



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Loudoun County Board of Supervisors Public Hearing, Wednesday, October 14, 2026

Date Wednesday, October 14, 2026
Place Loudoun County Government Center, Leesburg, Virginia
Length 1h 8m (video)

- Official meeting video (eScribe): <https://pub-loudoun.escribemeetings.com/VideoStream.aspx?MeetingId=7960f118-c668-45ef-a975-2362de95de1c>
- Meeting page and agenda (eScribe): <https://pub-loudoun.escribemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=7960f118-c668-45ef-a975-2362de95de1c&Agenda=Agenda&lang=English>

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 2026-10-17. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:12:33] Supervisors, can you give me, I need to go talk, say, just talk to Mr. Davis for a quick, quick second. I'll be right back on the dance. I have to ask Mr. Davis a bit of a favor.

[00:13:24] Well, good evening, supervisors.

[00:14:08] Good evening, staff, and good evening, Loudon. I'd like to call to order the October 14, 2026 Loudon County Board of Supervisors public hearing. This room has a hearing loop. If you need hearing assistance, please switch your hearing aid to the telecom mode. If you need a headset, we have those available as well.

[00:14:24] Please see the clerk to our left to request one. But everybody, please 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, with liberty and justice for all.

[00:14:44] As a reminder, members of the public addressing the board this evening, you may only register to speak on matters that have been advertised for the public hearing. Due to the broadcast delay, any member of the public, if you are not in the boardroom and you wish to address the board on items 3B, 3C,

3T, 3E, and 3F, which are on the consolidated agenda, please call the number that's scrolling across your screen at this time.

[00:15:15] If you're a member of the public and be registered to speak, you will be allotted two minutes. If you're in the boardroom, I ask that when your name is called, please come to the podium closest to you, state your name for the record. The timer on the podium will indicate the remaining time that you have left, and when your time has expired, please yield the floor to the next speaker.

[00:15:35] If you're providing your comments via phone, I ask that you use a stopwatch because you may not be able to see the clock in the room and when you get to 1 minute 30 seconds, I'm not going to stop you because it breaks your flow, but I will stop you when you get to 2 minutes and so if you keep your own time, that would be really, really helpful.

[00:15:53] When taking public input, I will first ask if there's anyone in the boardroom who wish to speak. And then I will go to the moderator and ask if there are any speakers online. Please note that there is a slight delay between the broadcast and the boardroom. I will also ask, Andy, can you hear me? Yes, I can. Wonderful. Please note that item three led you 2024-0074, the Spring Valley Technology Park was advertised as deferred, and we will

[00:16:28] We have five items on the consolidated agenda, and I will call the item, and I will call the district. Why don't you take a second, and please pull out your motion sheet for those items. I think Mr. Crony is not here, and she will not be here this evening.

[00:16:50] And Mr. Letourneau is not here, and I thought he was coming. So, I will, we can make the motion for the Dulles districts, but you know what, we'll do those last, Dulles last, just in case he comes rushing in the room, we can still catch him before his items come up.

[00:17:08] So, the board will hear the following items of the consolidated hearing. As a reminder, the items will be consolidated because there are no outstanding issues. Staff has recommended approval. The applicant has waived their presentation, and no public speakers have been signed up in advance to speak.

[00:17:27] Item 3B, resolution approving the public use and necessity, I knew that was going to happen. Point of order.

[00:17:59] Item 3B, resolution approving the public use and necessity of acquiring certain real property and authorizing the acquisition by eminent domain for the Route 15 Speaksbury Road, New Valley Church Road, Roundabout project, that's in the Catoctin District. Item 3C, resolution approving the public use and necessity of acquiring certain real property interests and authorizing the acquisition of eminent domain, Dulles West Boulevard, North Star Boulevard, to Arcola Boulevard.

[00:18:27] That is actually in the Dulles District. Item 3D, resolution approving the public use and necessity of acquiring certain real property interests and authorizing the acquisition by eminent domain, Sterling Boulevard and Glen Drive, intersectional improvement.

[00:18:47] That's in the Sterling District. And 3E, resolution improving the public use and necessity acquiring certain real property interests and authorizing the acquisition by eminent domain, Waxborough and Ashburn Road, Ryan Corner Place, intersectional improvement. That's in the Ashburn and the Broad Run District.

[00:19:05] And, of course, 3F, the LEGIE 2026-0001, the Dulles Logistics CCPA 2026-0002, that is in the Dulles District. Those are the items on the consolidated agenda. Are there any members of the public who wish to speak on any of those items tonight?

[00:19:26] Andy, is there anyone on the phone who wish to speak on any of those items tonight? No, Madam Chair. Okay. Seeing them, I'm going to close the consolidated agenda. And, board members, I'm going to ask you to go to your consolidated sheet. Again, I'm going to call the Dulles District ones last and go to all the other ones first.

[00:19:42] Let's do 3B first. It is the acquiring certain real property, eminent domain for Route 15 Speaksbury Road, New Valley Church Road Roundabout Projects in the Catoctin District. Mr. Kirsten, would you like to make a motion? I will. Thank you, Madam Chair. I move the Board of Supervisors approve motion 2B for the approval of the resolution approving the public use and necessity of acquiring certain real property interest and authorizing the acquisition thereof by eminent domain as provided in the October 14, 2026 public hearing item number 3B staff report.

[00:20:15] Motion made and seconded. Discussion on the motion, Mr. Kirshner? Yeah, just briefly. I've been in touch with the owner of this particular property. I know there has been ongoing negotiations with the staff. I think both sides in good faith. After speaking with the owner of the property, I do believe that there is some room for movement by our staff and the county here to make sure this is a fair exchange.

[00:20:38] It's a very important aspect to Route 15. And I think overall, things have gone well. Just hopefully we can finish this resolution without having to go to court, as we always do in these sorts of things. So thank you, Madam Chair. But I think things are moving in the right direction. I think we'll get there. Anybody else like to speak on this item?

[00:20:57] Seeing none, all in favor say aye. Aye. Any opposed? That motion will pass, 702, with Mr. Letourneau and Ms. Crony being off the dais. The next item we'll go to is the Sterling District item. It's 3D.

[00:21:13] Mr. Sainz? I move that the Board of Supervisors approve motion to be for approval of the resolution approving the public use and necessity of acquiring certain real property interest and authorizing the acquisition thereof of intimate domain as provided in October 14th, 2026 public hearing item 3D staff report.

[00:21:37] Motion made. And second made, Ms. Bricksman. Discussion on that motion. Mr. Sainz. Thank you. We're doing some pedestrian improvements in the Sterling District, and this is just one piece of that, and it's necessary to do the eminent domain to continue to move this project forward in the name of safety for the Sterling residents and those who pass through daily. Thank you.

[00:22:01] Anybody else? I would say safety is really one of the only reasons I would say yes to eminent domain of safety. All in favor, please say aye. Aye. Any opposed? That motion will pass 702. Let's go to item 3E, the resolution approving the public use and necessity of requiring real and certain property. This is in the Waxpool. I'm sorry, this is in the Ashburn and Broadrun District kind of combined. Ms. Glass, you want to make that motion? Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.

[00:22:30] I move that the Board of Supervisors approve Motion 2B for the approval of the resolution approving the public use and necessity of acquiring certain real property interests and authorizing the acquisition thereof of eminent domain as provided in the October 14, 2026 public hearing item number 3E, Staff Report.

[00:23:00] Motion made second by Supervisor Sainz. Discussion on the motion, Ms. Glass? Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. This project involves a traffic signal with crosswalks on all four sides at the intersection of Waxpool Road, Ashburn Road, and Ryan Corners Place.

[00:23:15] I want to thank staff from DTCI for all the help working to address the concerns with the Parkside community and making themselves available at meetings that we had. The compromise to allow a left turn into Parkside has fully alleviated the opposition of this project from the residents and we are moving forward.

[00:23:36] Parkside also needs us to do a friendly quick take situation to satisfy their covenant requirements to sell the HOA owned land. This item allows us to move forward with that land acquisition. I've been in direct contact communication with the Parkside Association President, Mr. Sage, who shared that their board supports this item tonight and will work with the county staff to finalize the property transfer.

[00:24:02] I want to thank the Parkside Board and residents for engaging in this topic and working to the desired outcome. Wonderful. Mr. Turner. Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to emphasize the depiction in the item does not show the left-hand turn lane, and that was the key compromise.

[00:24:20] I'm assured by staff that that, in fact, will be put in play. This resolution just moves it forward in the process, but I want to emphasize we want to ultimately see the left turn lane and get rid of the right in, right out only on the Alexan Terrace entry.

[00:24:39] So we want that left turn lane there. I just want to emphasize that. Thank you, Madam Chair. Wonderful. And again, this is a safety issue. Yes. Yes, it's a safety issue, I'm saying. We're doing an imminent domain because it's a safety issue. Okay. All right.

[00:24:55] All the people who say aye. Aye. Any opposed? That motion will pass, 702. I guess we're going to go back to the Dallas motions now. Mr. Sains, do you mind making those motions? Sure. I move that the Board of Supervisors approve motion 2B for approval of the resolution approving the public use and necessity of acquiring certain real property interests and authorizing the acquisition thereof of intimate domain as provided in October 14, 2026, public hearing item number 3C, staff report.

[00:25:25] I will second that discussion on that motion. No, it's good. So, Mr. Letourneau, often, he's coming from D.C., from work, and it's a hard drive for him to get here, so he's likely stuck in traffic. I will say that we would not put something on consolidated and pass it without the district supervisor being here. If we had not talked to him in advance and he had not said that that's fine for it to be on the consolidated agenda. So we don't normally do something like this without the district supervisor, but there are discussions and his staff is here. They've talked to our staffs and all those types of things. And so just to everyone to know that communication with the

[00:26:05] Douglas district supervisor has happened and he's likely on his way here right now. We hope he gets here soon. All right, anybody else? All the people say aye. Aye. Any opposed? That motion will pass 702. And the last one is also in the Dulles District. Mr. Sains, will you make that motion as well? I move the Board of Supervisors approve. Motion 2B for the approval of a zoning concept plan amendment as provided in October 14th, 2026 public hearing, item number 3F staff

[00:26:32] report. And I would second that as well. And this one, this is a warehouse use, so there's no data center, substation, or anything of that nature. Mr. Laterno is walking in right now, so I'll see if he

wants to say anything else about this application, but this is a warehouse use, which is something we're looking for and see more of in Loudoun County.

[00:27:02] So we can do, like, the Jeopardy tune until Mr. Letourneau gets himself settled. Mr. Letourneau, we already did 3C. You already read that motion. Yeah, we already did 3C. So now we're on item 3F, the legy item. You're right on time. And Mr. Sains made the motion.

[00:27:19] Did I second the motion? Did you have any comment on that motion? Yeah, I'm supportive of this. It's truly just kind of an administrative thing where they're changing the interior of the building, but because of our process, they just need this zoning concept plan amendment, but it's really very perfunctory.

[00:27:40] Okay, thank you. All in favor to say aye. Aye. Any opposed? Remember, that motion will pass 801 with Mr. Crony off the dais tonight. Okay, we have one item on the agenda that will be heard in its entirety.

[00:27:58] It is the item 3A, so 2028-2031 Board of Supervisors Compensation Structure. It was put forward by Mr. Crony, Ms. Bricksman, and Ms. Glass as a BMI, but then they sent to a public hearing.

[00:28:18] So staff has joined us at the table, and we will do the staff, if you have anything you'd like to tell us, And then I will go to my colleagues who put this forward. As a BMI, I'll go to you first, and then we'll have the discussion from there.

[00:28:35] Staff does not have any updates. Staff does not have any items on this. This is unusual that, because, I mean, obviously staff wouldn't. This is unusual for this to happen like this.

[00:28:51] And so I do think that it is fair. I'll say the word fair. From my colleagues who put this forward, and at this moment it's Senator Brixman, Senator Glass, and Mr. Crony is not here, to take, I don't know, two minutes to say anything about this item they want to, because the questions that we might ask will probably be more appropriate to go to our colleagues than it would to go to staff, because this item is not a staff-driven item.

[00:29:23] And so, Ms. Glass or Ms. Brixman, would either one of you or both of you like to take maybe two minutes and have a discussion about this item? I, no.

[00:29:41] I mean, I think that there was an item in the agenda that explains what the proposal is. We discussed it at the board meeting when it was first proposed, and then it was sent to public hearing.

[00:29:57] And, you know, I'm happy with Table 8 and happy to listen to any public comment on it. Thank you. Thank you. Ms. Glass, would you like to say anything about this item? Well, I co-sponsored this because I believe this initiative is something that I believe the compensation earned by the board members should reflect the substantial time, the preparation, public engagement and growing responsibilities required by this position.

[00:30:39] That's all I have to say right now. I guess I can say more within the motion. Okay. I meant to say that as well. I'll just speak in the motion. Okay. Madam Chair, point of order. Well, clarification, I guess.

[00:30:54] Well, it's time for you guys to ask questions if you want to. So I just heard Ms. Brisbane say that she, I'm sorry. If you have a question, and the questions, as I said, It will probably go to our colleagues who put this forward more than staff. So if you have a question, please put your lights on, and I'll go with you first, Mr. Kirshner.

[00:31:10] So I heard Ms. Brisbane say she was, I think the current compensation calendar supervisors are making, it'll go up in 2008, so 2007 wouldn't change.

[00:31:25] Okay, I see what's going on. I misinterpreted Ms. Brisbane's statements about table number eight. I was looking at table number nine. That just shows the actual increase. I think I answered my own question. I talked myself through it. It actually works very well. There's not a motion.

[00:31:42] No, but it's a public hearing item. And so I'm kind of treating my colleagues as if they're kind of the applicant a little bit because they kind of are. And so that's what we're doing right now before we go to public comments and then a motion. So does anyone else have any questions, comments, statements for Ms. Bricksman and Ms. Glass and because Mr. Crony's not here. So I will say this. So just so you all know, I'm going to split the motion. I'm going to split the motion between supervisors and the chair's position. I'm split

[00:32:17] the motion for this reason. I love being chair of the county. I've never been a supervisor. I don't know. And they're very different jobs. The chairs don't like a supervisor on steroids. they're very different jobs. And so I can absolutely make the case over and over and over again that what I do, the chair's job, is not just a full-time job, it's a full-time plus-plus-plus job. And in fact, my predecessor did this job as a full-time job as well. The predecessor before

[00:32:54] him, who's now my planning commissioner, was a real estate agent, but also for the most part that this job's full-time. So going back many years, the chair's job is a full-time job. I left my career to do this job, and I don't know how anyone would do it well if they didn't do it full-time. I do think that when I get questions, the one thing that I think I don't hear or that might be missing is my colleagues, for you all to make the case of whether or not yours is a full-time job, or what you think that it might be. I don't, I so respect everybody on this dais. I mean, I think

[00:33:33] these jobs are harder than I think people realize. And I say all the time, happy people who have green lights don't never send you emails. And so it's a lot that goes on with these jobs, I think, that are behind the scenes. But I also think that I can absolutely, and all day long, you know, make the case of how many hours I work per week, how many events I do, what I'm doing, when I come to the dais, I'm ready, all those things. And I'm not saying that my colleagues, I'm not saying one thing or the other. I'm saying that I think that the public at large

[00:34:09] might feel more at ease or clear or even just have their curiosity settled if they believed, If they knew what you did more and believed that what you did more was if you did it in a full-time way or not.

[00:34:27] And so when I get questions or when I read questions or when I read the emails, what I normally read is not even a full-time job. And I can't answer that for a supervisor. I can only answer that for myself. And for myself, it is an absolute full-time job, which is why I'm going to split the motion because I'm not going to vote on the chair's salary.

[00:34:49] But I do think that there are valid reasons to have this discussion, and I will, in the rest of my time, for either one of you who put this forward, maybe just invite you to make the case, to make your case a little bit.

[00:35:09] Ms. Brixman? Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a point of order. I think the packet motion just sends this to the November 5th meeting, so I don't know if there's a reason to be splitting the motion. And

I think that the justification for this was said at the previous meeting, and folks can go back and watch that.

[00:35:28] And I think the justification for the increase next term, by the way, I want to make it very clear that it's next term, I think that that is proved out by supervisors in the community. And I think the fact that we aren't seeing a lot of opposition here at a public hearing is because it has proved out that we do the work in the community.

[00:35:53] And I think that folks must be pretty happy with the work that we're doing in the community. Otherwise, they would be here opposing next term's proposal for salaries. Thank you. I will split the motion because what I want to go to the meeting is actually a split motion.

[00:36:10] I split the motion on purpose. With due respect, I know what I'm doing. I know why I'm doing it. And I will split the motion. So, at this point, then, we will have public comments, unless anyone else has public comments. Okay. So, I think I only see four people signed up for public comments.

[00:36:28] And so, unless, Andy, do we have anybody on the phone that I don't know about? We do not. Okay. So, I will call you in order. The first speaker will be Donna Wadowski, followed by John Myers, followed by Dean Daniel. Good evening, Ms. Wadowski.

[00:36:50] How are you? I am well, thank you. Good. Every day, the men and women of the Sheriff's Department put on a badge and their gun and kissed their loved ones goodbye, not knowing if it will be their last time.

[00:37:07] Supervisor Bristman attempted to deny the Sheriff's Department a pay raise earlier this year, but is now asking for a 30% pay raise of her own. Utterly shameful. This board needs to listen to constituents' hardships.

[00:37:26] Every day, residents face steep cost of living increases and inflation. The cost of the proliferation of data centers and Dominion's transmission lines have lowered the value of their homes. Public analysis will show the proposed increase would give Loudoun's supervisors the highest pay of any DC suburban county with similar populations.

[00:37:54] Loudoun County actually has the fewest number of citizens per supervisor among these comparable jurisdictions, meaning local representatives would be paid more to oversee fewer people.

[00:38:10] I'm not opposed to a pay increase, but not one of 30%. I have heard the board mention transparency quite often. The proposed pay hikes has been criticized by Supervisor Letourneau for bypassing community conversations.

[00:38:27] It would slip directly into meeting packets without prior public discussion. Supervisor Briskman, in a loud and loud article, already has plans for a pay raise as the new chairwoman by saying, and I quote her, "By raising the compensation of these positions in the next term, it will allow new voices to represent Loudoun County.

[00:38:51] In other words, she sees herself as the new chairman. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Podowski. John Myers, followed by Dean Daniel, followed by Derek Robinson. Good evening, Mr. Myers. Good evening.

[00:39:07] Chair Randall, members of the board, good evening. My name is John Myers, president of the Loudoun Career Firefighter Association. I want to start with something I think we all can agree upon, that

people who choose public service should be compensated fairly. That includes members of this board. I know firsthand the demands that come with serving Loudoun County, and I understand the importance of making sure compensation does not become a barrier for good people who want to serve. I agree with that principle. My concern tonight isn't whether the board deserves fair compensation. It's about how we determine what fair looks like. Loudoun County already has an established compensation philosophy for its workforce. It uses a defined comparator market and a consistent methodology to determine

[00:39:45] whether positions are competitive. The county's official comparative market includes eight jurisdictions, establishes a target market position for employee compensation. The proposal before you takes a different approach. It compares board compensation to three neighboring jurisdictions and also induces area median income as another measure of appropriate compensation. And that is where my concern really lies. If AMI is an appropriate measure when discussing whether an elected official can afford to live and serve in Loudoun, then we should consider that same measure when we're valuing compensation throughout the county workforce.

[00:40:18] This doesn't mean that every county employee and every elected official should make the same salary. Clearly, they shouldn't. But the standards and measures we use to determine whether compensation is fair, should be consistent. That same consistency matters when we talk about affordability. During our recent negotiations, the county didn't just generally tell us the budgets were going to get tighter.

[00:40:36] We are shown a specific pathway to reduce year-to-year operating expenditures growth from 9% in FY27, ultimately to 5% in FY31. Our bargaining team took that message seriously, and the agreement we negotiated reflects that reality. So I'm not asking the board tonight to value its service less.

[00:40:53] I'm asking that we value all public service using the same level of scrutiny and the same principles. If comparative markets are an appropriate measure in a comprehensive comparative market, or if AMI is the appropriate measure, consider what that benchmark means across the county workforce. Fair compensation matters for everyone who serves Loudoun County.

[00:41:11] I simply ask that we use consistent standards and measure when deciding what fair compensation looks like. Thank you, Mr. Myers. Dean Daniel, are you here? Dean Daniel, going once, going twice.

[00:41:27] Dean Daniel. Derek Robinson. Good evening, Mr. Robinson. Good evening, yes, almost a good afternoon. I'm going to have a lot less formality and a lot less numbers and the last two very intelligent individuals.

[00:41:46] I'll just say I'm Derek Robinson. I started a watchdog organization called Loudoun Data Center Watch. I'm here because I count myself as a concerned citizen, and I've been here for about five years. And as I get more involved in this county, I was surprised but not surprised at the very low wages for our elected officials.

[00:42:08] I count you all as folks who are fighting the good fight, and we know that this county is facing a, you know, this country is facing a cost of living crisis, and this county is not discounted from that cost of living crisis.

[00:42:24] And, you know, like I said, I believe that you all are fighting the good fight. And, you know, no matter if people agree or disagree with your points of view, you all deserve, as public servants, devoting

your lives to this community, I think, deserve a livable wage.

[00:42:41] And additionally, I think the current, you know, the current salaries as they are really discourage other people from being leaders in this community. There are plenty of folks who, you know, may— Robinson, hold on one sec. Can you give him 10 seconds back? I apologize. Okay. So additionally for others who want to get involved in our community as public servants, you know, this is quite discouraging because it is certainly an unlivable wage, at least for this and for our community. And it's certainly a deterrent that discourages new leaders from wanting to be

[00:43:20] involved in public service. So I completely, you know, tip my hat to everybody on this board. You know, people cannot seek good elected leaders and expect them to eat ramen noodles every night. So I support this increase.

[00:43:37] Thank you. Thank you very much. Ramen noodles are not good for you. That's very true. That they do. Okay, Mr. Crony, I'm sorry, Ms. Glass or Ms. Bricksman, would one of you like to make the motion in the package? Yes, Madam Chair.

[00:43:56] I understand what the motion in the package is, but would one of you like to make the motion in the package? Madam Chair, are you still looking to separate the motion? Guys, we can't do anything until we put a motion on the table. Will you please make the motion in the package? Okay.

[00:44:12] Thank you. I move that the Board of Supervisors forward 2028-2031 Board of Supervisors Term Compensation Structure to the November 5th, 2026 Board of Supervisors Business Meeting for action.

[00:44:29] Second. Motion made and seconded. Ms. Glass, would you like to speak on the motion? Yes, Madam Chair. So I want to thank those of you who came out to speak on this topic, who have emailed, committed, commented on social media, and engaged on this topic.

[00:44:48] And as I said before, I co-sponsored this initiative because I believe compensation by board members should reflect the time, the preparation, the public engagement, and growing responsibilities required of the position. With the compensation proposed for the next term, members of the board would make closer to the area median income for an individual in Loudoun, which is \$116,300, right now in 2026.

[00:45:18] The proposed salaries would reach that \$116,300 amount for the chair in 2031. The compensation amounts for the next term are proposed to have a 3% cost of living adjustments each year.

[00:45:34] with the chair position being 10% higher than the vice chair position and the supervisor positions. The compensation a board member receives should reflect the demands of the office and makes public service more accessible to qualified individuals who may otherwise not be able to absorb the time and financial demands of this position.

[00:45:57] The ability to be compensated appropriately should never be a barrier for encouraging someone to serve their community and help toward the betterment of Loudoun County. Running for office should not be reserved for those who are retired, independently wealthy, or supported by another family member.

[00:46:16] A broader pool of candidates benefits Loudoun County, including those from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds who are committed to serving the community. If approved, this proposed adjustment would apply to the incoming 2028 to 2031 board, not the current board.

[00:46:35] I believe this adjustment is reasonable and justified for the third most populous county in Virginia and consistent with reasonable, I'm sorry, responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars. I hope my colleagues will support sending this proposal to the first business meeting in November for final action.

[00:46:55] Supporting this change means recognizing the significant responsibilities of the office we hold. Thank you. Point of information, Ms. Glass, in your motion, do you want to say what table you're talking about?

[00:47:13] Because if anyone wanted to read this or look this up, the motion itself doesn't point to the table you're talking about. It just says we're moving the item. Yes, it's table four. It's proposed board supervisor's compensation from 2028 to 2031.

[00:47:34] So it shows the compensation for the chair. Wait, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. This is a point of information. This is a point of information. That's all I'm asking. I'm sorry. Because the motion, the motion just says to move it on. So if anyone wants to look at this before the next meeting, any member of the public, and we moved it on, in the motion, it does not say what table we're considering.

[00:48:00] Would you like to say the table? No. It's table eight. It's table eight. Thank you. I'm sorry. Well, that changes the motion. Table one. Sorry. Table one. Table one. Point of clarification, Madam Chair.

[00:48:18] Is it a point of clarification? Excuse me? Well, point of order, point of clarification. Staff wrote the motion just to send the full item forward. And as a seconder of the motion, I feel comfortable with just sending the whole package forward so we can have more of a debate when it gets to the November 5th meeting.

[00:48:37] So I would not support putting a table in there. I didn't ask her to do anything. I thought you asked her to change the motion. I didn't. I asked her what motion, what table was she talking about. Oh, thank you. I did not make any alternate motion. I did not make any friendly amendment. I just asked her to clarify for the public because they don't know what she's talking about.

[00:48:55] Oh, pardon me. I thought that you were asking her to put a table on the motion. Thank you. Ms. Umstead. Thank you, Madam Chair. I will be opposing this motion, and I will oppose this level of pay raise in November as well.

[00:49:15] So everybody has to make a decision based on the income levels in their own district, I think, the folks they represent. In the Leesburg district, there we have 35% of our households making less than \$100,000 a year.

[00:49:35] Now, that's household income. When you look at per capita in Leesburg, it's about \$61,000 a year. I don't think I should be making that much more than the bottom third of my constituents when it comes to income.

[00:49:57] And I just think we need to lead by example, understand that we have constituents who can't afford everything we can afford. We already make a very good salary in this job.

[00:50:14] And so for that reason, given that I've got over a third of my constituents in really difficult financial straits, I don't think now is a good time to raise the board's pay by this much, given that the board already makes more, considerably more, than 35% of my constituents.

[00:50:46] Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Umstead. Mr. Ms. Frixton? Thank you. I will associate myself with pretty much everything that my co-sponsor said about why this should be approved by the board.

[00:51:07] Listen, it's never comfortable to sit up here and talk about your own salary. It's not comfortable. We know that we are talking about taxpayer dollars. We understand that. Hopefully everyone on the board understands that. I just want to reiterate that the salaries that we're talking about do not apply to any member that is sitting on the board of supervisors right now.

[00:51:30] We are required by state law to adopt a salary structure for the next term by July 1st, 2027. There's not one of us here that is guaranteed to be sitting here January 1st, 2028.

[00:51:46] The only person we know won't be sitting here, sadly, will be Supervisor Umstead. But otherwise, you know, the majority of us on here haven't even declared whether we're running or not and what we're running for. So I think that if we can kind of take it out of that context, that we're actually voting for something for ourselves, it might make it a little bit easier to be objective about the fact that, you know, Loudoun County is a very extremely diverse community.

[00:52:14] We are elected to represent and address the needs of our residents. And at the end of the day, each of us is equally accountable to our constituency. Fair board compensation is justifiable because, you know, many of us actually on this day has ran on the idea that we wanted to be able to unionize our workforce because we think everyone deserves to be making a living wage and to be paid a fair wage for the work that they do.

[00:52:42] This makes public service more accessible to residents who are parents, teachers, small business owners, and those from varying backgrounds. As Supervisor Glass said, someone who is interested in representing their community and working on public policy shouldn't have to be, you know, dependent on a second income in the family.

[00:53:02] They shouldn't have to be dependent on generational wealth or family wealth. They shouldn't have to be someone that's pulling down a retirement from somewhere else so that they can make ends meet. And I would actually argue that, you know, paying a fair wage is a way to avoid conflicts of interest.

[00:53:18] When electives are compensated from other sources, there can be a higher likelihood of conflicts of interest or even perceived conflicts of interest, which we definitely want to avoid. I think it also incentivizes quality of work. It strengthens the quality of work and accountability, allowing more time for research to respond to constituent requests, to applicants, and just to make time for policy work and constituent advocacy.

[00:53:41] I will definitely support moving this to the November 5th business meeting. Thank you. Mr. Letourneau. Thank you. I'm not going to beat a dead horse and reiterate everything I've said previously on this. I genuinely appreciate where my colleagues are coming from, and I don't disagree with a lot of what was just said.

[00:54:00] I think it just comes down to a subjective judgment of what you think fair is, and then I think a non-subjective judgment, which is actually what Mr. Meyer pointed out about how we're calculating this. I went through this uncomfortable process with Chair Randall years ago to try to reset this compensation level because the board at that time had not had a salary adjustment in 12 years.

[00:54:27] And so there had to be a level of catch up that happened, which looked bad because it was a big amount at once. But when you broke it out through the 12 years, it wasn't. So I am willing to do that if I thought that that's what was needed.

[00:54:43] But at this point, we have been steadily increasing the salary at a reasonable rate of 3% or 4% to account for cost of living. And I just don't see a reason to deviate from that, from the way that we've been moving, because it has been keeping up to some extent with cost of living.

[00:55:01] Obviously, we had an inflationary period for a time, which things got out of whack. But I don't like being in a very different place than what the general workforce increases have been. So the one-year jump here is just too much. And so that's why I haven't been supportive of this proposal and won't vote to move it forward.

[00:55:21] Mr. Kirshner. Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate what my colleagues had to say. I just fundamentally disagree that we as supervisors need to be paid this kind of money. A lot of my colleagues have already said it. I appreciate Ms. Wadowski pointing out that, you know, we're voting for that we have a motion on the table and yet certain members that we had here did not want to even give our police officers raises.

[00:55:45] I think that does, that is kind of a problem. But with that said, we are here now, we're addressing this. I just want to point out that I just looked this up. I think the starting step one with a bachelor's degree for our teachers in Loudoun County started about \$63,000.

[00:56:01] If you're at step 10 and you have a master's degree, about \$91,000, all of which is paid less than what the proposal is here. I think that's problematic as well. To me, this is not, as a supervisor, I have a different position in terms of the chair, but as a supervisor, this doesn't need to be a full-time job.

[00:56:18] Plenty of hours, trust me, I put in plenty of hours on this job because I love the county, I love the people I serve, I love the district that I live in, and I want to make it the best I can be. But I didn't sign up for this job, and I don't think either of us should, to make it a job. This is what we call public service, with emphasis on the service.

[00:56:36] That doesn't mean a laborer is not worthy of some of their hire, and we need to have a level of compensation. But we're talking now pushing \$100,000, not quite, but pretty close, for a district chair, \$95,000, I think.

[00:56:53] Sorry, not even, yeah, sorry, not a district chair, just the district supervisor, which is just, you know, again, I appreciate what Supervisor Umstead said. And, you know, we got a lot of people that's higher than 30%. Yes, we're a highly compensated county. We have a lot of responsibility. That's not why we should be doing this job. And I just kind of fundamentally disagree with the concepts as well. If we give more pay, then that opens up for more people. Listen, I work two jobs. I'm a partner at a law firm. I work really hard at that. I've got seven boys at home. I work really hard at that. As a matter of fact, my wife is at a ball game right now, and then she's running the other couple little boys to a 4-H club, and then I'm going to

[00:57:29] go pick them up after we're done here. So there's sometimes work to be done, and we do this because we love it, not because we need to be highly paid. With that said, I do, I would like to make a motion when we get to the splitting to actually raise the chair's salary position a little bit more. I will vote against the supervisors, the seven district supervisors, but in terms of the salary chair, I believe that that should probably be raised by about 10%. To have similar compensation, it's still lower than some of our surrounding counties,

[00:58:01] But the chair does represent this board, does go to almost all the ribbon cuttings, goes to the legislative, both nationally and locally, statewide, and has a lot to do with it. If I were chair, it would be a full-time job.

[00:58:16] I probably would not be able to work another job, and I think that probably deserves a level of compensation. So those are my thoughts. Thank you, fellow supervisors, for bringing this forward. Thank you. Mr. Turner. Yes, Madam Chair. Can I ask staff some questions? Sure. You can ask staff or you can ask your colleagues, either one.

[00:58:33] I'd like to ask staff if you could. I'm trying to figure out, so the one-year jump is from 27 to 28, correct? Yes. And the percentage varies. So by my calculations, it's a 15% jump for the supervisor position and about a 6.5% jump at the chair position.

[00:58:53] Is that correct? I have 7% for the chair position. Okay, 7%. I'll buy that. So that establishes a new baseline, and then on the note after the chart, it says everybody increases 3% a year for the four years after that. Correct. Okay. Okay, that's all I needed.

[00:59:13] Thank you. So the seconder of the motion has already said she wouldn't accept a friendly, and I don't know if I would do an alternate right now. My issue was this with this motion. If you're not sitting here, if you're not in the public, no one knows what this actually is saying to do.

[00:59:33] This is says move to the next meeting. I think that is not in many ways full transparency. So let me be clear with this motion that it's saying. From the table that I believe Ms. Glass has said to use is the one-year jump is 15%, and then year after that, every year after that is 3% for a district supervisor, whereas the one-year jump for the chair is 7%, and year after that, 3% every year.

[01:00:03] So when you say we can move it all to the next time and then discuss it here, we're supposed to have these more in-depth discussions during public hearing and during our committee meetings. That's what these are for. So just saying move it on to a really busy agenda in November does not give as much light and as much clarity as we can do right here.

[01:00:23] I think this motion is kind of throwing the ball and hiding your hand, because it's not actually saying any numbers, which is why I kept pushing to say, which chart are we using? I also think it's incredibly disingenuous to say that we ran because we support unions when one of our union leaders is in the room having issues with this.

[01:00:44] I mean, the head of the firefighter union is sitting in the room with us right now and have issues. I still did not hear, and I think over the next, what, until we get to the fourth, I think what people are going to want to hear is what do you do full time?

[01:01:04] And I'm not saying you don't, and I'm really, really, really not saying that. And just because people don't have time to come in this room right now does not mean that there's not a lot of people who agree or disagree with this item. I've talked to many people who totally agree with this item who are not in this room right now.

[01:01:23] I've talked to many people who totally disagree with this item who are not in this room right now. I don't think we can make that statement. When we get to the 4th, I will support a motion that increases my colleagues' pay at 6%. That's what I will do.

[01:01:39] And I will, somebody else will make a motion for the chair. I will not, I will abstain from that motion completely. I will also say Ms. Umstead makes such a good point. Gas is \$4.50 a gallon right now. People cannot afford their rent.

[01:01:57] Eggs, I was like, my God, I don't need eggs this bad, right? I just don't need eggs this bad. The economy is very, very tough right now. And while I do think that you have to pay a living wage on this board, I also think that as we're talking about what that living wage is, we have to be transparent.

[01:02:22] And I do not think that this is a transparent motion. That's why I want to put the numbers on the table. Ms. Glass, would you like a closing? Well, no, I'll put it on the fourth because we're not going to accept it right now.

[01:02:39] Thank you, Madam Chair. This was my clarification question. Yeah. Would you like a closing, Ms. Glass? I would ask that my colleagues support this motion and move it forward to the next meeting. If there is any more clarification that is needed, please contact us.

[01:03:03] You know, while there's no requirement that supervisors treat this as a full-time position, the demands of it are. I don't know what else more to say, but, you know, thank you for listening to what I had to say.

[01:03:31] So let me take a point of personal privilege, because I'm off my clock, and ask you, Ms. Claus, would you take a friendly amendment to put some numbers in this motion? I'm sorry. Would you take a friendly amendment to put some numbers in this motion? What's the friendly, Madam Chair? The friendly amendment would say all that it says with the board of supervisors for 2028-2031 board of supervisors term compensation to the November 5, 2026 board of supervisors business meeting for action with the understanding that the one year increase for supervisors is 15% and the one year increase for chair is 7%.

[01:04:10] Ms. Bricksman, uh-uh. You shouldn't do that without that. You shouldn't do that. Mr. Crony knew she could have been here. She knows what's happening right now. I talked to her earlier. You can say no. I won't make it as an alternate, but I just think that it could be a clearer motion.

[01:04:29] Well, then can I add to add table one to the motion then? That's why I was asking you before. So then you will add table one to the, as a friendly amendment, you'll say to add table one to the motion.

[01:04:45] Yes. Ms. Bricksman, as the seconder of the motion, will you accept that? hang on just a second please i i'm i'm not gonna accept i'm not comfortable accepting that right now i'm gonna make an alternate motion i move the board supervisors for 2028 that's 2031 board supervisors term conversation structured on november 5th 2026 board supervisor business meeting um using what the um what's the word wording um you just said she wasn't gonna make

[01:05:25] make an alternate. Well, I changed my mind. What a shocker. Using, referring to, or using, how? Referring to table one. That would be an alternate motion. Second. All right. I don't know if I need to discuss this all over again. I'm just simply saying, I think we need to know, people need to know what we're talking about. And you do not take the board meeting to do that. These meetings are for meeting out the different questions.

[01:05:56] That's why we have committee meetings. That's why we have public hearings. Our board meetings are much busier and a little bit more crazy, and so you do it here, and everyone on this day

knows that. So all I'm doing is adding the table that we're talking about. That's literally all I'm doing. I'm sorry.

[01:06:15] Point of clarification, Madam Chair. Yes, sir. So the motion is, as it was stated before, except it specifically references referencing Table 1 to move to the November 5th board meeting with no changes to move to the November board meeting for discussion.

[01:06:33] That is correct. Thank you. Ms. Glass, your light's on. Sorry. Anybody else? All right. So that motion was made by me, seconded by Mr. Turner, to move it with referencing Table 1.

[01:06:51] Honourable, please say aye. Aye. Opposed? No. Nay. If you're a nay, raise your hand. Okay. So that would be, one, two, three. That would be a four. I'm sorry. Yeah. Yeah. Four, three. Is that right? No. Five, three. With Mr. Croney not being here. Five, three. Mr. Croney not being here.

[01:07:16] All right. Five, three. And we'll, and that's it. Five, three. And that will pass five, three. I think we're done tonight. All right. Thank you, everybody. We're adjourned. Get ready for the marathon on Tuesday. The marathon on Tuesday. Only six days away.

[01:07:33] I can't wait.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com