



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, FY25 Budget Work Session, Thursday, March 14, 2024

Date Thursday, March 14, 2024
Place Board Room, First Floor, Government Center, 1 Harrison Street SE, Leesburg, Virginia
Length 2h 51m (video)

- Official meeting video (county, Granicus): <https://loudoun.granicus.com/player/clip/7627>
- Agenda (Granicus): https://loudoun.granicus.com/AgendaViewer.php?view_id=73&clip_id=7627

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 2026-10-19. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:13:30] Well, good evening, supervisors. Good evening, staff. Good evening, Loudoun. I'd like to call to order the March 14th Loudoun County Board of Supervisors budget. What? I'd like to call to order the March 14th Loudoun County Board of Supervisors budget work session.

[00:13:49] Board members, I'd like to stress the importance for this last work session to offer any changes, additions, and relations to the budget in a timely manner. I won't have to say all the rest because we've said it before. I will say when we get to our final vote on April 2nd, staff would not be able to make large changes to the budget during the meeting, and the vote on the budget could be delayed if we don't do the things we have to do and make the substantive changes we have to make right now.

[00:14:14] I would also like to ask everyone to join me in the Pledge of Allegiance. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, liberty and justice for all.

[00:14:35] Okay, before we get to the update, Mr. Hemstreet, I don't know when we started letting just any old body in this room, but there's this guy in this room from some part of North Carolina named Vincent Jones, who I believe is going to be hanging out with us for a while.

[00:14:56] Is that correct? Yes, Chair Randall. Ms. Bricksman says he sounds like a singer's name, so I need Mr. Jones to stand up for me, please. Mr. Jones, can you sing? mr jones welcome to loudon county you live here now right okay very good that's a very good answer welcome to loudon county mr jones megan we are ready when you are good evening good evening um we have for you some updates first of all i'd like to say that your packet from yesterday

[00:15:32] includes another installment and i believe the final responses from county staff to questions that were submitted to staff or came up during work sessions that required some follow-up. So you have that in your packet. You also have a few memos associated with topics on tonight's agenda. You have a memo from the Commonwealth's Attorney. You have a memo from me about Loudoun County Public Schools. And then you have a memo from me and Chief Johnson in response to a request that the board made during last Monday's budget work session.

[00:16:08] And finally, the TOTE board sits at 87.5 cents for the real property tax rate with an unallocated balance of about \$970,000. Okay. So we have a lot of things going on tonight.

[00:16:24] This is very possibly our last budget work session. If we need to do another one, we will need to do another one, but this is very possibly the last one we will do. So we're going to try to hit a lot of things and do a lot of things tonight. So if it takes a little longer, we can either do it tonight or we can do it on Saturday.

[00:16:43] So let's try to get it done tonight. The first thing we're going to do is hear from the Loudoun County Public School System that has some information that they want to share for us tonight. We're going to be hearing it for the first time. With us tonight is my counterpart, Melinda Mansfield, who's the school board chairperson.

[00:17:05] Is Arben here yet? Mr. Estreffi, yes, he is, the vice chair of the school board, and Sharon Willoughby, the CFO. Would the three of you please come to the table? Yes. I'm sorry? Oh, Dr. Smith, I'm sorry.

[00:17:22] I did not see you over there. Dr. Smith, yes, please join us at the table. So for the most part, we wanted you all to come in to answer because, you know, this is a night where we'll have the discussion on the schools.

[00:17:43] The final vote will be taken late, but we wanted to make sure that the board could ask any questions and you all answer any questions or ask any questions of us and just have kind of a back and forth of a little bit. But I do understand also that there's something that you all want to share with us about another request that you have.

[00:18:00] Is that correct? Yes. Okay, then I'm going to ask, and Supervisors, this is the first time I think most of you will be hearing or seeing this, so I'm going to ask you all to do that right now, and then we can, if you don't mind taking questions, we will have questions for you.

[00:18:21] Good evening, Board of Supervisors, Chair Randall.

[00:18:37] Thank you for having us. We have, I think at your desk, at the desk right now, I think you have a blue paper that shows that we have some information to share with you about some spending.

[00:19:00] That's this sheet of paper right here? It's a blue piece of paper, I think. It's blue? It's for white for most board members. Oh, it's white for most board members. So it's this piece of paper right here.

Okay. I think it's the same one, though. Whether white or blue, it's the same paper. I mean, I can do just this. Thank you. Okay, and so we're looking at, we have three items that are of concern.

[00:19:22] One of them is \$1.5 million for our virtual elementary distance learning. The school board designated seven FTE out of the school flexible staffing pot to support reinstating their virtual elementary distance learning. And we directed staff to conduct an interest survey as part of its budget adoption motion.

[00:19:43] And we did complete that survey, and it showed significantly more interest than we had anticipated. The interest would require about 12 additional FTEs on top of the seven FTEs that are set aside to support this program, which would then kind of deplete our flexible staffing that we had put into the budget.

[00:20:05] The second thing is the new recovery school, \$0.5 million. The governor proposed budget included funding to start a recovery school in Loudoun County. However, the funding wasn't allocated directly to LCPS. And the joint committee budget amendments reduced it to \$500,000 and allocated those funds to start the school.

[00:20:31] but what we feel is to start the school, we're gonna need a total of one million is required, and thus we would need an additional 500K. And then to read the request, then three million to reinstate bonus funding.

[00:20:49] The request of three million is to replace funding that the joint committee removed to support one-time bonuses initially proposed in the governor's budget. As LCPS experienced, its highest teacher attrition rate 9.2% in FY23. Retention efforts are just as important as recruitment and efforts, and this one-time bonus is one initiative to help support its retention efforts. So then in total, what you're saying is that LCPS is requesting a total of \$5 million on top of what the request has

[00:21:24] already been. Is that correct? Yes, ma'am. Do you mind doing me a favor, Chair Mansfield, Your item number two, I didn't quite follow. Who was it allocated to? So what happened was they actually, we were supposed to look to get \$1 million correct, and so what they did is they gave \$500,000 to us and \$500,000 to Virginia Beach.

[00:21:52] So that was something that was unexpected. So then we would only get \$500,000, and then we thought startup costs for the first year would be \$1 million, And so that's why we're asking for that extra, that other \$500,000.

[00:22:08] Was the money, was it an accident that was on purpose? Virginia Beach also has a recovery school going on? Is that what's happening? That's my understanding is they have also requested one. I think, do you want to speak to that, Sharon?

[00:22:24] Do you know more? I'm not sure about the Virginia Beach piece, but I think maybe to help clarify is that when the governor proposed the budget and that there was an initiative for a recovery school in Loudoun County, there was funding allocated, but it was not directed specifically to come to LCPS. It was targeted for a recovery school in Loudoun County, but not allocated to LCPS, the funding. The Joint Committee Budget Amendments revised that initiative to where it lowered the dollar amount, and then it lowered the amount to \$500,000, and

[00:23:01] And now that \$500,000 is an allocation coming directly to LCPS. So there's two items that's happening. The amount was lowered, and now it's coming directly to LCPS. And this request to utilize some of the additional \$19 million of funding that is in the budget amendment is to add or to use \$500,000 of that to add to the other \$500,000 that is directed to LCPS.

[00:23:31] for a combined total of a million, which is what we have identified that would be needed to start the recovery school. Okay, supervisors, your questions? Ms. Bricksman? Oh, well, okay, Mr. Sains? Oh, sorry. In regards to the virtual distance learning, can you talk a little bit further about the benefits of it, and which student population are you looking to capture for the distance learning elementary school? Well, first of all, it's elementary school, and we would be

[00:24:07] unable to just target a population because it's a program so it would be open to all the all populations i think that that people thought it would just be for kids who are homeschooled or that kind of thing but that's not how it the program would be that's not we wouldn't be able to do to do that to just have one population or two populations it would have to be open to the whole school just like it just like virginia loud and when you say open to the whole school are you saying k through well it would be k it's going to be one through five k through five so the

[00:24:45] whole elementary school population for distance learning so you're going to you're proposing to have students in kindergarten first grade doing distance learning that was our request yes there was a lot of advocacy for it from our from our constituents well for me personally that that's a stretch i just don't see how a kindergartner first grade second grade or third grade for that matter to be honest with you, how that benefits them unless there is some severe discipline issues or some severe issues going on that they need to be learning distance.

[00:25:24] I think at that young age, you need to be in the classroom learning. So that gives me a lot of some serious heartburn for the virtual learning, to be quite honest with you. And then for the recovery school, you're saying you thought we were going to get the million dollars.

[00:25:40] We're getting 500 now, but isn't the money split in half? Isn't it 500 now and 500 the next year, or how is that working? I think it's 500 now and 250 for the next year. 250? 50,000? Yeah. All right.

[00:25:56] To go back to, if I may, to go back to that other, the virtual distance learning elementary, we had a lot of passion and advocacy for kids who were really, really sick and who could not come in, as well as homebound kids, to take part in this.

[00:26:14] And while I may agree with you that it's important that face-to-face learning, this was a need that these parents had and then it was taken away. And then these kids don't have a lot more.

[00:26:34] So I think that I don't know how many kids will be in kindergarten or first grade from that population. And that's something that we'll have. We just, the needs assessment was more for, is there a need, period.

[00:26:50] And then we'll start coming down, like, figuring out who really, really is going to be in the program later. All right. Thank you. Ms. Glass, I'm going to you next because this is what you do for a living. So I thought maybe you'd have to have some insight.

[00:27:08] Yes. And thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, and I really appreciate you all, you know, putting the funding in for virtual learning. I was in a virtual classroom for two years before I went back into the school

when they had stopped having distance learning for elementary school.

[00:27:32] And the kids that were in my classroom were kids that had medical issues that could not be in the classroom because of illnesses or they would have to have someone to be by their side to, you know, to help them take care of themselves.

[00:27:55] So these were kids that could not be in the classroom for various reasons. And during that time, these kids, this was their class. You know, those were their classmates, and we were their teachers, and, you know, we did projects.

[00:28:14] You know, we tried to do as much as possible as they would in the classroom with, you know, although it was virtual. And you saw the light shine on these kids that, you know, they were happy to be here.

[00:28:32] So I really am glad that you all are doing this again. Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Letourneau. Thank you. Thank you for being with us. So I'm kind of in a place where if we can use the state money to fully fund the original request, then that's a win.

[00:28:52] So I guess I would ask, is there any opportunity for you to perhaps reconcile your budget post that, even though the original request would be fully funded to see if it's possible to prioritize some of these things if you wish to do that. Typically out of this process there is a reconciliation that would take place. Usually the county transfer is not 100 percent of the request so this year would be pretty extraordinary in the first place. So is there an opportunity to look and try to reprioritize if some of these things need to be funded within that several billion dollars

[00:29:23] of budget the items in the letter that was transmitted are in priority order one and then two in terms of reconciling the the discussion would have to be with the school board in terms of for these five million dollars worth of items and the the natural place to go would be related to compensation that is our largest pot and to be able to find five million dollars quickly versus is trying to, you know, nickel and dime to get to \$5 million.

[00:29:59] So it would be a balance between compensation and these \$5 million would be the question before the school board for reconciliation. Mr. Crony. Thank you, Chair Randall. So I think I noticed in the superintendent's estimate of needs that you were counting on that 1% bonus payment.

[00:30:22] Is that what this is for full-time eligible employees? Okay. Yes, ma'am. Okay. But you are providing a 1% top of scale payment to eligible employees. Can you explain what that is? Yes. So each year, employees, our compensation package is scale driven. So each year, employees receive an annual step increase where they move to the next step on their pay scale. For employees that are on the top step of the salary scale, they obviously have, they would

[00:30:59] they would have no pay increase so instead what lcps has historically done has provided a one-time one percent payment that is representative of the annual salary and that's just basically to replace the fact that they do not have a step increase did the governor give a bonus last year do you know is that something that has happened before there was no bonus in the state budget last year, and from my recollection, this is the first that I can recall in years in terms of a bonus

[00:31:32] being funded. Typically, the state budget has funded pay increases. Okay, so I have a question from last year. I know we closed that gap of the \$13 million, and I think that Loudoun County Public

Schools got that \$13 million back from the state. Am I correct? Remember there was a gap, And we closed it during the fund balance discussion, and I'm just wondering if that could be leveraged on some of these initiatives.

[00:32:02] Supervisor Tukrani, that's not correct. They did not receive that funding. Oh, you didn't get any funding? No, the county supplied the \$13 million. No, I knew you did. I just didn't know if the state had made it whole, so they did not. Okay. Okay, thank you. Mr. Kirsten?

[00:32:20] Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question from Mr. Sains since he ran out of time. so on the actual virtual learning um that did uh what was shared by miss glass is that the kind of student that would be serviced by this or is this a general class of student or is it special needs type of student or can you give us a little bit more detail so thank you for the question the uh what the staff was asked to put out a needs assessment survey in terms of uh who would who would benefit from this and so we did put that out we put it out to all of our elementary students

[00:32:58] we send it out to homeschool homebound students we send it out to our preschool programs and so where we are at in the point in that process is we've received those responses and now we're working on what kind of virtual program can we provide and so we have not the board has not decided staff not decided in terms of what is the criteria for that program what we know right now is that there a need exists there is a desire to have a virtual elementary program and so i can't speak to that as much because the criteria hasn't been developed yet okay um i kind of have a tendency to agree with mr letourneau in terms of trying to find i mean the way i see it as a

[00:33:35] supervisor here is we you get you guys present your budget but ultimately when we do the local transfer you can do with how how you want and so you know everything's tight for everybody um it's not easy so i have a tendency to believe that a lot of this can be funded um by finding by sharpening our pens a little bit I think the biggest thing I'm really struggling with and the whole is this the time to talk about this madam chair and ask questions sure overall budget yes yes yes on the schools yes I think the biggest thing I'm struggling with is I went back and over the last four years the average transfer from the county to the schools is 76 million the request this year is 120 million that is I figured out to be about a 69 percent increase and yet when I look back at

[00:34:15] the student population from 2019 we're about at the same place the student population was from 2019. So I dug into those students a little bit, and I did notice that the English learners are growing, and some of the IEP and special classes, but the students that don't fall into those actually are falling significantly. I don't know what the reasoning for that is, etc. So I understand that some of the costs are going to go up. I understand the cost of living is going up, but what I'm struggling after kind of pouring through the budget for the school is why we are requesting, if you're at, yeah, I think it's 120 versus the 76.

[00:34:52] That's a significant increase because anyone sitting at the table can help justify why are we asking for such a larger transfer than we have on average over the last four years. In terms of the \$121 million, we build a budget based on the county guidance as a starting point.

[00:35:20] Well, not as a starting point, but as one factor in the starting point of developing the budget. So and based on the 60-40 split that was used last year and was used again this year, again, it's based on that budget guidance. And historically, LCPS has tried to come close to the budget guidance, you know, trying to develop a fiscally constrained budget in relation to that guidance.

[00:35:42] In relation to purely looking at enrollment or in trying to tie that to the increase as well, you've hit on some of the topics of our population has changed, though. While the overall enrollment may be relatively flat or similar to several years ago, the special education population and the EL population and our economically disadvantaged population has significantly increased, and those require additional costs.

[00:36:12] In addition to that, as mentioned, related to the bonus funding, each year we have seen an increase in the attrition rate of teachers. And obviously we need teachers to be able to, you know, provide education. And so we have had healthy pay increases to be able to recruit and retain as well as be competitive because we are very competitive in the market with Fairfax and Prince William and Alexandria with teachers.

[00:36:41] And lastly, one other topic before I hand it over to Chair Mansfield would be unique to this budget for FY25, we are also opening two brand new schools. And so those two new schools require additional resources.

[00:36:57] And if I remember, Ray, I believe it's roughly, I think it was a net of about 60 additional FTEs. Because while students are redistributed, they're not necessarily going to be redistributed in equal packages of, you know, 23 students in a classroom, in addition to the fixed costs and the fixed staffing that's required for opening those two new schools.

[00:37:17] So those are some of the high-level touch points. So his time's not running? So I'm going to go and let me... He ran out. Did he run out? Yeah. Oh, I missed that. Okay, I think you're done. I think, okay, I think you're done now then. Thank you very much. Yeah, I think you're done, Mr. Turner.

[00:37:43] Thank you, Madam Chair. Ms. Wilbur, I just want to dig down on something when you started to answer that question. So I'm not sure I heard correctly in the process. So you get the budget guidance from the county based on a 60-40 split. So are you saying that the county said, this is our expected revenue and a 60-40 split gives you this number, go ahead and fill up that number? I mean, how did that work?

[00:38:00] Because it sounded like the reason you're at \$121 million versus \$76 million is because the county gave most of that money to you with the budget guidance. The budget guidance letter that we received, and if I recall correctly, and maybe Ms. Borg can help me, I think presented two scenarios.

[00:38:20] With the first scenario being using the current rate and the 60-40 split would yield \$121 million to LCPS. The equalized rate was an amount that I don't recall other than it was significantly less. And we had, I believe, a shared concern with county staff in terms of being able to fund some basic operations, at least from the school side, at the equalized rate.

[00:38:42] So we built our budget using that as one very significant factor in developing the budget and the \$121 million that was communicated to us. Thank you. I want to dig down on that, if I could, Ms. Burke. So is that the process, that we give them a fixed amount?

[00:39:02] We say, okay, this is our expected revenue, and this is a 60-40 split. Here's how much you have to play with. Go ahead and play with that. So that we basically generated the increase in the school budget from the county side? So the process or policy from the board, which was put in place formally last year, but has been in place as a practice for decades, is we tell them as part of guidance what their funding is.

[00:39:28] So this year, that was \$121 million was their share of new local tax funding, which was approved by the board in both preliminary as well as final budget guidance. We went one time, sorry, Ms. Burkes was correcting me, but in December, the board approved final budget guidance, which included those numbers.

[00:39:51] And so that's what was provided to the school division. Okay, so then my next question is, what on the county side generated a 69% increase in what we were available to give to the schools? Because now it sounds like the 69% increase that Supervisor Kirshner was talking about was generated by us having more revenue to give the schools.

[00:40:10] So I think we are talking apples and oranges, right? Because there's a revenue side of the budget, and then there's an expenditure side of the budget. And so the things that make up the school division's revenues include both state funding as well, I mean, basically four sources.

[00:40:27] They get funding from the federal government, they get funding from whatever fees they charge, they get funding from us, and they get funding from the Commonwealth. So they take an estimate of whatever the governor is saying he's providing, and then they ask us for the balance of whatever they believe they need on their expenditure side, and the numbers come out the way they come out.

[00:40:46] In any given year, those numbers could be vastly different. My understanding of their budget is very similar to the county's budget over the last two years, where both of us have been heavily impacted by inflationary factors. So for the past couple years, we have seen pay increases even on our side in terms of pay proposals that are significantly above what we have seen in the last decade.

[00:41:10] So the pay proposal accounts for a good amount of that because prior to the last few years, our pay proposals were in the 3% range in terms of increases. Because of what has happened in inflation over the last few years, we have been recommending pay proposals well above that.

[00:41:29] I think they did reference competitiveness within the market, competitive salaries for educators as a part of that. Another piece of that is the JLARC study, where the state share of revenue and support for education has been dropping traditionally.

[00:41:47] So I think the answer to that question is much more on the expenditure side and what's driving those elements within their budget than it is on our revenue side. Okay, thank you. Ms. Borksman. Thank you, Madam Chair. So this is difficult for me because my mind has been set to get the \$10 million gap covered.

[00:42:10] And so it's difficult for me to try to think about finding another \$5 million because we've been really trying to, we've been struggling to get that \$10 million gap filled, which I really want to do. I would, I'm not you guys, but I would reverse this priority.

[00:42:26] I'm much more concerned about an over 9% turnover and not having the bonus. I understand that's because it was removed from the governor's budget. So that's, you know, that wasn't a failure of you to request it in your budget. If you had requested it in your budget, I absolutely would have supported that.

[00:42:41] That would be my highest concern. I don't feel as if the elementary virtual program is fully baked. I wouldn't support another \$1.5 million for that. If you were to come to me and tell me we have this student population who can't be in the classroom, they are sick or they have behavioral health issues, they have mental health issues, they have, you know, they have some reason why they can't be in the classroom,

and this is how much money we need to support those students, I would be able to support that. But right now, it's not clear to me, at least, what population you're going for. So to me, I don't feel as if

[00:43:19] it's justified. I know you did the survey, and there was a response, but, and I'm also kind of with Supervisor Saines, like, kindergarten, first, second, third, socialization is just as important as the education and um any anyone that's a parent kind of understands that so um and then the recovery school i'm a little nervous about because i thought it would take a lot more than a million dollars to start a recovery school so is this is this a school that's being operated by someone else or would it be operated by lcps and where is it going to be so thank you miss

[00:43:55] miss brisman for the question um in terms of the recovery schools um this is something that we have been advocating for and we really feel like there's a need and so we have tried to we haven't identified the exact spot we didn't know how much money we were going to get it got cut in half in terms of what we thought we were going to get from the state and so okay a million dollars is what we felt like was the was the minimum amount that we needed to give to a contractor or that you guys would say that we would still run it it would be run by lcps okay one we would serve only loudon county students and year two we would open it up to the region but it's but you wouldn't have well okay i'm running out of time so i'm going to ask my last question um how is it decided that um the sheriff's department would be coming into our

[00:44:34] schools with drug sniffing dogs and um how do you justify doing that and not voting on it as a policy in a board meeting i will say in terms of the the canine scans that has been one of one of many things that we've done to try to curb some of the the drug issues and it's been a partnership with lcso to do that it's not cost us any additional resources to make that happen but did parents give any feedback before you did it so yeah yeah your time is up so can he answer the question he you

[00:45:11] answered you asked it after the time was up so i'm sorry um okay a couple of things one anyone that doesn't think kids can learn virtually have not been paying attention your entire lives you guys have one thing about virtual learning in your head sesame streets virtual learning abc mouse is virtual learning bernie is personal learning everybody over 45 can finish this sentence. I'm just a bill. Yes, I'm, that's virtual learning. That's what that is. All that is virtual learning. So conjunction, junction, that should go. There you go. Who doesn't remember all that? And all that is virtual learning. So any, so virtual learning is a whole lot of things,

[00:45:51] whether or not, whether or not you've made a case for is a different issue, but of course, little kids can do virtual learning. I mean, we've done, we've been doing it for years. Um, And sometimes, depending on the kid, that is how they socialize. That's why Big Bird and Ernie is part of your life for the rest of your life.

[00:46:08] They're like family. Those are your cousins, right? Of course you can do virtual learning. Of course you can. Now, I don't know if you've made the case for it, and that's a different discussion. But virtual learning, let's broaden that out because we've been doing that for decades. We've been doing virtual learning in some kind of way.

[00:46:25] I'm not going to give money for the recovery school. I've been down there. We're not ready yet. It's not baked yet. but I don't know how much money they got in the General Assembly. I think it was a whole big pot of money. There's too many questions about it. I think I'd like to know more. I am learning

more, but I'm not there yet. The reinstatement of the bonus funds, my issue with that is that is a state responsibility.

[00:46:45] It is a state responsibility. It is one more time that the state is saying, we're not going to do this. You all have to do it, and it's another unfunded mandate by the state. The JLARC study was done. It was said this much money is needed to close that gap for students, And then the governor, to his credit, put it in his budget, and then somebody else took it out.

[00:47:03] So this continued to come into localities to ask to do state responsibilities is something that I just don't know where I'm at on that yet. And so I think I'd like to have the discussion, but it's frustrating to me when that happens.

[00:47:22] I would finally say with all due respect, and please believe I mean that, I respect you all so much, on the amount of money we're about to transfer to you and the amount of money that your budget is, a \$5 million gap is darn near fully funded in this budget in very many ways.

[00:47:39] And so, you know, some of this stuff is not you all's fault at all. This \$3 million is not your fault. But I'm being hard-pressed to believe that you can tell me that it has to come out of the house of teachers' and educators' pockets, because I don't know that I believe that.

[00:47:55] The only question I have is, if we were to do the \$3 million, Mr. Hemstreet, since they're calling it a one-time thing, is that something that we can discuss in fund balance? So we can definitely discuss it in fund balance. I do have a different perspective of what that dollar amount represents, which if you send it to fund balance, and we'll provide additional commentary on that when we get there.

[00:48:26] But that answer is yes. You can set the fund balance. Okay. All right. Okay. All right. Supervisors, this was surprising, and so if there are any questions on anything else that's not this right here, Mr. Kirsten was right to say, is this any other questions?

[00:48:46] Because any other questions? And first of all, I've got to tell you all, You all being here is pretty impressive because that has not happened every year. And thank you very much. Thank you very, very much for coming. And so I have promised our school board members, especially, that these were time for budget questions.

[00:49:06] And we're not going to be throwing things at them that are not part of the budget because that's why we're here. That's why they're here for budget questions. And so we're not talking about other things. These are budget questions. So if you have any other budget questions for our guest from LCPS, please let me know right now.

[00:49:29] Thank you very much for coming. We appreciate it. Thank you so much for your time. Thanks. Mr. Hemstreet, would you like us to make, let's wait until the end and make motions. Yeah, let's wait until the end and make motions. Okay. Now I know how old the all you are.

[00:49:49] Everyone who knew what the next answer to I'm just a bill was, I know how old you guys are now. Okay, so we're going to do the, oh, we're going to do Mr. Letourneau's jam right now.

[00:50:06] The cap budget comes next. Will you guys please come to the table? CIP. The CIP. In fact, the CIP is coming, and I'm going to let Mr. Letourneau take this part of the meeting. Want to just make a motion?

[00:50:22] Unless they want to say something. Well, yeah, we should let them say something first. Huh? Okay, we can let them say something. Thank you. Like, it was a long night last night. I don't think any of us want to be here that long tonight. No, but if they want to say something.

[00:50:38] Yes, yes, this is us. God, let's not do that. Let's not do that. Mr. Turner? What? You guys want to say something, or do you have anything new to give to us?

[00:50:55] Do you have something new to give to us? Good evening. I do not have anything new to give to you. I will just note you have your item in your packet. I don't have anything to add to that, so I will. You're going to take Mr. LeTourneau's motion now, right? Would you like to make a motion? I would. I move the recommendation of the Finance, Government, Operations, and Economic Development Committee that the Board of Supervisors adopt a 25 to 30 proposed capital improvement program, capital asset preservation program fund, major equipment replacement fund, metro garages fund, public facilities fund, transportation district fund as amended by the committee on March 12, 2024.

[00:51:27] I further move the recommendation of the Finance, Government, Operations Committee that the Board of Supervisors send funding consideration for the planning study and conceptual design of the Cascades Library and Senior Center Complex renovation in the amount of \$1 million to the FY24 fund balance discussion. Second.

[00:51:45] I mean, seconded by Ms. Briggsman. Discussion on the motion, Mr. Latter-in. Yeah, this is probably the, I guess, quietest CIP discussion we've really ever had, at least since I've been around, because, you know, as you all know, the CIP is pretty much fully baked.

[00:52:04] It's programmed out. There's a whole list of future fiscal year projects. I made the comment that I felt like in many ways we went backwards. Most of my priority projects, some of it was in the budget and now it's out again because we had cost escalation.

[00:52:20] I think that's probably true for most people. But staff really tried to drill down on project costs and what it's really going to cost and then pivoting things to the actual cost in the year that it's funded. So there's pretty significant increases between a FY25 dollar and an FY30 dollar.

[00:52:42] All of that is kind of baked into this. So there really wasn't too much to do unless we really wanted to, you know, significantly impact projects that are kind of midstream. So it was really only one very minor change that was considered. We did talk through a few other things and Supervisor Briskman asked that the board consider accelerating the beginning of the Cascades Library and Senior Center renovation process, planning process, in the fund balance discussion.

[00:53:11] But that was really it. Thank you. Mr. Turner. Thank you, Madam Chair. What I'm about to say isn't lighthearted. I'm not upset. I've been here for five years, and I have come to view the CIP process as Christmas for the Dulles District.

[00:53:30] I would like to know, in the item, In the item that moved, that we made \$3 million from the Route 7690 interchange. And in the item, we say, quote, however, given its priority ranking, blah, blah, blah, that's why the Bull Run Post Office Road got funded.

[00:53:51] Now, my understanding was the only time you can substitute projects is inside your district. And when one comes out, one can go in. I would like to know, where did the priority ranking come from?

Where is the list that shows the priority ranking? Have we ever been shown, have the other supervisors ever been shown the list for priority ranking?

[00:54:11] And who and how made the decision to put Bull Run Post Office Road in that \$3 million slot? The Finance Committee made that decision. Based on what list, what priority list that was accessible to all supervisors?

[00:54:27] In the presentation that was presented during the CIP work session on February 27th. But I was in finance, right? Yes. Yes. So if you weren't in finance, you might not have seen that. And the priority list was generated how?

[00:54:44] It was an internal document that we developed while staff was putting the budget together. Who was we? The Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Transportation and Capital Infrastructure. Okay, so I want to say this back, make sure I understand it.

[00:55:02] So the Office of Management and Budget put together a priority list of projects that it presented to the Finance Committee, and the Finance Committee then approved, and that's how the selection was made. So none of the other districts ever got to see the priority list or be involved in that discussion. So the process that the board uses is every packet, regardless of what committee it goes to, is provided to every single board member.

[00:55:27] For the purposes of budget development and, in particular, the capital budget, all board members are invited to that finance committee meeting. And that is the process that the board has used for many, many years. And so board members who are interested in having a dialogue around the capital budget, who are interested in participating in the development of the capital budget, are asked to attend those finance committee meetings.

[00:55:54] And that is where that decision is made by delegation by the board. Keeping in mind that the guest supervisors to those meetings don't have voting privileges. So if they objected to that priority list, they have no voice in that, other than the fact that their opinion can be heard.

[00:56:10] the decision is made by the members of the finance committee the point i'm getting at here is this is invisible to supervisors that don't work on the finance committee yeah okay we can see the items and if we if we want to read the items and we come want to come to the finance committee we can hear the discussion around the priority list but it would seem to me if we're going to establish a priority list every year to establish what comes in and goes out of the cip at some point the entire board ought to get visibility over who's making those decisions and what those priorities are i've always been under the impression in the set i'm out of time madam chair i'm just

[00:56:44] rambling on okay so i wasn't even looking up mr kirchner so i'm going to back up mr turner 100 in these comments because i was taken a bit by surprise and he mentioned something in his opening statement that normally money stays within the supervisor's district and the money taken out of the 690 interchange actually came out of catocton so mr letourneau and i had some email exchange this very next day about this particular issue because I had anticipated that we were going to have the discussion about this. We had a little bit of discussion, I think, in the full committee meeting, but I had anticipated based upon the original budget memo that the CIP was going to

[00:57:23] be discussed in any possible openings at this particular meeting, and I agree 100 percent with what the supervisor has just said that took me a little bit by surprise. I don't know if it's quite Christmas in

Dulles but it certainly is a Christmas Eve or or something along those lines um so I I have resolved I think this is a little bit baked at this point I'm not going to fight over this on this particular occasion with Mr. Letourneau because I know this is something he really really wants but I think that the process that we just went through and that took us both

[00:57:59] myself and Mr. Turner by surprise probably should have a little bit more of a full board review of it, quite frankly. Mr. Sains? Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll just channel one of our former supervisors. Supervisors, my first term, he used to always say, read your board packets. Everybody has the availability. If you're in finance or TLUC or the full board, when the packets drop,

[00:58:29] we all get an email. When the packets drop, what's on the list? Read your packets. Everybody's invited to go to finance or to TLUC send emails to those chairs to the staff who manages those different committees ask questions yes you don't have a vote but you still can attend ask your questions and get information at that meeting or if you can't attend the meeting send an email to staff and ask your questions and there's been several supervisors who vice versa if you've

[00:59:08] been on TLUC have attended finance meetings for various reasons and same thing if you've been on finance have attended TLAC meetings for various reasons. So to sit here and say, oh, well, I didn't know. I didn't see this. I'm sorry. That's not accurate. And so I'm not challenging anybody's point of view or whatever. You might have your feelings. That's fine. But again, read your board packets and say, I didn't know about this. I didn't have availability. That's not accurate either.

[00:59:40] Thank you. Ms. Brixman. Thank you, Madam Chair. So I believe when we were developing the CIP that staff met with every single office and asked what is your priority for the cip we're adding projects this year um i believe they met with every office to talk about that um so i think that was a good opportunity if you have something that you want to be prioritized in your district

[01:00:14] that you can talk to them about that um the 690 interchange project was canceled and so it's it's not, it's not like, it's not like it was money taken from another project that is supposed to get done and put in and put into this project. And yeah, finance supported it. I think it was a probably a unanimous vote. And it's \$3 million in the year 2030. So we didn't move around a bunch of stuff. And I don't think any one district necessarily got Christmas or Christmas Eve or

[01:00:52] a birthday or thanksgiving or anything like that i think that i think that um you know that this happens when we do the cip but we didn't move a lot of stuff around um i did have one question one thing that we did approve in um in finance i believe was that we're adding the askegrins park to future years list did that need to be in the motion no that was what we would consider as amended as amended okay okay great so um so anyway to lower the temperature a little bit um i'm very

[01:01:29] happy that ask your grins was added to the future years and um happy that we're we're finding a little bit of money and fund balance hopefully to start the process again just start the process to look at how we're going to renovate the senior center and the cascades library thank you thank Thank you, Ms. Brixman. So I would say that more than one thing can be true at one time.

[01:01:52] I do think when you are the chair of a committee, you probably have, you just, you have more awareness of what's going on in that committee and where money's going and where it's sitting. And so Mr. Turner has been the chair of finance for a while through many terms. And so it is, it is plausible, possible that he probably sees it more and may get more in his district.

[01:02:13] However, what Mr. Sainz said is also true. Anyone can attend any meeting and have this discussion at any time. For me, the learning moment is this for me as chair. As we go forward next year, I would try to do a better job making sure that people who are not on the committee knows when the committee meeting is and really encourage people to look at the budget as it's being developed just as this year as we're doing the rules OM. And that's going to go through TLUC.

[01:02:42] I will make sure people on finance make sure that I say to them what's coming up in the rural zone where I'm CPAM and to come and look at it as possible. I think all these moments are teaching moments. There's never a time that we can't do better, can't learn from a moment, and can't do more.

[01:02:59] I think this is a learn from it and see what can happen different or better in years to come. I will take that responsibility on as chair, and I think we will focus on that in the remaining years on this term.

[01:03:17] As nine very happy board members, thank you very much. Would you like to have a closing, Mr. Let's go? Yeah, I think I better take one. I think this is a little bit of what happens when we're together a little bit too much as well. This is our fourth night. Yeah, but from a kind of educational purpose, and I apologize, too, if it wasn't clear, but every year I've been chair, we have allowed scenarios from non-committee members to be submitted to, and last year, I believe Mr. Turner submitted one, came to the meeting and asked for a scenario.

[01:03:50] So that's the exact process that was followed. The priority list, so to speak, was indeed culled from what each of us asked for, and then staff actually put some of those in the budget. So this budget document we got from the Coyote Administrator has some of the board priority new projects in them.

[01:04:07] And then there was some other ones that did not make it in the budget. In this particular scenario, just so everybody kind of understands since it was said publicly what happened, there was an additional amount of money added to the 7690 project for the easement that we thought we were going to have to acquire.

[01:04:26] And then through the good work of Mr. Kirshner and others, the town of Percival ended up granting that easement and we didn't need the money. And so at the very beginning of the finance committee process, Mr. Kirshner, I said others, Mr. Kirshner and others.

[01:04:43] So at the very beginning, staff said this project is no longer needed. We are going to take this out, regardless of what we put anything else in. We don't need this anymore. and so the board has this other list of priorities that are available if you want to move one of those in and and so that's that's what happened um you know the the three million dollars maybe FY28 I don't remember what year was put in but um for that particular project I mean as staff will tell you I was fairly upset it didn't get in the budget in the first place but it didn't um and so I was able to get three out of the 21 million needed for that project

[01:05:21] so it's not as if that's really accelerating things but from a process standpoint any member of the board can come to either of those work sessions especially the first one and ask for a scenario to be presented if they want to have consideration for something and then the full board votes at this meeting as well as the committee so that's we can do a better job making sure everybody's aware of that. Okay so the motion was made by Supervisor the Turner I think Supervisor Briggs made a motion All in favor say aye.

[01:05:51] Aye. Any opposed? That motion will pass 801. Ms. Umstead's not here tonight. Ms. Letourneau is right. For everyone on finance, this is our fourth straight night on the dais. We're very, very long

meeting, so we are, I think, a little punch drunk at this point.

[01:06:11] Okay, we're going to have... So on this day in the wrap-up session, if I have a supervisor, if I have a colleague that wants to revisit a budget of a department, I will ask that department to come back.

[01:06:30] And there's no, I'm sorry. Thank you, guys. We're good. I'm sorry. We are tired. Go away now. We did the motion. Is there another motion needed? I think we're good.

[01:06:45] No, I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry. We are tired. We are tired. So on this evening, there were two offices that we asked to come back and one office that I delayed because I wanted to have the finance committee and anyone else who wanted to come see a presentation on housing.

[01:07:09] So the first office that was asked, the first department that was asked to come back is the sheriff's office. You don't have to do another presentation, but if you all would come down so you could ask any questions that may be asked, that you could answer any questions that may be asked of you, that'd be great.

[01:07:28] And a presentation is not needed because you've done that once already. The Sheriff's Office is on page R57 through R60 of your resource requests, and the budget narrative is 242. Welcome, everyone, to the table this evening.

[01:07:45] One of my colleagues, our vice chair, asked you all to come back, and so I believe she has a motion. Ms. Brixman, I think we should, well, they've already given a presentation, and so they're just back for the motion, so we should go to a motion.

[01:08:13] And you have an open and closing, so. Thank you. I move that the Board of Supervisors remove 14 field deputies from the LCSO budget for FY 2025. That motion has been made and seconded by Supervisor DeCrony.

[01:08:31] Can you say the amount that would be of the amount that? \$4 million. \$4 million even. Okay. Motion was made by Supervisor Brixman, seconded by Supervisor DeCrony. Discussion on the motion, Supervisor Brixman. Thank you. Thank you very much. I have no doubt that you're going to need more deputies probably in the following fiscal year.

[01:08:52] And I would be, you know, I would be very supportive of that. However, from our previous discussions, there were 36 deputies allocated last year, of which 29 have not yet been hired. And so I would like to see those deputies hired and then next year add the 14 deputies.

[01:09:16] Um, the, you know, by the sheriff's own campaign materials, the crime rate in Loudoun County has gone down 47% since he took office. And, um, I haven't really been hearing, um, a lot about any lack of service from the sheriff's department.

[01:09:34] As a matter of fact, anytime I make a call or anytime I have a constituent concern, the department, especially Eastern Loudoun station has always been responsive and, and quick. and I think you guys are doing a great job. I would just rather save the \$4 million this year and do the 14 deputies next year.

[01:09:53] Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you. Mr. Crony? Yeah, thank you, Chair Randall. So I guess the question I have, do you think you can hire the 29 deputies? Yes, ma'am, I think we can. So there's several different contributing factors here.

[01:10:11] So you're correct on the numbers of the 36 deputies from last year. One significant point of clarification there is that 18 of those positions we didn't get until January 1st of this year. So we just got those as mid-year enhancements, so they came in. There's also some fairly significant things that happened over the past year to include the opening of the courthouse, where we shifted extra focus of background investigations to courthouse positions to ensure that we had sufficient people hired for those.

[01:10:41] But our bandwidth through our employment services section is significantly high. We have nine people working there. They can handle about 30 cases per year. And actually, at this moment, we have 79 cases assigned to background, 41 are field deputies that are currently being actively worked by background investigators right now.

[01:11:02] Our application numbers are pretty high. So we're in, I mean, they're doing, and this is Major Schladen's shop. They're doing phenomenal work in the employment services section to do that. Last year, we hired 98 people. We hired 14 people today.

[01:11:18] This was a hire date for us. So we are on track to exceed that this year. It's also important for us to have the positions on paper so that we can have conditional job offers to be able to put out. We can't start the hiring process with someone, especially with the extensive, thorough background investigation we do, the medical, the polygraph.

[01:11:37] some very very invasive parts of the process that we have to have conditional job offers extended for us to be able to do that and we can't do conditional job offers if the position doesn't exist on paper so i mean i can i'm happy to talk you know more in depth on this but the short answer is yes i do believe that we can fill these positions okay and will some of those positions go to western loudon county yes so um yeah so enough deputies out there yeah as we talked last week um we uh the 14 positions that are needed they are specific to certain squads and to certain stations and that does include at least one deputy in each of our

[01:12:16] service areas so we have four service areas eastern loudon which covers primarily supervisor saying supervisor brisman's district we have the ashburn district which is primarily supervisor turner and supervisor glass the our dulla south station which is primarily supervisor letourneau and mr crony and then we have our western loudon station which is also some of you but also a significant amount of supervisor kershner so those are our four station areas it would include staff to each one of those station areas okay thank you thank you mr turner thank you madam chair what's the likelihood and the time frame that you'll be able to hire all of the remaining 36 plus these 14

[01:12:54] in in within fiscal 25. um i'll actually pass that one down to major slide thank you for the question And I think that based on the numbers that we hired last year, which was 98 of those 98, just over 60 of those were sworn deputies, I think we could very easily hire all of those within fiscal year 25.

[01:13:16] And did I hear you correctly that the 14th principal, they'll supplement Western areas primarily? Yes, I believe there are two deputies that are set for Western On-Station. Thank you. Mr. Letourneau.

[01:13:33] yeah um i'm not going to support the the motion the the reality is when we look at these positions we have to remember these are shifts right so you know it's how long are the shifts eight ten hours twelve twelve hours yeah so it's two two deputies actually is one at any given time so 14 is really only

adding seven in terms of the coverage that the public feels or or you know is able to go out there. So, um, I think in the past we went through a period where there wasn't a lot of hiring and

[01:14:08] then, um, you know, last year, this year, it's been a little bit of catch up. Um, the IACP report found that there were, um, you know, we were undercovered in those areas. Um, you know, if, if you're out there and I've done some ride alongs, the, the list is full, you know, while they're out on, on duty. Um, you know, there's the, they have the laptops that tells them the calls, priority calls they go to, but, you know, there's people that wait for property crime issues for, you know, cyber issues, all those kinds of things they're waiting. And sometimes

[01:14:42] even in accidents that are more minor and things like that. So, you know, I support more people on the street to, to address that backlog. Um, and then also to have that swarming capability when there is a major incident. Um, you know, we, we had a unfortunate, uh, you know, event at a school this week and that must have had a significant impact on your operations at that time I don't know exactly how many deputies were there but it was a lot as you were dealing with that so just for instance so you know having people on the street I think that's not a bad thing when we have data that backs up there's a need for it and the number of sort of deputies needed per

[01:15:21] population so I look I want to try to get the tax rate down I came here with the intent of trying to do that tonight, but I don't think this is the area to do it. Mr. Kirshner. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you guys for coming. I'm not going to support the motion. I will note that the theme here is public and life safety, that, and listen, I would support almost any motion that was put on to help shave off some of this to get, but this is the one area I think we have to be real careful about. It's fair to say that these deputies will probably not be hired from other departments, but they will actually have to go through the academy. Is that right? Yes, so we do, I mean, we do hire some from other places and we've had some pretty good success with

[01:15:59] that, but a lot of our deputies and the bulk of our deputies do have to go through the Academy. So we will say hire these starting in, in I think right now it's split between July and January already. So some of these will get hired in and go into maybe the fall Academy.

[01:16:15] Is that, and then some in the spring Academy, and then they have to go through their field training and they literally will not be on the road by themselves to meet these standards for another year and a half. Am I correct? Yes. And actually that's a phenomenal point. So, So we use, for planning purposes, we use about an 18-month schedule that includes the recruitment, the hiring phase, getting them on board, getting to an academy, which for us starts in July, starts in January, getting them through academy, through a three-and-a-half-month field training program.

[01:16:42] It takes about 18 months for us to get a vacancy into an actual deputy that's working on the street. So, you know, we have a chunk of deputies right now that are hired, right? they are employees of the sheriff's office somewhere in the training process that are not actually providing service on the street today.

[01:17:01] And that's a routine thing that we have when we deal with any type of separation, which, I mean, our turnover's low. We average about 7% turnover per year. So our turnover's low, but even 7% of 700 sworn deputies is still fairly significant.

[01:17:16] So that's something we really have to consider. So for us to wait next year, that would actually put us out another 18 months. So it could be potentially two and a half years for a workload that's here today. So the workload analysis that was done to identify these positions, which we are, and Sheriff Chapman's trying to be as conservative as possible, the workload analysis that we have right now would actually support an additional 20.

[01:17:42] It would actually be 34, which we're not asking for at this point because we do think incremental, because we want to see the actual impact to the street. Incremental change, I think, is the best for everybody, fiscally as well. You know, however, these 14 are based on workload analysis done over the past two years.

[01:18:00] That workload is here already for us to get that, you know, throughout this next coming fiscal year and then the time to hire and train the workload is going to be that much significantly higher by the time we actually get these, you know, these individuals. So, so yeah, there, that is a very real thing for us.

[01:18:16] It's going to create even more strain if we continue to delays. Essentially, the workload is going to be just greater and it's already here. Got it. Yes, it will. And if I can, if I can, you know, kind of piggyback on that from a lot for a second, what that workload actually translates to is it translates to deputies running what we term as call to call, where at the time they're ending one, there's one either in the queue, you know, waiting for them the next one or, you know, the one after that.

[01:18:44] And what that does is it just burns out the deputies that are out there working and it reduces their proactive time. And that was the conversation we had with the supervisor Turner last time about their workload. When they don't have proactive time, several things happen. One is, you know, our response times go up.

[01:19:00] So for them to disengage from one incident and engage on the next one, that alone is a process where they have to tell a citizen, hey, you know, I need to wrap this up so I can get to the next one. That extends response times, and response times are, in fact, increasing. It also decreases our ability to, you know, to respond to quality of life issues, conduct proactive patrols, and things like that.

[01:19:21] and when we when we look at our deputies workload right now and we talk averages we are and we say hey we're over 30 percent that's averages of averages okay so that's every day that's every day of the week every hour of the day averaged all the way out well that's not the way the workload actually goes it it has a it has a pretty traditional pattern through the day and we get really really busy between about 2 p.m and 9 p.m every single day and that's the time where these deputies are running call to call to call which means they're not conducting speed enforcement during evening rush hour they're not available to do that when they're running in that mode they're also not patrolling neighborhoods when kids are out playing and people would just want

[01:19:59] to see a police car drive through the neighborhood is just peace of mind that hey we're out there so there's some real tangible benefits when that proactive time decreases and deputies get in that status so this is a this is an important issue for us thank you miss glass thank you madam chair And thank you, Lieutenant Colonel Sawyer, for speaking.

[01:20:20] I think one thing that most of my constituents speak on is speeding in the Broad Run District. And you had talked about deputies on call in the queue.

[01:20:39] Are the duties different for certain deputies, such as you have someone on the road to four patrols for speeding, and then that sort of thing or um yes so uh so we have deputies that are assigned to different functions in in certain areas so the patrol deputies that we're talking about now what we would just say field deputies are essentially the jack-of-all-trades that handle all the calls that come in when they have proactive time they are expected to use that to meet the community's needs to do selective enforcement and known speeding areas to address you know um you know speeding issues to go through areas with known parking issues and issue parking summonses and

[01:21:18] And basically do the proactive, you know, drive through neighborhoods and, you know, wave at kids and just, you know, that kind of stuff. So so those deputies do that. We do have some deputies that are assigned solely to traffic. So that would be the, you know, the traffic deputy, Deputy Gonzalez at the Ashburn station, you know, primarily does that, that his sole function is to take the traffic complaints and, you know, follow up on those specifically and do the research, the data analysis.

[01:21:44] you know, put our speed cameras out in our, you know, our, as far as the trailers that capture speeds, you know, to see, is it really an issue and to, you know, to look at traffic calming and to work with y'all's office on that. That is something that I do foresee that, I mean, that is one of our largest, you know, areas. I do foresee that need growing and we will probably come in another, you know, in another future budget year looking to increase the deputies that are assigned specifically to traffic related issues. But these deputies are essentially kind of the jack-of-all-trades deputies that you would see in the marked cars driving around the community responding to incidents. Thank you. Thank you. Some years ago, and I guess not too many years ago,

[01:22:22] there was the, we heard the word terms, back the blue all the time. And I didn't always understand what people meant when they said that, but I know what I meant when I said it. When I think of what back the blue is, it means that we have to pay our law enforcement what they're worth. We have to make sure that they are not um overworked and overwhelmed because what we know for a fact that there is more suicides than line of duty deaths in law enforcement we know that the um domestic violence rates are up the anxiety and depressions rates are up in law enforcement a lot of those

[01:22:57] things comes because of the overstress and overwork just the nature of the job period but overstressed and overworked when you don't get to have downtime um i you know to be honest I the sheriff's department gets a good good good good marks but when you ask what's maybe the one thing that's the issue is you know especially in the evenings or especially on the weekend when an accident even a fender bender happens it takes a long time to get the patrol car car there and that's because there's not that many patrol cars out in the street that that that is that is the reason um there's also these you know I was watching a show this morning um about swatting

[01:23:37] which is a whole new thing it's it's pretty sick but it's a whole new thing and it's especially it was like especially when it came to you know certain people the experience squatting incidents there are these new offenses that we didn't even deal with before so like this is not your grandfather's law enforcement you know the cyber crimes the the these types of things and if you have more people who are just doing the what you would consider the day-to-day kind of and would you think that law enforcement is, then you also will have more people that you can start to focus on some of these specialty areas that are now coming up out of everywhere.

[01:24:17] And so with respect to my colleague from the Algonquin District, I won't be supporting this motion. And if I have a criticism at all, it's I don't think you all asked for enough. I don't think you asked for it in a timely enough way.

[01:24:34] I think we should be talking about the whole cybersecurity, law enforcement, how that looks and how we start building that up even more to take care of some of the incidents that we know are coming down the pike. And so my advice for you right now is come back with more next year and come back with it in different law enforcement areas that are new and that are things we don't even know what we're going to be looking for next.

[01:25:02] And so, you know, I used to say this all the time when I first got here, ask for what you need, and let the board pare it down, but don't pare yourselves down. Ask for what you need, and I don't think that that's always been done enough, and so I respectfully will not be supporting this motion.

[01:25:20] Thank you. Ms. Brixton, would you like a closing? Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. So I went on a ride-along as well out of the Eastern Station, and I did not have the same experience that my colleague shared. but I'd like to go again this term since it's been a couple years.

[01:25:38] Maybe I'll go in the two to nine time frame. I don't feel this need, and I haven't heard from my constituents that they are unhappy or waiting a long time. The other reason I brought this motion, and I probably wouldn't have brought this motion if it weren't for the fact that it's a priority four in the budget.

[01:26:04] So that tells me it's one of the lower priorities overall for county administration and maybe have been kind of a lower priority for you guys. I don't know why it got rated a priority for, but for me, it's an opportunity to save us \$4 million, let you guys catch up on hiring the next 29 that you have on paper right now, and fund the 14 positions next year.

[01:26:31] I don't, you know, I don't have the criticism either of my experience with the sheriff's department. And so I don't want it to feel that way. I just think that, you know, it's budget time and we could save \$4 million on a priority for item. So thank you so much for coming tonight.

[01:26:47] I appreciate it. Thank you, Ms. Bricksman. Okay, the motion was made by Ms. Bricksman, seconded by Mr. Crony. All people who say aye, oppose? That motion will fail, 7-1-1, with Ms. Bricksman voting for the motion.

[01:27:02] Ms. Umstead not being here. Thank you. Yes. Oh, really?

[01:27:21] Was he not here with the vote? Was he just got up and left? Okay. So that's 6-1-2. Yes, that's right. With Mr. Sains also stepping off, 1-6-2, off the dais. With Mr. Sains and Ms. Umstead being off the dais and Ms. Bricksman voting for the motion.

[01:27:38] I am tired. Thank you very much. Thank you. Is Mr. Clemens in the room? Is Gary Clemens in the room? No, because he's sending me stuff like, and I'm sitting here on Capitol Hill.

[01:28:02] So, yes, very good, Mr. Clemons, very good. Well done. Okay, the Commonwealth's attorney is going to come back and speak to us again.

[01:28:19] We actually didn't do a whole lot with his budget last time. He did send us a memo that everyone should have received a date, and it was in your package as well. If he would come back down, that would be appreciated.

[01:28:36] I'm going to go on and make a motion right now because there were some agreements of what would be taken out of his budget and the amount.

[01:28:53] So I'm going to make a motion that priorities two, three, and four are removed from the Commonwealth Attorney's budget in the amount of \$637,040. Is that the motion? Main segment by Ms. Briggsman.

[01:29:10] Discussion on that motion? Okay, so Supervisor, so first of all, huh? Sorry, you moved quickly there. Oh, you were discussing. Okay, you're up. I'm sorry. Yeah, yeah. Mr. Anderson, thank you for that. I don't know yet what I'm going to do with the two investigators that you're requesting, but I do thank you for going back and retooling the budget and working the budget and taking those out because, you know, because you did say you had, you know, more attorneys.

[01:29:39] so we do appreciate that. It's not always done that when we ask something like that it happens. So thank you very much. And then after this motion I will have more questions about your investigator. I'll have questions about both your letter and then the description of the investigator positions that are in the package. Okay? Thank you. Mr. Letourneau?

[01:30:08] Yeah, I just wanted to see if Mr. Anderson had anything to add on this. I appreciate your taking our words to heart and working to try to reclassify. So I believe what Chair Randall moved is what we kind of had agreed upon. Okay, all right.

[01:30:26] Well, I think that's a good approach. When we get to the investigator positions, I think I'm going to support leaving those in, but I appreciate you working with us on this. Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Kirshner? Yeah, thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Mr. Anderson, for doing that. I think I was a little disappointed when the request first came because we had gone through four years of Ms. Biberi asking for enormous, very large requests, and that was very frustrating to me.

[01:30:51] And so when you agreed to go back and look at reclassifying this, that makes me a lot more appreciative, and I thank you very much for doing that and be willing to do it. So I just wanted to make sure I made that statement. Okay, I made the motion.

[01:31:06] Supervisor Bricksman seconded the motion. All in favor, please say aye. Wow. Any opposed? That motion will pass 8-0-1. Thank you. All right, questions for Mr. Anderson on the other two, well, I'm sorry, the investigators, which is a priority one.

[01:31:31] I have questions, but if anyone else has questions. Yeah. Mr. Sainz? Thank you. Yeah, can you elaborate a little bit more on how these two investigators are going to help address the fentanyl? Because it's listed here, Two positions need to address issues with fentanyl, human trafficking, and case prep.

[01:31:51] Can you go a little bit further into detail in those positions for me, please, on how they're going to be involved with the sheriff's department in their investigations? Okay. Yes, the answer is I can do that. In the course of the campaign, I said, while I was commonwealth's attorney the first time, I wasn't aware of a problem like this to the magnitude that we have it right now.

[01:32:14] The answer to your question is, when I look at the way we're handling that, there are task forces, And I want to be able to be part of those task forces. I want to be able to use an investigator that's embedded with those people, investigating those incidents and cases so that we can better prosecute those cases.

[01:32:33] That's not redundant with people that are already on the task force. These people are there for purposes of doing things that we ask them to do on a spur-of-the-moment case. I'll give you an example. We had one this week, a case where the individual had been convicted of not guilty by reason of insanity on a brutal murder case.

[01:32:56] And we found notice that the hospital was going to release that person for unsupervised furloughs. So what we did was we got the investigator involved immediately because those are post disposition cases that we really can't ask a police agency to get involved in.

[01:33:16] And so we were prepared to be able to deal with that, and we were able to deal with that. We didn't have to provide any surveillance or anything at all, but we were able to do that. But I want you to know that part of the solution to that case was the investigator. And these are the types of things that come up.

[01:33:32] This is probably the third time an incident like this has happened, even since I've been back. And so basically, those people are there for purposes of responding to the Commonwealth attorney, helping collect evidence, strategize cases. They're not redundant in the investigations.

[01:33:52] And so basically... All right, with respect, sir, and thank you for that example, but you listed here, again, fentanyl, human trafficking. Give me an example to that. How are they going to help with those cases? They're going to be embedded with the task force. And when the task force is involved with investigating or going forward on those cases, our office is going to be in that group.

[01:34:12] All right, before my time ends, how many investigators do we currently have now that are doing the work? We only have one now? Also, we have one investigator embedded with the task force. No, I have one investigator that is not embedded with the task force yet. I'm asking for two. And I want those task forces to be involved are the fentanyl task forces and also the human trafficking task forces.

[01:34:32] Well, you have one for both of those right now. I have one person, plus the fact that there are issues involving trial preparation. These are violent felony cases. These are not misdemeanors. These are violent felony cases where they're more complicated. And we have an individual there that we can work with.

[01:34:48] I want to mention one thing. We prosecute cases from eight different agencies. And those, obviously, the Sheriff's Department is the major agency that we deal with. But we deal with seven others. And so those are seven other potentially different systems that we have to merge together on a timely basis to make sure we deal with a violent felony quickly and in the right way.

[01:35:10] Thank you. Mr. Kirshner? Thank you, Madam Chair. So you have one current investigator that came from the past administration. Is that correct? Correct. And that one investigator you had work on this particular issue, what is that investigator doing right now?

[01:35:26] Right now? Yeah, not at this very moment, but like in the office. Well, I'll tell you what he's doing. He is going back and forth with the task force and telling what our plan is so that he can be involved when the time comes for him or whoever else we get in addition to him to be involved in those cases.

[01:35:44] I told him, I would like you to go around to all these police force agencies, introduce yourself, make sure they know who you are. They can call you. You're part of this office right now, but I want you to be involved with those types of officers. So basically, I mean, right now he's not involved in the task force,

his fentanyl or human trafficking, but he's involved with violent felony cases and helping us prepare those cases for trial.

[01:36:10] He's not the most busy person in the world right now, but we're about to make him so. So when you say the task force, how many task force are we talking about? Well, when I went through the campaign. I mean, do we have any task force set now that you're thinking of specifically or creating some?

[01:36:26] The fentanyl task forces, the human trafficking task forces. I want a part of those. I want this office to be part of that. Okay. And that is run by what department? Well, there's various task forces. Are they joint task forces you're referring to between various departments?

[01:36:43] Yeah, between various departments, yeah, throughout the region. And have they said they want someone from the Commonwealth Attorney's Office? Caleb, I can't imagine that anybody is not going to, in Loudoun County, because there's nobody there now, is going to object to a task force member coming in from Loudoun County.

[01:37:01] Have I talked to them? No. Okay. But do I think they're not going to object to any task force member coming in there from a county that is not represented at this time? Okay. All right. Thank you. Mr. Anderson, did you just say he's not the most busy person in the world, but I'm about to change that?

[01:37:20] Well, one of the things that changed that was the incident we had this week. Mr. Anza, hold on, hold on. Did you just say he's not the most busy person in the world, but I'm about to change that. I did say that, and I'm going to be totally up for it. No, no, no. I got three minutes, sir. I'm a little, so you may have just answered my question, because in the book where it says to address issues with fentanyl, I think what you are actually saying and what's actually being said is with the fentanyl task force.

[01:37:51] Is that correct? Not just with fentanyl, because that doesn't make any sense to me. you either address issues with substance use in general, or you address issues, well, that's the only answer, because you can't address issues with just a single drug.

[01:38:08] So do you mean the fentanyl task force? I mean drugs. I mean specifically fentanyl and the task force work that's going on right now. So why do you mean specifically fentanyl and not other substances? Well, I made a mistake. Okay, so basically we're talking drugs. Okay, so you're saying?

[01:38:25] Fentanyl right now is the hot button for purposes of enforcement. So fentanyl, I made a mistake. It should have been drugs. It should have been substances. Okay, that's a fair answer. Because, I mean, that's a fair answer.

[01:38:44] Tell me, because when I read your letter, and I did read your letter a couple times and through, Tell me, though, why is some of what you're asking for not in the purview of law enforcement, these investigative jobs, not in the purview of law enforcement?

[01:39:06] Because you have party one of critical persons to help perform tasks of OCA routine that is not in the purview of any law enforcement. So what, because I didn't really understand, and maybe I just don't understand that, that your office does investigation.

[01:39:24] I thought that was more a law enforcement duty. Well, I think maybe we all just heard the dilemma with the Sheriff's Department and how busy they are. This is focused, and this is focused on a issue. It's not general law enforcement. But the issue he just asked you is the three issues you're talking about?

[01:39:41] When you say the issue. We can branch out. I mean, right now, that's what I'm talking about. If there were other issues that came up, I have the flexibility to be able to use these people. What's the issue right now? Drugs and human trafficking, which is what I'm trying to cover with the investigators, to be part of those task forces.

[01:40:01] Okay, so I just want to say it back to you. You like to have these two positions to embed them in the task force for substance use and human trafficking, but not really substance use, substance trafficking, substance selling, substance.

[01:40:23] I'm sorry? You're absolutely right. It is not substance use. It is trafficking. That's what we're focusing on. I get it 100%. It's the use that's not the issue that we would be dealing with. It's the trafficking. Okay, okay, okay.

[01:40:45] Supervisor, is there, I'm going to make a motion. Okay. Okay. I'm going to make a motion to remove one investigator from the Commonwealth Attorney's Priority Investigation List. I'm going to second that. Okay. The reason I'm removing one is because it's a couple of things.

[01:41:05] One, this is still a very new office, and I think you're still trying, to your statement, you're still trying to kind of get your hands around all this happened and all this happening. The last CA received 23 positions and was criticized for it, but they still went to the office.

[01:41:28] I don't think I would have even taken one out had you just made the statement he's not the most busy person in the world right now. Can I clarify that? But truthfully, what I think may be happening is, you know, we can see by next year if you need another one, and if you need another one, you come back.

[01:41:48] You have one right now that's not very busy. You're going to put him to work and make him busy. I get that, he or she. And you will give another one, and we'll try to get that person on board. And then we'll see where we're sitting next year when you come back as far as do we need another investigator? Is the sheriff's department picking up some more?

[01:42:05] Do we have a greater grasp around some of what's going on with the substance use issues both in Loudoun County and regionally? I'd love for you really to at some point when you have time to come back and give this board a briefing on what's happening with human trafficking in this county.

[01:42:28] I don't think most people really understand that we have a human trafficking issue in this county and what that looks like. and it doesn't look like what most people might think it looks like. So to come back and tell us about that. But let's start with one and then see how we're looking when we get here to this place next year. Thank you for your consideration.

[01:42:44] Thank you, sir. Mr. Kirshner? Thank you, Madam Chair. I was actually going to make the same exact motion. Originally, and I told Mr. Anderson this when he came, I was not sold, and I'm still not completely sold on the need for investigators in the office.

[01:43:01] However, this is Mr. Anderson's office. He has won this office in a fair election here in Loudoun County. This is his top priority, and I think if he believes, based upon his authority there, that he needs an investigator, we should give him one.

[01:43:18] However, given kind of the conversation that we've had, I think because of just budget issues and whatnot and the fact that he went back and pared these down and found reassigned basically some of

these positions, I think I'm going to support the one, and that will give you two, and you can handle how you, if you come back next year and say, listen, I really need a third one, and here's why, let's investigate it then.

[01:43:43] So I appreciate what you're doing, and keep it up. Thank you for that. Thank you, Mr. Letourneau. All right, I'm going to give you a chance to, do you want to clarify, it sounded like you wanted to clarify the statement you made where the individual wasn't busy.

[01:44:00] Okay, yeah, what I meant was he's new, And he's a former state police officer. And when I say he wasn't, it was the wrong choice of words. I made a mistake. He is now busy introducing himself to agencies, police agencies, so that he can be, he didn't have to do that as we get going on this issue.

[01:44:20] So the answer that I gave shouldn't have been that answer. I will tell you that he was about to be very busy on that incident that I just told you happened this week. But he is certainly there for purposes of using him, and we will definitely use him.

[01:44:36] Okay, so walk me through having three versus two investigators then. I mean, is it essential that you have three, or can you live with two that the motion is? I've already been really blunt with myself on going back and taking it to the recommendations that you made.

[01:44:55] Chairman Randall's comment, I can't argue with that. I mean, if we get to a situation where we need him, we'll definitely be, it develops into where I think it's going to go. We're definitely coming back for another one, for sure, and maybe others, other positions. But I will tell you that I think that's fair.

[01:45:12] Okay, thank you. Thank you. Mr. Turner? Can I just clarify in the question, you think that's fair, what's fair, one or two? I think Chairman Randall's one is fair. Okay. If we have one, yes.

[01:45:29] We may build into these task forces rapidly. I don't know, to be honest with you, they haven't been there yet. It may need the third one fairly rapidly. If it does, we'll make whatever adjustments we have to make.

[01:45:45] Well, I am adverse to, when we get into these budget discussions, really drilling down on granularity within individual department heads. I don't have that expertise. I think most of us don't have that expertise. If it's a credible case that's made, then I tend to go with the department head's request. What I'm persuaded by in this one, and I appreciate your candor, I appreciate your willingness to work with us and eliminate the two, three, and four priorities.

[01:46:11] So I was inclined to go with two. I am very persuaded by Supervisor Kirshner's comments and by the Chair's comments. And I appreciate your willingness to be flexed and say, I can live with one. That's a refreshingly candid approach from people we see at the table.

[01:46:28] That sounded terrible. I don't mean everybody else at the table. It's not like that. Again, we're tired. I apologize. But usually everybody rightly fights like heck to hang on to every one of their priority requests because they've thought them through, and I really appreciate your flexibility there.

[01:46:48] So I'm going to support the motion, but I appreciate your comments. Thank you. Can I respond? Mr. Turner, thank you. Thank you very much. We may come back next year with an additional request. Ms. Bricksman.

[01:47:04] Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for working on the reclassification. I'm not sure if you're aware that we had to change Virginia code so that Chair Randall can be addressed as chairwoman or

chair, and she has chosen chairwoman or chair.

[01:47:25] I just wanted to put that out there in case you didn't see it. I stand corrected. Thank you. I'm not feeling as if the strategy is fully baked on the two investigators, and I don't know if it's because I don't understand the legalese or if it's not being presented in a way that I can understand it, but I would be in favor of eliminating both investigators while the strategy of the office is changed and moved around.

[01:47:58] But the motion on the table is just to remove one, and I will support that motion and look forward to next year. Thank you very much for your consideration. All right. Thank you. I don't believe we need to take shots at former elected officials because they're not here anymore.

[01:48:18] They cannot defend themselves, and why do that, to be honest? So I'm just going to say that, and that was not directed to you, by the way. That was not directed to you. I don't have any closing comments except to say thank you all, and thank you for coming back.

[01:48:34] I really do appreciate it. It's good to see you again as well. All right. Good to see you. All in favor, please say aye. Any opposed? That motion will pass, 801. Thanks so much. Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay.

[01:48:51] We're going to see the Housing and Community Development Department, and this is the first time seeing them. They are on page, description of resources on page R85, and the budget narrative is, you guys need a break? Y'all need a break? Those two are on finance, so they've seen it already.

[01:49:22] Okay, they're good, because they've seen it already.

[01:49:46] So, hi, how are you? You all presented the other night at finance. Did you have talked to anybody who's not on finance? We haven't spoken to anyone outside of finance.

[01:50:03] Okay, that's unfortunate. I only say that because the clarification was so, so helpful. And so I'm actually going to ask you guys, do you have a presentation? You don't have a presentation? All right.

[01:50:19] I'll let you just do your thing. This is your first time here. I'll let you just do your thing. And then what I might do is for people who are not on finance, I might give them a little more leeway to ask some questions about how more money on the tax rate would work because they weren't here.

[01:50:40] And I think it's important before I make that motion that they understand that because I am going to make that motion. All right. All right. We're ready when you are. Good evening, Chair Randall and members of the board. I'm John Hall, Director for the Department of Housing and Community Development.

[01:50:56] With me at the table are Cheryl Kroll, our Finance Manager, Brian Regan, our Assistant Director, and we have members of the Office of Management and Budget with us as well. The department's single resource request can be found on page R85, and the budget narrative begins on 528.

[01:51:15] Staff followed the budget equity tool in developing this request to expand access to fair housing choice so that all people are fully able to connect to the region's assets and resources. The programs that the department provides are as diverse as the residents we serve.

[01:51:34] Our wide array of housing programs and services increase affordable housing opportunities for Loudoun's low to moderate income households, including home buyers and renters, as well as providing gap financing for nonprofits and affordable housing developers.

[01:51:50] On a daily basis, staff provides opportunities for residents to become first-time homebuyers, to rent decent, safe, and sanitary housing, and to obtain financial assistance with a down payment or closing cost, to rehabilitate a home in order for the occupant to age in place, and to also provide grants and loans to help preserve, provide access to, and add to the supply of attainable housing throughout Loudoun County.

[01:52:18] For fiscal year 25, the department's only resource request is for the current part-time temporary state rental assistance program specialists to become a full-time permanent position. This position will be funded with a combination of state administrative fee funding and local tax funding.

[01:52:40] The state rental assistance program is a partnership between the county and the Virginia Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services and provides rental subsidies to support independent living for individuals with developmental disabilities. Having received a total of 50 voucher allocations from the state, the program's demand has exceeded the capacity of a part-time employee. This position strategically aligns with the county's unmet housing needs strategic plan, its strategy to improve housing stability and increase access to rental housing

[01:53:18] by supporting a rental assistance program. Staff and I would like to thank you for your unwavering support of housing activities over the last couple of years especially, and we are available to answer any questions that you may have.

[01:53:34] - Thank you, Mr. Hall. If anyone has questions for Mr. Hall, please turn your light on. Okay, no questions. I'll just say thank you, And I would recommend anyone who doesn't sit on finance committee to go and look at the slides and maybe get a briefing from you that came to finance committee this week because it was really beneficial and really helpful to get our minds around all of the different pots of money and how they're being used.

[01:54:05] I'm actually shocked you're only asking for this one resource. Shocked. So I'm hoping that maybe next year, maybe some more resources will come. One question I had, and it comes from talking to some folks in the community, and that is with the rental assistance work that's happening right now, there seems to be a communication problem.

[01:54:33] And I know that, is it Loudon Cares that's doing the program? And so I'm wondering, like I've been told that some folks were in application and then they thought that they were disqualified for it, but then found out that they were qualified.

[01:54:51] And it seems to be maybe a bit of a language barrier. So I'm wondering if there is any thought to putting sort of a communications facilitator that's bilingual, maybe there or in our department.

[01:55:07] And maybe you've already done that, and it's just a common problem, but has there been any thought to that? And, of course, I'm getting this from New Virginia Majority for some of those folks. Okay, thank you for your question, Vice Chair Briskman. A couple of responses to that.

[01:55:24] I believe, well, currently the only program that Loudon Cares is administering is our Interim Eviction Assistance Program. Okay. so with that program there is a timing issue for eligibility everyone who would be eligible besides the income eligibility criteria and having a valid lease agreement has to have an unlawful detainer and so a lot of times what happens if rent is due on the first of the month you you have basically the first 10 days of the month before a landlord would actually file with the courts that unlawful

[01:56:01] detainer. And so that's the milestone that is needed in order to participate in that program. So I think part of the disconnect is if I'm calling Loudon Cares on the first of the month, because I know I can't pay that month, I still have to wait until the landlord files, takes legal action. So that's part of it, but that's only for the eviction assistance program. On Monday of this week, we had our kickoff meeting with Loudon Cares to be able to start planning and launch the temporary rental assistance that will go for up to nine months of rental assistance

[01:56:39] that entails case management. That program, they will need 45 days to launch. So our target implementation date is May 1st. And I think we'll see clarification happen there. I'm running out of time, so I don't mean to rush you. But the other question I had was, When we're operating a program, if there's no restrictions from funding from somewhere else, would it be possible to allow people to come to us before the eviction notice?

[01:57:13] Because they want to do that, and I think it kind of takes away their agency, and they're trying to be proactive, and they know they're going to have a problem, and maybe even eviction notice might hurt their credit record. is there any way to resolve that issue yes and that is what we plan for with the the temporary rental assistance program okay they just weren't launched at the same time but but that will be the the other program that will address the questions okay uh that's all the questions madam chair you might call for motion thank you um i won't need a motion uh yet from these folks but you know what

[01:57:50] we'd like you to do is uh just hang out for a little while with us if you don't mind um because there's another motion that's going to be made. So, Supervisors, we're really at the end here, except for Ms. Timstreet. You and I did forget to talk about, we forgot to talk about non-profit stuff, but that's okay.

[01:58:11] We have time to do that. Ms. Timstreet, would you like to make some comments, recommendations, give some thoughts on the budget process, any of those things? Thank you. Yeah, then go back to your seats. There's no motion for them, not right now, but there's one coming. So I'm saying hang out, like, in the room, not at the table if you don't want to.

[01:58:32] Mr. Demstreet? Thank you, Madam Chair. So on Monday when we were here as part of the budget work session, Ms. Burke and her team introduced kind of some of the options that we had come up with around revenue coming from the General Assembly.

[01:58:48] And so there were three options that we kind of, or three scenarios that we kind of presented and then indicated to the board that we would come back and reintroduce those to have, just because we do think the board should consider or make a decision around the additional funding that is coming, we think is likely coming from the state for K-12 education.

[01:59:15] So just as a recap, we believe the General Assembly and their budget has allocated right around \$19 million for K-12 education. So there was three options that were presented. I think the staff recommendation, which is also in the memorandum for today, would be for the board to go ahead and recognize that, if that's your pleasure, to recognize the \$19 million in additional state funding for K-12 education.

[01:59:46] If you should decide to do that, you'll need to decide how you want to allocate it.

[02:00:00] So the difference between the first two options is the board could reduce the transfer, recognize the revenue, and then reduce the local transfer by \$19 million, which would leave the school

funding where it is right now as part of the proposed budget with a \$10 million gap between what they've requested and what is funded.

[02:00:17] The second option, which is what the staff is recommending, what I'm recommending, the staff are recommending, is that you recognize the revenue and then reduce the local transfer by \$9 million. Doing so would fully fund the school board's request.

[02:00:32] You would then make someone here would then need to make a motion as part of that to reduce the local transfer by nine million dollars, which would add nine million dollars to the amount of money that you have available to you, which would also lower the tax rate.

[02:00:50] And then those funds would be available for the board to to either to either lower the tax rate or to or to spend.

[02:01:06] The other thing that has come up, which I think the board should consider, is the other option would be to keep your personal property tax rate at \$415 for the second half of the year, which could also be used to reduce the tax rate or to be utilized in another way by the board. And that generates about \$5.6 million.

[02:01:22] Ms. Dempsey, would you like to add, because what the school brought to us tonight, we discussed the fund balance possibility. Can you speak on that now? Because if you can't, that's fine. It's kind of on the spot.

[02:01:42] Yeah, I can speak on that. I mean, the only issue that I was taking, I have some concerns about, is how the \$3 million for the bonus funding is being represented. And so the governor's budget, when it was introduced, proposed a 1% bonus in one year and then a 2% pay increase in the second year.

[02:02:06] The General Assembly, when it went into conference, changed that to a 3% pay increase in both years. So I do take some issue with it being presented as a reinstatement of the 1% bonus because the governor's proposal was not to provide a pay increase in the first year.

[02:02:25] It was to provide a 1% bonus in the first year and then a 2% increase in the second year. So just what the General Assembly did was instead of doing that, they eliminated the bonus and just made it a 3% pay increase. So while I think it's fair for the school division to request a 1% bonus to be added, it, that I don't believe that the portrayal of it as a reinstatement is completely accurate.

[02:02:50] Okay, well, that is a different thing. But you could send out the fund balance for consideration if you wanted to provide them funding for a 3% building. I'm going to go to Mr. Turner for a motion in just a second, but I do think I want everyone to understand, I want to make sure everyone understands what Mr. Hemstreet stands. Does anyone have any questions for Mr. Hemstreet before I go, Mr. Turner, for a motion?

[02:03:13] Yes, yes, Mr. Turner. Yeah. So in keeping the tax rate at 415, that generates another 5 million that could then be used to reduce the real estate tax rate. Correct. Real property tax rate. That's correct. Without doing that, but following the rest of the scenario, that still lowers the tax rate by half a penny and provides some remainder, right? Something like 1.7 million or something like that?

[02:03:47] No, more than that. No, it'd be more than that. Yeah. So I guess the question is that the point of the 415 for tax year 25 would be what to reduce the tax rate by a full penny in the scenario that you were discussing so i'm i'm reacting to a question that i got from i know i'm trying to understand so if there is a

desire and that that has been vocalized a number of times by some board members to lower the tax rate and to be able to allocate a full half penny to uh to housing right

[02:04:23] in order to get enough money to do that i see okay the nine million you're using the 415 for that yeah you have to subtract 5.6 million for the nine so right you're not gonna have but on the housing issue specifically we did talk about a finance we wouldn't we couldn't use fund balance if we wanted to do it as a reoccurring half penny but we could do the equivalent amount as part of the fund balance process process in the housing trust fund or in one of the funds without making it part of the tax rate, essentially.

[02:04:55] That's correct. Okay, thank you. And I'm going to have a question about that in just a second to Mr. Letourneau, because I know that was done before in another situation. So, Mr. Kirshner. Thank you, Madam Chair. If I can speak to Mr. Hemstreet through the chair.

[02:05:10] Yes, please. Mr. Hemstreet, so I just want to make sure I understand here. I'm kind of inclined to go with option one, given some of the other requests that are about ready to occur. But if we did that and the funding for the school wasn't fully the 19 million, what options would we have later to provide perhaps to fill up that gap?

[02:05:31] Yeah, so the reason why we didn't recommend option one is because we don't think the amount of, if there is a decrease in funding, we don't, I don't think it's going to be zero, right? I think it's, you know, might be half of it, something of that nature. So what that means, if you went with option one, it's the schools would be at, would have a \$10 million gap because that doesn't get addressed.

[02:05:59] Anything that doesn't materialize then becomes an additional gap for them. And so the reason why we went with scenario two or option two is because it kind of splits the risk between us and the schools. It does allow the board, if you wanted to, to replace, you know, up to \$9 million of money that doesn't materialize using fund balance.

[02:06:23] And then also you would have to backfill that on the county side. So scenario two, the worst case scenario for the board is \$18 million coming from fund balance. If you use scenario one and the money doesn't materialize, then the worst case for the board then is \$20 to \$36 million in terms of, you know, \$38 million in terms of fund balance.

[02:06:45] So for that reason, we went with a lower number because we felt it was better. To reduce the risk on both sides is what you're saying. Correct. Okay. Have you spoken with the school administration about what they would or would not do, how they would refigure their budget?

[02:07:07] Has that had a discussion between administrators if we were to reduce it by \$9 or \$19 million, how they would refit? So scenario one does not reduce their budget. Scenario one leaves them with the existing \$10 million gap that they currently have.

[02:07:25] Right. So they would have to go through their reconciliation process. Right. So they would, okay. But they haven't talked about it. Okay. Fair enough. That's fair. Thanks. Ms. Bricksman. Ms. Bricksman, yeah. Thank you. I'm sorry.

[02:07:40] I thought I heard you say, Mr. Hemstreet, the short answer, if the funds do not materialize for the schools, the short answer is we could use fund balance. Yes, although keep in mind that for the schools, these are recurring expenditures.

[02:08:01] I know. Well, we did it last year, right? Correct. So like this year, we started out \$16 million less than what we normally start out with because you have to convert the one-time funding to recurring funding. Yeah. And then would this scenario be possible that we lower the transfer, right, you're saying lower the transfer, split the risk, so then that's \$9 million for us to lower the tax rate by half a cent.

[02:08:43] But if we combine that with the 415 in the second half of the year, couldn't we, and let me get through what I'm saying, couldn't we lower the tax rate a full cent and then send \$7.5 million to the fund balance discussion, but also in the motion, bake in the half cent for the next fiscal year? You certainly could do that.

[02:08:58] That's a good question. But you would set yourself up as being \$7.4 million in the whole. Next year. Next year. But that allows us to lower the tax rate by a full penny. For those of you not on Finance Committee, we had a briefing that we're going to have about \$200 million in fund balance.

[02:09:16] So we could cover that with fund balance and lower the tax rate of full penny. And we could make all those motions tonight. Consider that in fund balance. No, we're not making a fund balance motion tonight. Well, we could send it in a fund balance.

[02:09:35] Yeah, discussion. Discussion. So, Mr. Letourneau, I think, and I'm not, I promise, hand up, I'm not passing shade right now, I promise I'm not.

[02:09:52] I'm just trying to remember something that happened when, in 2015, when there was the whole, like, you know, fully funded schools and get full day kindergarten and all that kind of stuff going on. There was a lot of stuff done with fund balance that later rolled over into, it was said to be one-time stuff, and then it later rolled into the budget for the next year.

[02:10:14] Was that, so, because that's how the budget was fully funded. It's okay. I mean, you know, you do things. Do you remember that being an issue, though? I'm going to have to defer to Tim, because I don't quite know what you're referring to.

[02:10:30] Let me ask it differently. If we did, because I would think, that's because you've been hit with baseball. This is twice tonight, you know, it's just, it's incoming tonight. Pick on that.

[02:10:45] I'm so tired. These two have my back right here, it's okay. It's okay. Mr. Hemstreet, if, because I was thinking about what Ms. Bricksman said too, for the same reason that she said it, and then we could still get the money into it, because really all I care about is getting that money into the housing funds that the other half penny.

[02:11:06] Is that something that you would be worried about because, as you said, we go into next year with a \$7.4 million deficit, which is a pretty big deficit, actually, to go into the – and I say deficit because you would have built it into the next year's budget.

[02:11:22] That's a pretty big number to do that with. I remember when you all did it with schools, it was much smaller stuff. It wasn't anything this large. And so how do you feel about that? How do you feel about doing that out of fund balance and then taking that out of next year's budget?

[02:11:40] So my recommendation to the board is always going to be fund recurring expenditures, recurring revenue. That's what I thought. The main reason or one of the main reasons that I would make that recommendation this year is the board has indicated a desire to do a lot of things around land and land acquisition.

[02:12:02] And so I'm going to, again, we're coming to every board member in the August-September time period to see what your interests are. And so part of what I'm trying to do is secure sufficient land acquisition funding to address some of the desires of the board.

[02:12:21] All right, that's fair. Okay, that's a fair answer. That's a great answer, in fact. Mr. Turner, would you like to make a motion? Thank you, Madam Chair. Can we just listen for a second?

[02:12:37] It's literally what Mr. Tempsey just said. I moved it. Supervisor. Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead. There is a scenario that was prepared and is in the county response packet. It's question 13.

[02:12:52] Page 10, yeah. The package. You do. You have, yeah. Do we want to make sure everyone's on that page at least before? Mr. Rickson, can you maybe stop that? Thank you very much. Mr. Turner, would you like to make a motion?

[02:13:15] Yeah, I'm going to do this on a fly, which I think reflects what's in the piece. I move that the board reduce the LCPS transfer by \$9 million. I further move that the board hold the personal property tax constant at \$4.15 throughout fiscal 25.

[02:13:36] And I further move that the board transfer the value of one half penny. Whoa, whoa, don't make that motion. I get to make that motion. Make all the motions you just made. I'm making that motion now. Then that's all my moves. I have all my moves.

[02:13:53] You have all your moves. Chair Randall. Yes. If I may, so I'm staff, but would Supervisor Turner also want to recognize the additional state revenue of \$19 million? He would like to do that. My objective is to recognize, I want to use option two.

[02:14:13] I recognize \$19 million. There you go. By further move, I recognize the state transfer of \$19 million. \$19 million. All right. next all right the board recognizes and it's part of the motion that motion was been made I will second that motion sorry um discussion on the motion mr.

[02:14:30] Turner thank you madam chair I had some discussions with staff and I agree with the concept of splitting the risk difference I think there's a very very good chance that the schools will get at least 10 million from the state this This extra \$9 million enables us to reduce expenditures that the county is making in a way that I don't think will inappropriately affect the schools later this year, and we can make that hole down the road if we have to.

[02:15:05] The logic behind holding the 415 rate was well discussed in an earlier session. I believe, if I'm correct on this, the legislation has passed the House and the Senate but has not been signed by the governor to do away with the Sunset Clause, correct? That's correct.

[02:15:21] So we will then be able to establish separate car tax and computer tax, and that's the logic behind that, and that's all I have. Wonderful. Thank you. Mr. Letourneau. Yeah, can we pause while staff updates the Tote Board because it's important that we see what the actual impact is.

[02:15:40] Can you see the numbers before we even vote on it? Or even discuss it, because I need to figure out where we... Ah, so that went down by a full penny. And then it'll go back up if I do 7.4.

[02:15:56] Which is going to put it back in. Go down a half penny. I think I'll support this motion and probably not the next one, even though I would support fund balance for the next one. So, yeah, I'm willing to trade 415 on the personal property tax rate for a full penny on the tax rate.

[02:16:20] If that's not where we end up, I probably wouldn't be willing to do that. but and i don't think it is based on what the subsequent motion is but what's the margin uh one five eight three at this yes okay well all right i'll certainly support putting that in the housing but i don't want to go up a whole half penny on that when i think we can do it in fund balance have the exact same outcome without actually having to raise taxes to do it or at least go up by a half penny yeah all right i know but okay mr kirschner thank you madam chair so

[02:16:59] This is a motion that took me a little by surprise. There's some very intriguing aspects about it that I like. Some I'm not so sure I like. But if I can ask Mr. Hemistry this question or staff, Madam Chair. Sure, yeah, absolutely. If, and I don't think I'm going to get a second for this, but I might make an alternative.

[02:17:15] If we were to kind of do a blend of this motion with option number one, which is to bring it, the transfer down to 19 million versus 9 million, We're adding back in \$5 million as a result of keeping the personal property tax at \$4.15.

[02:17:36] So it would only be a \$4 million difference in part. Does that make any difference on the tax rate? Does that make sense? So I guess you could do it a couple different ways. Make the transfer \$5 million, it would be \$9 plus 5, it would be \$14 million difference.

[02:17:53] Does that make sense? Are you, let me ask. Can we stop his time just a second? Hold on, Mr. McIntyre. Mr. Kirsten, can you do that again? I'm sorry. So as I see the scenario right now, and I'm just wondering how it's going to affect the tax rate, we're reducing the transfer to the LCPS by \$9 million, but we're keeping the personal property from where we were, so that adds another \$5 million in terms of total dollars.

[02:18:19] Yes. So if we change the transfer to, say, \$14 million, does that— So if you reduce the transfer by another \$5 million, is that correct? Yeah, by another 5. Does that change our tax rate at all?

[02:18:38] No, you'd have to reduce the transfer by row 22. Yeah, so you'd have to reduce the transfer by 5828776, and then that would reduce it another half penny. I'd move an alternative to reduce it by that additional amount.

[02:18:59] You move, well, no, no. I don't know if we can, or I guess I could ask for a friendly. And I wouldn't do an alternative. I would think that you're moving in a completely opposite motion right now.

[02:19:15] No, it's just adding to the reduction in transfer. So it would be a friendly. Maybe he sees it as unfriendly. No, no. Let me be extra clear. He's not accepting the friendly. I understand. And I'm saying that that is too different of a motion for me to take up right now.

[02:19:33] We need to do this motion first. Okay. Thanks. But I actually do need to do something else. I need to pause this whole thing because, Mr. Hempstreet, what we have totally forgot is the fire and rescue. I was going to say that a minute ago. Fire and rescue. Yeah. So I think that discussion is also easier if you've got additional questions.

[02:19:51] If it gets us on the board. Okay, we'll do that next thing. Okay, that's fine. And I'll make that motion, too. Mr. Crony. Thank you, Chair Randall. So, Tim, I have a question about the 5.6 that we would get from the 415, keeping the personal property tax rate at 415.

[02:20:11] So, assuming SB 194 gets signed by the governor, our objective, I think, would be to lower the vehicle tax to 410 and keep the data center computer equipment at 415. so really we would only be getting about I think four million not five point six five yeah so I I would recommend that the board wait into the fall to consider those movements or consider that discussion and have that conversation separate from the FY 25 budget process okay I think given some other

[02:20:50] indications that have come up I would talk about those movements as part of the FY26 budget, and also the FY24 fund balance process. Okay, but could we lower, since this is for tax year 25, could we lower it 410 in October for the vehicles?

[02:21:14] So I think the board could set, assuming that it gets signed into law, the Senate bill, I think the board could set whatever tax rate it's comfortable with setting, giving whatever it wants to do with its fund balance process when you get there in December.

[02:21:31] Okay, thank you. Ms. Bricksman. Thank you, Madam Chair. So just one question, because when we talk about lowering that personal property tax rate, the reason that we've been doing it is because we are worried about the revenue pie being more than 50% from a certain bucket.

[02:21:56] are we not worried about that with not lowering the personal property tax rate is it negligible yeah so i think the revenue since the calculation is up there i think it's still 53.27 so i think the board is oh i'm sorry is 51.5 so okay we're still comfortable with this we're still in the right ball field okay okay i'm sorry i did not see the percentages up there um so i i'm going to support the motion and I just I know the media is probably watching very closely so I want to make something very very clear the motion is to reduce the

[02:22:36] transfer to the schools but that does not mean that the schools will not be made whole and probably the 10 million gap will be covered if something happens that the governor does not do the full 19 million we will figure it out we have ways to figure it out so and I'm confident that we've discussed that with with staff secondly what supervisor to crony was alluding to we have also had discussions about the sunset bill being passed that we were worried about that

[02:23:13] we would we were worried that we weren't going to be able to lower the car tax at a later date we think we're closer to being able to do that and we will discuss that in the fall. So I just want to make sure that nuance is out there for the press when they say the personal car tax has not been lowered when we thought we were going to have it lowered because we are going to talk and keep in mind this is for the second half of the fiscal year so that the lowering of the car tax rate would not have happened immediately anyway. That's why we're

[02:23:49] saying we have some time to do that in the fall. We're not going to do it right now but we will have some time to discuss that in the fall. So I just want it to be really clear because there's a lot of moving parts here, but just to be really clear, the schools are going to be funded and there is an opportunity, perhaps if the bill is signed, there's an opportunity perhaps to lower the tax, the car tax rate for the second half of the year, which was in the original proposal. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you. And I want to, because the media is watching, be equally clear that

[02:24:24] we are again lowering the tax rate again lowering the tax rate and and i think that this the idea that that you know we didn't make we didn't make substantial cuts um have the substantial discussions about this tax rate and i'd like people to go back and look and see who made who you know the

motions that were made and again the tax rate is getting lowered and so i i just think that should should be said um i will mr hemstreet i'm gonna we i'm gonna make two motions possibly

[02:25:01] two motions in a second i'm definitely going to make the motion for the fire and rescue but gosh um which which would keep us at the same tax that we're sitting at right now the 8.65 yeah we have the room yeah of course yeah of course um mr hemstreet with the amount of money we have in fund balance.

[02:25:26] I do, I understand what you're saying, that you want to keep that money separate, but you want to keep it for things like, really for land acquisition and such, because this board is actually, for the first time, actually talking about land banking and why we would do that. Do you believe that that 7.4 that have cents is a substantial amount to keep in the fund balance?

[02:25:58] It is not a substantial amount. Okay. All right. All right. Thank you. Mr. Turner, would you like to have a closing? Okay. Supervisors, Mr. Turner made the motion. I second the motion. All in people who say aye. Any opposed?

[02:26:14] That motion will pass 801. Supervisors, I'm just going to make the motion to allocate to the Department of the Loudoun County Combined Fire and Rescue System, \$285,000. Those two things are for a behavioral health coordinator for \$142,500 and a return to work coordinator for the same amount. That is the

[02:26:42] motion. Motion is made seconded by Mr. Sains. So obviously the whole county continues to be reeling from a tragic incident where we, one, lost a first responder. Two, sent, I think, 13 first responders to the hospital that night and still have one in the hospital. And three, and very, very important, just have an entire system that has been, actually an entire county that has

[02:27:17] been shaken and to some extent traumatized, either primarily or secondarily. The system is large. I think we have 2,000 people in our combined fire and rescue system.

[02:27:33] Is that about right, Mr. Hemstreet, both volunteers? What do we have volunteers and career? What's the number? I'm going to defer to Chief Johnson or Chief Williams or Chief Pro. About 2,000. I was right, about 2,000. And right now we have one behavioral health coordinator for 2,000 people who was sitting in the room, by the way, and very, very much appreciated who you are and what you've done.

[02:28:03] As amazing as she is, it's not enough. And I don't believe we have yet seen the fallout of losing a firefighter and having that incident happen.

[02:28:20] I know people might think that everyone's okay right now, and you might be, and you might be, but these things tend to not show themselves for a while. Even if we had not had this tragedy, what our fire and rescue department deals with on a daily basis is significant.

[02:28:42] It could be significantly traumatic. And so as well as, again, making sure they are paid well and they're staffed and all that, we have got to make sure that their behavioral health, mental health, emotional well-being, and just wellness in general is also something that we see to.

[02:29:04] And I believe these positions are absolutely needed. In fact, maybe even more, but these positions are absolutely needed. And so I say these words almost never because I think they're overused. But I'm going to say this right now.

[02:29:20] I'd appreciate my colleague's support in this motion. Ms. Bricksman. Thank you, Madam Chair. I will absolutely support the motion. When I read the memo earlier today, I was really glad to read it. And I'm really glad that we're doing this and paying attention to this aspect of what our first responders do in our county.

[02:29:42] So very, very happy to support the motion. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you. Anybody else? All in favor, say aye. Aye. Any opposed? That motion will pass, 801. I'm going to make one more motion. I'm going to make a motion to send to Fund Balance the discussion for a half-penny with the intent of it being to go to our housing.

[02:30:18] I'm sorry, half penny being \$7.4 million with the intent of that money going to our housing needs and housing discussions. Second. Motion's made and seconded. So this was a tough, this motion is tough because we need to put more money in that.

[02:30:38] I know people think that \$18 million is a good deal of money. It's not. It's not, not for what we're trying to do and what we need to do. Until we start even talking about \$50 million plus, we're not really having real discussions about our housing.

[02:30:54] Right now, we're barely able to do housing as it relates to rental. We're definitely not doing anything for closing costs, down payment, purchasing programs, and things like that. We are way behind, and I mean way behind, every other county save one in this area.

[02:31:14] And actually, most counties in Virginia, when it comes to taking care of our housing numbers and our housing funds, we just are. And so if fund balance was smaller this year, if we had less than fund balance, I wouldn't be doing this.

[02:31:30] I would have made that motion right now. But because we have a larger fund balance than we normally have, and this is probably the one time that that would happen, I feel comfortable enough sending this to fund balance and still believing that we can do other things like I know Mr. Crony has been very, very focused on doing some land banking, and I agree with that.

[02:31:50] And other, you know, we will have other discussions about what fund balance money, how that might be used. But I think that we are in a good position this year and that we have enough money in fund balance to do this amount and then do other things.

[02:32:07] And so, you know, now when we get to that fun balance discussion, if anyone pushes back or fights me on this, we're going to have all kind of other issues, all kind of other issues. So I am going to believe that that is not going to happen, and which is why I'm going to make this motion trusting my colleagues at this moment for when we get to the fun balance discussion.

[02:32:29] Mr. Turner? Yeah, point of clarification, Madam Chair. Is your intent to take the half penny out of this budget, or is your intent to defer a discussion on the half penny to include in the fund balance or to send it to the fund balance, in which case we go through the thrash at the end of the year on fund balance to get the \$7.4 million back out to go to housing?

[02:32:52] My desire is to institutionalize it in the budget process by allocating a half penny out of this budget to the housing fund. So let me answer your question. It's a great question. My intent is to send it to the fund balance discussion and have absolutely no thrash when we get to the discussion. Absolutely no thrash.

[02:33:09] But what we're saying is we're doing the same thing. We're going to start with this money for the fund balance this time, but it will be institutionalized in the budget from here on out, which is why Mr. Hemstreet was saying we will start 7.4 down next year because we're going to do both, send to the fund balance thrashless, And then actually, and then have it be part of the budget going forward.

[02:33:35] Did that answer your question? Yes, I have a follow-up question. Sure. Is he intent to do that to keep the tax rate at \$86,500? Absolutely, it is. I'm going to oppose that motion. I understand. Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Letourneau?

[02:33:50] I was just going to thank the chair for her measured approach that balances a lower tax rate with the need for additional housing. I'd also like to thank vice chair brissman for her contributions to the discussion on this topic and you know look i i understand everybody's coming i understand what the intent is we're doing everything in good faith here but i am pleased we're able to lower the tax rate by a penny and i i do want to just take this opportunity to re to remind my colleagues and in this motions in support of that that the tax rate is a component of affordability because we do have folks for whom

[02:34:30] The average is the average, but we have half people are over average, including me and probably a lot of folks in the room. So it is a component of affordability, and it does make a difference. We have a lot of residents who bought their homes a while ago, and they'd like to stay in the county.

[02:34:47] They're not going to realize these big real estate tax appraisal increases until they sell. So right now we're just creeping up on them, and so this is a way to give them a little bit of relief and also be reasonable with using the fund balance that we have.

[02:35:05] So I will support the motion. Thank you. Did you have something you need to add right now? I would like to ask something after you vote on this motion. After you vote on the motion, okay. Mr. Kirshner? Yes. When are we having the fund balance discussion?

[02:35:20] Do we know when that's going to be? Mr. Hirnstrup will come to us right around August, September. Okay. Start having that discussion. I hope not in August. I'm going to be gone. September then you're right you're right as i might you're right unbalanced discussion yes will all happen in november happen okay would you come to us before that we're going to come to the board in august september time frame and meet with um i think mcclellan and ms burke will come and talk about your cip requests and any um okay land and anything else you're interested in so so i'm going to support the motion and i appreciate the motion and i'm going to echo as much as it pains me

[02:36:00] Supervisor Letourneau's compliments to the chair and the vice chair on this because I think it's a really wise move to put forward this way and to have that discussion. I would like to understand the housing fund a little bit more than I do, so perhaps staff can give me a little bit more of a briefing on why we may or may not need this.

[02:36:24] No, no, no, not me not. I can't promise no whipping, but I will try to get there for your chair or your honor. So, first of all, there's no whipping, there's thrashing, and there will be no thrashing. Sorry, thrashing, no thrashing. I do want to follow, it's in my time, guys.

[02:36:41] I do want to follow up, though, and I want to reiterate some of what Supervisor LeTerno said. I am glad we're able to lower this from where we started. I wish we could have lowered it a little bit more, honestly. I went back and just looked at the numbers, And over this board and the last board have now raised, will have raised actual taxes.

[02:37:03] I understand the rate has gone down, but I don't know if we should be patting our backs necessarily all the time that the rate's going down. But we have raised it on the average household about \$1,269. I think it's a little bit less than that because we dropped it by a penny over the last five years.

[02:37:20] So, you know, that's real money. That's real money out of people's pockets. I think this is a little more restrained. And I think every year we seem to find a way of doing this and getting it down. I know this is not totally within the motion, but I do want to point that out, that lowering the rate isn't necessarily lowering the taxes.

[02:37:36] And so we have to continue to be cognizant of that. But I'm glad we got to a penny. I was hoping to get to a penny and a half at least when we started. I do think we need to do a little bit different on how we do this process because I think it's much better for us as supervisors if we start at an equalized rate And have the different departments come in and actually talk to us about and justify certain, as opposed to build a budget, as we heard from the school.

[02:38:03] I just think we are going to continue to find ourselves in this scenario where each year the tax rate will regularly go up. And so hopefully when we get to next year's discussion, we can discuss perhaps doing it in the reversed order. Thanks. Thank you, Mr. Kirshner.

[02:38:18] Ms. Crony. Thank you, Chair Randall. And I want to thank my colleagues for supporting the personal property tax rate of 415 for tax year 2025. This means that we're not lowering taxes on data center computer equipment, which I was very opposed to. So I want to thank my colleagues.

[02:38:38] And in September or October, we'll take a look at lowering the vehicle tax rate to 410 for tax year 25. And remember, tax year 25 doesn't start until January, so we do have time to make that change, according to Mr. Wirtz.

[02:38:59] And I do want to let Chair Randall know that I will support transferring a half penny to the housing fund when we do the fund balance discussion. I think that's reasonable, given that we've been told there's \$200 million in our fund balance.

[02:39:16] So thank you very much. Thank you. So I've said, I'm sorry, Ms. Brooksmen. Thank you, Madam Chair. I just had one question for staff. By moving this to the fund balance discussion, will that in any way delay the timing of the \$7.4 million getting to the housing department?

[02:39:38] Yes, it will delay it by six months.

[02:39:53] Six months. Okay. All right. Having had the briefing from the Housing Department of Finance, which I do highly recommend my colleagues get that briefing, I think that's okay because of the RFPs coming in and then the process that we have to go through to actually get that money into programs and into loans and those sorts of things. So if it's six months, I'm comfortable with that. My second question to staff is, do we need any sort of amendment on this motion that guarantees this is baked into the next budget?

[02:40:15] And if we do, what would that motion be? Mr. Perlager said, yeah, I was going to actually add some language. That was actually the follow-up question that I had for you. And I'll add that language in my closing. All right. Okay, so we will add some language in the closing. Okay. You also have a closing motion that you can add it to as well.

[02:40:32] Okay, okay, okay, that sounds great, thank you, because I do want to, you know, I made commitments on going to a full penny to the community, and I want the community to be assured that that's what it will be, even though we are accomplishing that with fund balance this year, it will be baked in as a full penny going forward once we do this amendment.

[02:40:58] I'm really, really glad that I asked the question about the possibility of doing this out of fund balance in order. And now we are lowering the tax rate a full cent from where we started. And I believe when I did the math last year, I believe when we started in our term, the last term, the tax rate was 106, I believe.

[02:41:21] so i believe that's 17 cents or something like that that we've lowered it since since i've been on this board and tonight we're lowering it one more penny so um and and it's not lost on me who accomplished that and we might have been able to accomplish more if folks had supported the deputy's motion um but anyway i won't belabor the point any longer i'm happy to support the motion, and thank you, everyone, for all your work. Thank you, Ms. Brixman. Listen, it is, you know,

[02:41:57] our language at this moment is so important. I'm sorry, Mr. Kirshner, you are wrong. We have not raised taxes. We have lowered the tax rate. If taxes have gone up, it's because house values have gone up, which truthfully, you want your house value to go up, to be honest. And so I think that the language we use is really important, and I think this is going to be actually a celebratory moment. I will in this motion without objection at the language, and I don't remember who seconded the motion at this point, at the language that I will send this to fund balance. And if it is to

[02:42:34] pass fund balance, then it becomes part of the base budget going forward. I would say at that language without objection. So that's there and that's clear. Why is your light on? Because if that's a friendly to your own amendment, I'd like to talk briefly.

[02:42:51] No, you don't talk to a friendly. It's not an amendment. You don't talk to a friendly. Oh, my God. That wasn't that deep, guys. Language to make it part of the base budget going forward? I said, if it passes in fund balance.

[02:43:10] Oh, I see. I actually said that. That's not part of this budget. Actually, it's a friendly that says, if it passes in fund balance, it becomes part of the base budget. Okay. Jesus. We're all tired.

[02:43:26] Yes, that is what I said. Ms. Bricksman is correct, and so are so many others. We have talked to many community members about the problems with housing. You know, when we talk about the tax rate and the tax burden, one of the things that makes people very cost-burdened is the price of mortgage and rent.

[02:43:52] You take care of that in a lot of ways, But one way is to have attainable houses available for people. And I'll say this again. In Loudoun County, attainable houses are our firefighters and our police deputies. They are waitstaff. They are teachers. They are nurses.

[02:44:07] That's what attainable housing is in Loudoun County. And so we should always be trying to figure out a way to help the people who serve our county live in our county. So we shouldn't see this as money we don't have to spend. We should see it as money that assists people for living in the county that they serve.

[02:44:28] And so, you know, that is one way to help with housing costs is to literally help with housing costs. And so when we get to the fund balance discussion, I will push this very, very hard because it's so important.

[02:44:43] I really don't think, I can't imagine this would be an issue, but I'm just going to set this out right now that this is a very important goal for us and it's part of our strategic housing plan, our plan.

[02:44:59] That's what it's part of. All right. So that is my motion. The closing motion? No. Girl, no. No. The closing motion. I don't care.

[02:45:15] All right. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed. That motion will pass 8-0-1. Ms. Bricksman has said, can she make the wrap-up motion here? I move that the Board of Supervisors direct staff to prepare the FY 2025 appropriations resolution based on the FY 2025 proposed budget as amended through straw votes taken during the March 4th,

[02:45:48] March 7th, March 11th, March 14th work sessions with a tax year 2024 real property tax rate of 86.5 cents per 100 of assessed value and a tax year 2025 personal property tax rate of 415 per 100 of assessed value. Second. Second. Ms. Bricksman. Discussion on the motion. It's a motion.

[02:46:21] I know. I'm just trying to decide if I really want to discuss it anymore. No, I'm really proud of all our work, and I want to thank all the departments and staff for coming and presenting your budgets. I am consistently impressed with the justification in our budget book for the positions that staff believes they need to appropriately operate this county, provide the services that our constituents deserve and want, the protections that they deserve and want, the facilities that they deserve and want.

[02:46:58] And I'm just really proud of all the work we did over the last couple weeks to once again lower the tax rate by a full cent, fully fund our schools, and in addition, live up to our commitments to help house our residents.

[02:47:16] Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you. All right, a couple of things. One, Mr. Hempstreet, thank you. We start this process in, what, July? We are the first county to do it, which means every county kind of grabs up all of us.

[02:47:33] If you look in the audience, what you look at is all of our department heads and assistant department heads. You guys are here with us through the whole process. I know you really want to be here tonight with us. You do not want to be home with your family, so thank you so much for hanging out with us tonight.

[02:47:52] We have, and I've said this before, and I'm not joking, we have one of the best, if not the best, county staffs in the country. The work you all do every single day is public service. You all don't, staff does not get the press that the supervisors get.

[02:48:12] You don't get to cut the ribbons or do the groundbreaking or make the speeches, but you work every bit as hard, if not harder, than we do. I know that. I notice that. We all know that. We all notice that. And when we say, when I say how much we appreciate you and every single one of your staffs, I'm not kidding.

[02:48:32] I used to work in county government. For 20 years, I worked in county government. I know what it is to be a county government official. I know that many of you could take your experience and your

education, go work in the private sector and make more money. But you choose to be here because you choose to do the work of public servants.

[02:48:51] And so I appreciate you. I appreciate you all so much. Mr. Hemstreet, your staff, your exec team works very, very hard, and I appreciate you and all of your staff so much. So thank you, and thank you to the citizens of Loudoun who have given us this amazing, amazing opportunity to serve in this way.

[02:49:13] We are not a perfect board, as has been seen tonight a couple of times. But I do believe that every one of my colleagues has good intentions, even if we disagree with how we get to a space, I believe every one of us has good intentions, and I appreciate the service of all of my colleagues, and I want to say that to you all individually tonight, that these are not easy positions, and I thank you for that service.

[02:49:40] thank you every day for that service. Mr. Hempstreet my only question is if we do have a discussion about the nonprofits and possibly adding one more to the nonprofit core how would I go about doing that as far as a budget process so chair and I think we should have that conversation you do have a remainder that's up there that can be allocated okay all right then I might then I might do that and have that part of a budget process so that is it and I think you you very much. Ms. Brixman, do you need a closing? Madam Chair, I cannot say it any better than you

[02:50:17] just did. Thank you. Thank you, everyone. Thank you, everyone. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? I'm going to, that motion will pass 7-1-1. Before I leave, I do want to say one more thing. I want to say a special thank you to all of our, to all the supervisors, staffs, because they have been there here every night and done all the stuff as well so that all the staffs of the supervisors thank you all as well all other budget sessions as of right now are being canceled we are adjourned



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com