don't remember which two regions, but the original proposed budget prioritized two regions in the state. So based on the read I did, should this money end up in the budget, there may be a way that we will reach out to DBHDS and say, hey, hey, don't forget about Loudon.

[03:13:34] We asked for 16.1 to build. And there'll be a process of how they distribute based on the equity considerations and the number of TDOs per population, ECOs per population, and I forget what some of the other considerations were.

[03:13:53] Okay. All right. Supervisor Bristman. Thank you. Just, I'm supportive of this. I just want to make sure we have the clear picture. Megan, when we put this in the first year of the CIP, it's not displacing anything, but could it prevent that we have another list of projects that are supposed to go into the CIP, right, when we do it next year for the two years.

[03:14:21] So is it going to prevent us from adding projects to the CIP that we are looking at? one of the other reasons and i didn't get to touch on this in my opening comments is that we are recommending this be added to the first year is because it will be cited on county land that we already own that is able to be um that the use is allowable under current zoning um it's going to be a lot cheaper to do it basically and we know what the facility is it's a relatively simple facility to build we know where it's going to be and so a lot of the pre-work and design that

[03:14:56] comes with a major road network project for example that takes years to start designing and planning where we're a little bit ahead of the game and that's why we're we believe that adding it to the first year of the CIP will be successful right but will it will it disallow adding new projects to the CIP that are on our truly let that let Tim get oh I'm sorry the answer to your question is it will have no impact on any year outside of fiscal 24 because the way that we do the debt issuance the debt is being allocated to the first year of the cip so it will have no impact

[03:15:35] on the additional years as they come in because your debt issuance guideline is based on a year by year basis okay all right okay um and then it's 46 beds right is that correct um and there's youth beds or so the youth beds are a separate facility so it's 10 short-term crisis stabilization beds for adults and 16 23-hour assessment beds for adults in this facility i'm sorry so how many a total would be 26 26 okay i was looking at the wrong list okay so 26 beds i mean and the fact

[03:16:14] the fact is if we have beds whether we're getting state funding or not we're not going to say no to somebody that needs a bed probably i would assume if there's somebody not from loudon that needs bed we're probably not going to say no no and the center is open 24 7 to anyone to come into so if somebody's drives to it and walks in right i'm not going to turn them away right okay thank you very much

thanks chair randall um i'm just going to try to if i mr letourneau my most recent conversations and and of course general assembly things change you know kind of hour by hour but my most recent

[03:16:53] CONVERSATIONS IS IT WAS OBVIOUSLY FOR A REGION NOT FULL OUT AND IT WAS THERE THERE WAS AMOUNT OF MONEY PUT IN THE IN THE SENATE SIDE AND THE HOUSE SIDE IT WAS IT WAS ALREADY STRIPPED OUT THE HOUSE SIDE BECAUSE THEY SAID THEY WERE DOING NO NEW CMP PROJECTS BASICALLY AND LAST I HAVE HEARD BUT IT'S BEEN A COUPLE DAYS IT WAS STILL IN THE SENATE BUDGET SO I'M NOT SURE WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF IT GOES TO CONFERENCE AND HOW THAT LOOKS BUT THAT'S THAT'S THAT'S THE LAST I HEARD I HAVE NO IDEA what's going on from three days ago.

[03:17:24] So if that helps at all. Thank you very much. This is not an action item for a vote tonight, but do you need any guidance at all? No. All right. Thank you very much. All right. We go to the final and most exciting item on the agenda.

[03:17:44] Item 17, the Capital Improvement Program presentation. Thank you.

[03:18:16] I wanted to take a minute before I start and introduce the staff at the table. We are missing this evening, Nikki Speight, our assistant director. She's homesick and very disappointed to miss the presentation. But we have Truman Horowitz, our capital budget manager.

[03:18:32] And then I wanted to introduce Kristen Drummond. She is our newly hired debt manager for the county. Hi, it's a pleasure to meet you all. So thank you. I am proud to present the county administrator's proposal for the FY23 into 28 amended capital improvement program.

[03:18:51] Consistent with past practice, the CIB is presented ahead of the county administrator's full FY24 budget proposal, which is scheduled for tomorrow evening. The county CIP is developed biannually, with a six-year period moving out an additional two years every other fiscal year, and so FY24 is the second year of the biennium or an amendment year.

[03:19:14] This slide shows the factors that influence the development of the amended CIP. In the fall of 2020, the Board of Supervisors revised the fiscal policy to increase the annual debt issuance guideline.

[03:19:31] This was beneficial in affecting a decrease in the use of local tax funding in the CIP, which had grown substantially over the last several years, and allowed existing projects to remain in the plan despite significant increases to project costs, particularly for transportation and school projects.

[03:19:49] FY24 is an amendment year of the CIP and thus continues to represent priorities identified by the board during FY23. The school's adopted CIP is fully accommodated in the county's proposed CIP through FY28. This year, transportation projects experienced considerable cost increases related to market conditions impacting construction costs, land acquisition, and extraordinary costs discovered through progressed project designs.

[03:20:18] And finally, renovation and renewal programs continue to be an important part of the CIP for both the county and schools. These are recurring programs that consume a large amount of funding annually. The county continues to ramp up its long-term program, but also has larger individual renovation programs, which you'll see in the CIP.

[03:20:39] This charge shows the major expenditure areas of the CIP over the last five years. Overall expenditures in the six-year planning period have generally increased over the last five capital budgets.

And the budget for the six-year CIP is approximately \$3.5 billion.

[03:20:57] Funding for county projects represents 35%, transportation at 36%, and school projects at 29%. The CIP proposal complies with all debt ratios and are within the current debt issuance limits.

[03:21:15] County projects total \$1.2 billion over the six-year period. The largest category is general government projects, which includes increased funding to the county's renovation program. The FY24 proposed CIP includes the addition, as you just heard, of a crisis receiving and stabilization center, which addresses a critical need for behavioral health intervention services in the community.

[03:21:39] Additionally, important information technology projects are funded to support county operations as well as public safety needs. Transportation projects total \$1.3 billion over the six-year period. Although road projects experience significant cost increases compared to the FY23 CIP, the county has been able to leverage additional debt, state, and federal funding, as well as targeted identification of projects for future grant applications.

[03:22:10] Funding is also included for design and construction of both shelters along the local fixed route stops, which was a topic of discussion during last year's work sessions. School projects total \$1 billion over the six-year period.

[03:22:25] The largest expenditures are attributable to other school facility projects, which includes the full replacement of Parkview High School. Other changes to the FY23 adopted CIP include renovations and additions to Banneker and Waterford Elementary Schools and increased funding for school security improvements.

[03:22:45] This slide presents an overview of the different revenue sources used to fund the six-year CIP. The CIP continues to leverage a variety of funding sources, which reduces pressure on local tax funding over time.

[03:23:01] As stated previously, the increase in the annual debt issuance guideline allowed for a reduction in the use of local tax funding in the CIP. For the amended CIP, debt is 62% of total funding sources and local tax funding is 22%, compared to 55% and 31% respectively for the adopted FY23 CIP.

[03:23:23] Before I go into more detail about the specific changes you'll find in the proposed CIP, I'd like to remind the committee of some important sections that you'll find in your document that we'll hand out in a moment. The Executive Summary, which is the first tabbed section, Volume 2, includes comparison tables.

[03:23:41] These tables compare changes between FY23 adopted CIP and the proposed FY24 CIP. FY23 data are shown in gray bars, FY24 data are shown in white bars, and any changes between the two are highlighted in yellow, as you see on your screen.

[03:23:59] This slide shows all the projects that were accelerated or newly added to the proposed CIP. This slide summarizes projects that were re-phased or replaced, and none of the projects shown here resulted from funding constraints or addition or acceleration of another project.

[03:24:18] Rather, new or accelerated projects were accommodated after these changes were made. Go to the next slide. SAF continued to facilitate the past practice of soliciting requests from our incorporated towns. This slide summarizes town requests that were accommodated in the CIP this year.

[03:24:36] These were relatively small dollar amounts and were accommodated with NVTAs 30% revenue. All were projects that the county previously committed to funding to and are anticipated to just be experiencing cost increases, which is why the funding request was made this year.

[03:24:53] Standing board direction is for staff to prioritize county and school projects over town requests. This slide shows the next steps in the board's CIP process. We've already been in contact with all of your offices to provide individual briefings on the CIP and answer any questions.

[03:25:12] By next week, we would ask for an initial set of questions on the CIP so that responses can be included in the work session packet, which will be distributed ahead of the next work session, which is scheduled for February 28th.

[03:25:29] During that discussion, we would ask that if the committee has requests for scenarios, that the finance committee give us direction for those scenarios, and we'll return back to the committee on March 8th for a straw vote and to send the CIP to the board's full work session on the CIP on March 13th.

[03:25:52] That concludes my presentation, and thank you to Mr. Hemstreet and Ms. Murphy for handing out the CIPs, and we're happy to answer any questions. Thank you very much, Megan. I appreciate that. Questions, Supervisor Briskman? Could you put the presentation back up?

[03:26:10] There was the slide when you were talking about accelerated projects. So, okay, so it's a two-column thing.

[03:26:31] So, like, for example, Route 15 Lockett's bypass is a new project? It's new to the six-year period, yes. It's new to the six-year period. Okay. So all of those projects are new to the six-year period in the CIP?

[03:26:51] That's correct. Many of these projects, so the Banneker Elementary renovation and addition, as well as the Waterford Elementary renovation and addition, and as Parkview you know, those are new projects that have been prioritized by the school board and were swaps with other funding from their, I believe, capital renewal program.

[03:27:15] Oh, so just because it's a new project doesn't mean that it's new funding. It's new funding. No. Okay, okay. They're just new to you. That's helpful because I'm like, I thought we weren't adding new projects. Yes, sorry, yes. Okay, okay, I get it. So I have some questions about the Parkview project.

[03:27:41] It's now in the first year of the CIP, right? It's in the 24 in the first year because it replaced the Parkview renovation. Correct. But do you think that it's actually possible to do a replacement in the same time that you would have done a renovation?

[03:28:01] For example, there needs to be permitting, design of a brand new school, and all these things. So is it actually possible to do it in the same year that you would have done the renovation? I don't believe that the funding is slotted in the same years that the renovation project was slotted previously, but that would be a question that we would need to ask LCPS to respond to.

[03:28:28] Oh, did it get moved up into the CIP? Did it get moved into an earlier slot? So I think there's two answers to your question. So part of it, as Ms. Burke just indicated, the replacement project is financially and from, as you correctly identified, from a construction perspective, longer.

[03:28:53] Yes. Larger and longer. So I believe the renovation project was either in 24 or 25, but it was much smaller. We were talking about a \$50 to \$70 million project.

[03:29:08] The way that they funded the replacement project is they did switch out funds, which I think you've alluded to previously. So they did take projects that they were now going to delay or cancel, so they then fit the appropriation into the years where they had room to fit it, if that makes sense.

[03:29:33] so the appropriation for a portion of the project appears in fy 24 and then the main appropriation for construction appears in fy 25 the construction process though is probably spread out over three to four years because of the amount of time that it takes to finalize the design do permitting and actually go through that construction process okay longer than you would have for the renovation project are they tearing do we know if they're tearing down the old school and putting the new school right in the same spot so that's a better question for the school I'll ask them on Thursday my preliminary understanding which they typically do on a site is you'll see the new building built

[03:30:13] like where the athletic fields are in those areas yeah okay and what happens is once the building is built then they'll demolish the existing structure and then build the athletic fields and those amenities where the existing structure is okay do we have does the school have contingency funds or do we just have the contingency funds and then how much is in our contingency funds right now to do the projects that are getting pushed out by this by the parkview project so again the

[03:30:49] so that we did allocate a contingency for the schools of somewhere around 25 million dollars as part of the annual fund balance process in january the specific trades that the school division made in order to fund parkview high school we would need to ask the school division to articulate that uh unless miss burke you know but i don't know what the topic no we would have to ask lcb i'll have a second round madam chair very good uh supervisor letourneau so um the

[03:31:23] comparison tables fy 23 and fy 24 adopted just looking at it these are what's supposed to show us what's what's changed between them i just want to make sure i'm reading it correctly so that the top part of the chart is what's proposed in 24 below that what's adopted um a lot of them have a lot of yellow which i assume means that there's there's changes or a change in revenue type oh okay oh between local tax funding and oh okay well it lists different so i mean so i don't have to

[03:32:02] go through the whole thing so anything you think i'm really going to care about that got moved back generally speaking because we had a lot more capacity by the way i will go through the whole thing but i mean right now no there's nothing to highlight because i can't uh there were no projects that we had wasn't anything major that has to be had to be moved back or anything correct correct no transportation you said no transportation for the stabilization center but i just overall Correct. We've rephased projects and retitled them, but it did not delay sequencing or our production schedules.

[03:32:36] Okay. Well, that was my second question, which was, obviously, we're having a lot of issues delivering the capital program right now. So were there any of those things that got changed simply because we weren't ready to go on something when we thought we were?

[03:32:52] No. Okay. Well, that's actually really good news for this year. Because last year, I believe, we did move some stuff back because it wasn't going to be ready. So, okay, well, I look forward to digging in on this. I definitely do have some questions on the school side, but I think those are better served to ask them.

[03:33:11] Lots of questions on the school side, but a lot of things. Okay, thanks. Supervisor Bristman, round two. Thank you. Yeah, I got a lot of questions on the school side, too. If I might, through the chair to Mr. Hemstreet, did you just say that the schools have a \$25 million contingency fund?

[03:33:37] Yes. So the board established a \$25 million contingency for them on January 3rd. Yes. And are they using it? So I don't believe they've used it yet for any of the projects. They have not. And do we have any authority to make them use it?

[03:34:00] For example, on the projects that have been delayed, like the weight room at Dominion High School, the weight room at Heritage High School, the press boxes at Heritage and Dominion, all those projects that are in their crosswalk slide that they've delayed to fund Parkview High School, could we use that \$25 million for those?

[03:34:21] So it is a board appropriation. If the board wants to do that, you certainly can. I would not recommend you do that for the simple reason that the school division is an independent entity.

[03:34:38] They have a sizable capital program. They currently do not have a capital contingency for their projects. And so they are in the same situation we are in. Whenever they get a project that they get bids back on, they get unanticipated change orders, they get any of those things that happen during the course of a capital project, they don't have a contingency to go to.

[03:35:04] So we really recommend that that contingency be there and established for existing projects and issues that come up for existing budgeted projects as opposed to taking that contingency to fund additional projects. I see. It's basically if unexpected things happen in the coming year, then they have that to fall back on.

[03:35:28] Correct. That's correct. Okay. I'll ask a lot more questions on Thursday. Thank you. All right. Absolutely. So, supervisors, and I'll say this before Thursday, I appreciate and share some of the many frustrations with our colleagues on LCPS.

[03:35:52] And I would never first begin to tell people what they can and shouldn't or can't say when we have that meeting on Thursday. But I will say that the goal of the meeting is to have as productive as conversations as possible about a myriad of issues.

[03:36:11] And while I do think that questions should be asked and deserve answers, I also want to just remind us that the relationships between us and the relationships between our school board colleagues are important as we present those relationships to the citizens of the county.

[03:36:38] And so, yes, we have questions that need to be asked and are going to be asked, but let's just remember that we're not there to message. We're there to do the work of the county, of every county citizen.

[03:36:57] Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you all. I am now going to read the script that all of you so kindly prepared for me to read tonight. The first work session for the amended FY 2023 to FY 2028 CIP will be held on Tuesday, February 28th at 6 p.m.

[03:37:19] In advance of the work session, I request that you submit all formal CIP questions and alternative funding scenarios to Nikki Spate, Assistant Director in the Department of Finance and Budget, by close of business on Tuesday, February 21st.

[03:37:37] This will allow staff enough time to respond to your questions for inclusion in the work session packet, which will be distributed on February 27th. Prior to the February 28th work session, I encourage you to take advantage of the CIP briefings staff has offered to you.

[03:37:55] During the February 28th work session, we will review the CIP and ultimately direct staff to produce specific alternative funding scenarios for consideration of the finance government operations economic development committee at its next work session on March 8th should a board member wish to propose that the finance government operations economic development committee to direct staff to produce an alternative funding scenario it is my expectation the board member will identify a project offset within the same district that can utilize the

[03:38:34] same revenue sources changes cannot be accommodated in funding scenarios that are not discussed during the February 28th work session so please seek staff feedback as needed prior to the work session additionally during the February 28th work session Loudoun County Public Schools staff will present the school boards adopted capital planning facility guidelines for the finance government operation economic development committees review and ultimate recommendation to forward to the full board for approval as part of the adopted budget I'll be sending out an

[03:39:13] email drafted kindly by staff as soon as I adjourn this meeting which I will do now with no further business to conduct I call this finance government operations and economic development committee meeting adjourned thank you all



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com