MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Prince William Board of County Supervisors Meeting, Tuesday, April 16, 2024

Date	Tuesday, April 16, 2024
Place	Prince William County Board of County Supervisors, Virginia
Length	5h 55m (video)

- Official meeting video (Prince William County, Granicus): https://pwcgov.granicus.com/player/clip/3456
- Official Board of County Supervisors page (Prince William County): https://www.pwcva.gov/department/board-county-supervisors

> 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 2026-11-01. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:38:18] All right. Thank you, everyone. It is 730 on Tuesday, April 16th. We are going to start with a moment of silence to remember the 17th anniversary of the Virginia Tech shooting, which took the lives of 32 people. If you are able, the Pledge of Allegiance.

[00:38:50] Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Thank you so very much. And we are moving right into public comment time. Please note that this public comment time is for items not listed on today's agenda as a public hearing item um we are going to while i'm waiting for the list of speakers i just want to let everyone know that i'm going to call speakers five at a time each speaker will have three minutes to share their views and

[00:39:29] opinions on matters before the board we ask that all speakers state their name magisterial district or generally where they reside we will close in person on the in-person sign-up list after the first 15 minutes of in-person public comments. All right, thank you so very much. We're going to start with Bill Wright, Liz Matarana, Mike Kaczmarek, Neil Kelly, and Irene Kelly. My name is Bill

[00:40:07] Wright. I live in Gainesville. I advocate raising the data center tax to the maximum permissible level. I'm sure several supervisors received some positive feedback last week for their encouraging words about supporting an increase in the data center tax and using the resulting revenue for promised taxpayer

relief and other pressing public needs. I'm also sure several supervisors received contrary advice from data center proponents trying to make an indefensible case for extending their inexplicable discount. Do yourselves a favor and toss that embarrassingly servile Chamber of Commerce lobbying letter in the recycling bin where it has a chance to do some

[00:40:43] good. We are here tonight to ensure you are listening to the right voices, the people who elected you and whose interest you are sworn to represent. Those voices which have been tuned out in the past are now reaching a fever pitch. The case for raising the data center tax to the maximum permissible level was made very effectively last week. The argument to be made this week is to follow through without backsliding. The rate the public expects is $3.70, no equivocation. There will be absolutely no sympathy for further accommodation of the data center industry. They have enjoyed every conceivable advantage over the past four years,

[00:41:21] including unreasonable ones the county is now being sued for. Their reckless plunder will scar this county for years to come and some of you will come to regret your prior support. Please don't conjure up reasons why they need further coddling. No one is buying it and any supervisor who tries to rationalize it deserves to have their motives examined. County Executive Shorter told you last week that each nickel increase in the data center tax yields an extra 1.8 million dollars to the county coffers. That means an increase to $3.70 would yield almost $56 million. Why would you prefer to leave that in the pockets

[00:41:58] of Amazon, Google, and Microsoft? The raise to $3.70 is only the first installment. Since the Chamber of Commerce lamented the short notice, the pending increase, they should be advised right now that the rate will go even higher next year to align with neighboring counties. Don't say we didn't warn them. The board should strongly consider an ordinance like Fauquier counties that decouples the data center tax from other business and personal property taxes to enable setting rates independently. Once done, the county can start to reap some of the long-advertised benefits of data center tax revenue and applying them to

[00:42:34] legitimate public priorities. Thank you. Next speaker, please. Elizabeth Martirana, Gainesville

[00:43:09] District, Prince William County, almost 48 years. Last week, I mentioned my concern that the homes in the Prince William Digital Gateway were recently assessed at $100 each, which did not make any sense to me because my house has certainly not been assessed at $100. I followed up with an e-letter to all of you asking for an explanation. This evening, my concern is the land values of those same digital gateway parcels. This first picture here shows a 12 and a half acre parcel with land valued at over $3 million. The second picture shows 10 acres, two and a half acres less

[00:43:46] with a land valuation of about $3.5 million. How can more acreage be valued for less? More importantly, how can that many acres of zoned, planned, business district-slash-data center land be valued at so little?

[00:44:03] This next photo shows 5.7 acres valued at around $817,000, with the next parcel showing 6 acres at $15,000. This is absolutely crazy.

[00:44:18] Per acre, my land where my house sits is being assessed at over four times the parcel in the first photo and over 200 times of that in the second photo. There is something terribly, terribly wrong in this county for such assessments to have no rhyme or reason as to valuations and percentage increases for 2024.

[00:44:41] There are enough homes on 10-acre lots in the Pageland assemblage whose valuation should be much, much higher with the December 13th rezoning change to data center. Something is very amiss here. Something is not right, and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure that out.

[00:45:02] I would now like to direct my comments to all present and former Prince William County employees. The Code of Virginia, Section 2.2-3009, is the Fraud and Abuse Whistleblower Protection Act.

[00:45:18] Quote, whistleblower disclosures are disclosures that the whistleblower reasonably believes evidence of violation of law, rule, or regulation, gross mismanagement, gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

[00:45:39] Since we citizens seem not to be able to get the answers to our questions, we respectfully ask one or more of you to come forward to report any act of wrongdoing. Let me point out that this Virginia Whistleblower Protection Act takes precedence over any nondisclosure agreement that you may have signed upon initial employment while in employment or upon leaving your employment in Prince William County.

[00:46:05] Please call the Virginia Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection at 855-429-6669 or look online. Thank you. Next speaker, please.

[00:46:26] Mike Hatchmerick, Heritage Hunt, Gainesville. I totally support immediately raising the computer and peripheral tax to $370. Any delay would only continue the $50 million a year tax break to the data center industry.

[00:46:43] At last week's meeting, we were informed that data center tax generates $1.6 million per nickel of tax rate. The current tax break is $1.55 compared to the max tax of $3.70, which is paid by all other businesses for furniture and fixtures.

[00:47:02] There is only one reason to phase in any tax increase, and that is for supervisors to leverage this tax break to obtain political contributions. The data centers will gladly make $100,000 political donations when they will get tens of millions in tax breaks.

[00:47:20] It is the best rate of return of any business could ever get, 100 to 1 ratio. These supervisors who voted for the Prince William Digital Gateway know how to maintain their own political leverage to get political campaign donations, but they were not concerned at all about maintaining leverage for Prince William County government and residents.

[00:47:41] They never were interested in negotiating the best deal, Prince William County. Now I'm going to shift to the Chamber of Commerce letter. I was a Department of Defense economist for four years during my 36-year government career. After rereading the Chamber of Commerce letter, they really need to hire a better economist, someone who understands cost-benefit analysis.

[00:48:04] They're proposing that in order to save small businesses less than $1 million in Prince William County cumulatively, Prince William County should forgo $50 million of additional tax revenue, less than a $200 tax increase per average business.

[00:48:24] Revenue from data centers could produce a $25 million in tax relief if you split the tax revenue increase. In their letter, they state the average C&P tax for a small business in Prince William County is $253.

[00:48:42] It would go up to a whopping $435,000 with the $370,000 tax rate. Average computer value at that $253,000 is $12,000, but they want a $50,000 exemption.

[00:49:00] In the last four years, Prince William County has provided over $200 million in tax breaks. The chamber proposes another $70 million in tax breaks over the next four years with their suggested phase-in approach. Reject this analysis and vote for the full 370 now.

[00:49:17] Because of depreciation, Prince William County will never recover lost tax revenue. Thank you very much. Thank you. Next speaker. Neil Kelly from the Gainesville District.

[00:49:33] I want to thank everybody for the opportunity to come here once again and to speak. As our citizens, we want to express our viewpoint to the board, and hopefully that you'll understand where we're coming from. After attending last Board County Supervisor meeting, I went home cautiously optimistic about the C&P rate might be raised to the advertised rate of $3.70.

[00:49:53] Some supervisors expressed support for the increase to provide additional funding for the fiscal year 2025 budget. However, Mr. Shorter's presentation on April 9th, 2024, page 3, showed the proposed budget C&P example starting at the current rate of $2.15 and increasing to a rate of $3, not the advertised rate of $3.70.

[00:50:14] In the updated presentation on page 15, Additional Revenue Options, and page 16, Five-Year Plan Remaining, the projections stop at $3.20. Why did the projection chart not work out the total amount of projection increased revenue to the $3.70 amount?

[00:50:33] Making that information available for the supervisors and the public would show how much tax revenue is left behind if the total amount is not adopted to the full rate. The board now needs to start working on separating the C&P tax from the county car tax and raising the C&P rate to the same as our neighboring counties.

[00:50:51] It's the time to be afraid of what the data center industry thinks of our county as long past. If the board would like to use some of the new revenue to help make Prince William County more affordable for its residents, it could start by eliminating the Wheeler-era meal tax and reducing the residential property tax.

[00:51:06] This would put money back into the pockets of the taxpayers. Thank you. All right, before the next speaker, ma'am, I just want to call up our next five. We have Astria Hart, Priya Saxena, Mrs. Johnson, Jason Grant, and Dennis Gill.

[00:51:25] Good evening, everyone. Irene Kelly, Gainesville. Just a couple of little topics. First one, that I'd like to see my taxes for my car separated from the C&P tax.

[00:51:42] There's no need for that. And then here's a balance check, right? I go and take my family out for a meal, and my supervisors had no problem voting for 4%, and now you're looking at 3.7% and saying, well, maybe we shouldn't.

[00:52:01] No, no, no, let's go there. Go up and higher and go into the other county's tax levels if you can. I sure would appreciate it. So would all the families in Prince William County want to take their family out for a meal. Second point, Mr. Shorter, I don't want to throw you under the bus, But I'm going to use you as an example, please, sir.

[00:52:23] All right. A while back ago, former supervisor Canlon, and I'm going to quote, said the developers, whoop, whoop, I lost my spot. It is process, oh, yes.

[00:52:42] Supervisor Canlon called the access to getting consultations into the offices here an approval process that's very relationship friendly. All right, now we leave that thought, and then we go to what the new tax rate you're looking at now only went up to, that 3.2, I think they went to.

[00:53:08] They didn't take it all the way to the 3.7. So if I turned around and I said, Mr. Shorter, what do you know behind the scenes that I don't know? Why didn't you bring it to the 3.7? So that's like kind of an accusation to you. It's not nice.

[00:53:23] So therefore, I propose, let's get a code of ethics established for our board of county supervisors and the Prince William employees. We need an inspector general that will provide citizens the opportunity to report fraud and ethical complaints.

[00:53:46] But at the same time, Mr. Shorter, it would protect people such as you from a lousy accusation that you would have that inspector. just say, no, no, no, no, no. It's all on board. So those are my thoughts. I wish you all well.

[00:54:06] Thank you. And next speaker, please. Hello, I am Asteria from Manassas, Evening County Board members. I am here today to present to you a petition of nearly 40,000 signatures from Prince William County residents and other Virginians to demand for a complete and total ban on traveling animal acts within the county. These traveling acts include circuses that use animals, rodeos, and circus-like acts such as seal-sows, horse-sows, etc., that involve animals being shipped around the country and state to perform. These events

[00:54:45] depend on cruel training methods such as using whips, tasers, and beating with sticks to force terrified animals to perform ridiculous tricks in front of audiences every day, usually multiple times a day. The animals, whether wild or domesticated, are forced to endure long hours of travel in tight trails and cages, rarely seeing pastures or having a proper home.

[00:55:08] Rodeos especially depend on cruelty. Bulls and horses used for bucking have their penises tied with flank straps to force them to buck out to pain and are tasered to freak them out. Calves are taken from their mothers and tasered or hit to make them run so grown men on horseback can chase after them, lasso their necks, and body slam them to the ground.

[00:55:29] Animals in roe deers suffer broken legs, broken spines, and broken necks, often even ruptured ribs and other severe injuries. I have snuck in the back of roe deers for years now, documenting these cruelties myself, and can verify that I have witnessed a bull breaking his leg and being shot at a roe deer here in Virginia.

[00:55:47] I have witnessed animals left bleeding in trails, left in 95-degree heat in the sun without water for hours, and some signs of dehydration and fear. When a circus came here last year with Bactrian camels, they made them and ponies give rides to children for hours in almost 100-degree weather.

[00:56:05] Bactrian camels are native to Mongolian Desert, which is normally below zero, reaching negative, negative 40 degrees. And these poor camels made for such hot conditions were in this extreme heat. This is like putting a polar bear in the Sahara Desert. On top of this cruelty to animals, there is also danger to humans.

[00:56:23] Many animals and woe-deers and circuses fed up with the constant abuse, the pain, and fear will attempt to escape. Bulls and horses flee from woe-deers and run into crowds of people. One incident and bull escaped a PBR event and ran over six pedestrians on the street. Animals and circuses also escaped, and the one that comes here, Royal Hannaford, has a long history of animal abuse and animals escaping.

[00:56:46] Desandra, I spoke to you months ago, and you said you were against these cruelties and would be interested in a ban. Many other counties, cities, etc. have already enacted similar bans. It is time that Prince William County does the same and end this horrific cruelty to these innocent animals and protect residents from them.

[00:57:06] Thank you. I will send you an email copy of this petition as well. Thank you so much. Next speaker, please. Hello. My name is Priya. I'm from Bull Run. I am disappointed that Prince William County still has yet to enact a ban on animal circuses, rodeos, and wildlife shows, despite so many other cities, counties, and states doing so already.

[00:57:29] Just recently, Maryland passed a statewide ban on wild animal acts. Leesburg, Virginia has a ban on rodeos, and entire countries like the UK, United Kingdom, have banned rodeos. It is time that Prince William County steps into the 21st century and protects animals and humans from these absolutely cruel and unnecessary events.

[00:57:48] Rodeos torture animals by beating them with spurs, tasing them, and tying the penises of bulls and stallions to force them to buck. Many places have simply banned tasers and flank straps, and rodeos have ceased performing there since they cannot make the animals act out without using these painful devices.

[00:58:05] That alone shows you that rodeos depend on pain and cruelty, and therefore have no place in a civilized society. In fact, rodeos go against the prevention of cruelty law that protects animals simply because they write off their animals as livestock, which erases all protections.

[00:58:22] It is legal to beat, kill, and sexually assault any animal so long as they are considered livestock, and thus this is why rodeos have managed to skirt by the rules. Let's stop this by enacting a proper ban in Prince William County. In circuses, I think most people know they are cruel.

[00:58:39] This is why most circuses from Ringling Brothers to Universal Circus have removed all animal acts, because everyone is against this well-known abuse. But Royal Hannaford, which is part of Shrine Circus, is one of the major circuses still refusing to stop using animals.

[00:58:57] They have lions, tigers, elephants, horses, camels, and other animals they ship across the country and abuse. Royal Hannaford is well-documented for abusing their animals over the decades, even having three elephants escape and run freely down an interstate at one point.

[00:59:13] They might not have elephants when they come to Prince William, but they are still abusing the animals they bring. I myself have seen these animals left in 100-degree weather in the blaring sun without water for days in a row. Other animal acts, such as seal shows, alligator shows, etc., also come through the county, forcing animals to perform under duress while also putting the public at risk of an animal escaping and in their panic harming someone.

[00:59:39] Please implement a ban and put a stop to this senseless cruelty. Thank you. Thank you. Next speaker. Good evening. My name is Dennis Gill. I am currently the director of the Americans in Wartime Experiences Voices of Freedom Project.

[00:59:56] I've been with the project since we did our first interview in 2010 at an office off of Golansky Boulevard, which is not too far from here. Since that time, we have preserved the stories of hundreds of Americans, men and women, both veterans and civilians, who have served our country and have a personal connection to a wartime event.

[01:00:14] Veterans like Michael Hubiak, who was wounded during the first wave of the invasion of Normandy, and Diane Evans, who served with the Army Nurse Corps during the Vietnam War, and civilians like Tom McAllister, who was a medic with the Arlington County Fire and Rescue and was one of the first paramedics on scene at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001.

[01:00:33] Our mission is to record and preserve their stories for future generations so that history isn't lost to the passage of time. Over the course of these last 14 years, we have partnered with several other organizations, such as the VFW Hall here in Dale City, the American Legion in Manassas, and the Military Women's Memorial in Arlington to capture these stories.

[01:00:55] In many instances, when the veterans share their stories with us, it's the first time they have ever told their story. Many family members don't even know what their loved ones did during their wartime service. And frequently, the veterans thank us for the opportunity to talk about their service because they didn't think anybody cared about what they had done.

[01:01:13] A few years ago, a lady came up to me at an event and told me that her father had recently passed away. He served in the Army during World War II. She said that at his funeral, they played a video of our interview with him and that it had a profound impact on all those who saw it.

[01:01:30] The next year, she brought her daughter to the event and told me that her class in school was using that interview to teach history. I cannot tell you how impactful it is to be part of something like the Voices of Freedom Project and to know how meaningful it is to families of those who have served and sacrificed so much for each and every one of us.

[01:01:51] And it is because their service matters that their story matters, and it deserves to be told. Today, I ask you for your support so that we may continue to honor our country's veterans and to educate future generations to inspire them to service beyond themselves.

[01:02:09] Thank you. Thank you. Next speaker, please. My name is Mrs. Johnson, and I am from the Woodbridge District.

[01:02:27] I stand today as an advocate and reminder to select members of the Board of County Supervisors and individuals within Prince William County who would like for you to forget about a child, a toddler, a toddler, affectionately known as Bumpy. As an advocate for foster parents, it is my family's mission to think of every child and every family, not just Bumpy.

[01:02:49] There are currently 5,166 children in foster care in Virginia. This number by locality is as such. Manassas has 15 children, Manassas Park an additional 15 children, and 89 in Prince William County. Of the children in Prince William County, what does the support look like for foster parents?

[01:03:09] Are foster parents welcome to share their feedback with the respective caseworkers? Are foster parents having meaningful conversations with the child's guardian ad litem, or GAL is the term that's used? Are foster parents encouraged to share their perspective with the county attorney and actually get a response?

[01:03:27] I would say yes to all these factors. Those are all good things, but I don't have confidence, nor does my husband have confidence that the Department of Social Services here in Prince William County will follow their own procedures and be transparent and allow for meaningful conversations. In simple terms, just tell the truth.

[01:03:44] I'm not an attorney, and therefore cannot offer legal advice, but I do have a question for Ms. Roble. I believe I saw Ms. Tierney outside, as well as you, Mr. Shorter. Why are some, not all caseworkers, I'm very specific about that, why are some caseworkers who worked for Prince William County encouraging foster parents not to go to court. Foster parents receive paperwork to appear in court to gain a better understanding of the legal process.

[01:04:09] During these proceedings, usually the county attorney and the guardian ad litem offer the judge pertinent feedback on the needs of the child, such as the schooling that the child may need, progress for reunification with their family, or fictive kin. In Bumpy's case, the goal was for adoption. Prince William County's DSS is failing foster parents if their voices continue to be silenced. It is important to note that specific rules and procedures regarding foster parents' participation in court proceedings vary depending on the jurisdiction and the nature of the case.

[01:04:43] Foster parents who wish to speak at court should communicate their intentions to the caseworker or the attorney involved in the case. Proverbs 4, 5, because I couldn't ever get up here in front and speak of myself, I have to speak of my God. Proverbs 4, 5, get wisdom, get understanding, forget it not, neither decline from my words of my mouth. Thank you. Before the next speaker, I'd like to call up our next five. We have Moshe Ekman, Alex Seinfranc, Sita Larkin,

[01:05:19] and Richie Soffokant, and then Teresa Menz. You may go, sir. Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the board. My name is Jason Grant. I've had the opportunity to talk with many of you all, particularly around the indoor event center that's been proposed in the community meetings and being there. It's a pleasure to talk with all of you. As we look through, one of the things that came up, there's continuous support for the facility. The only negative comment that's come up is how are we going to afford it and where's that money going to come from to fund the debt

[01:05:54] service. Your own financial advisors state that it'll operate at least $400,000 a year once it's after three years in operation, and so the advisors that you pay tax dollars to get guidance on to say, is this going to work, has said it'll work from an operational side. The question of why doesn't the private sector build it on its own, is it going to make money? It's because of the debt service side of it. Once you add that in, I think it was $10 million a year is what was stated at the public meetings of what that will cost. As you consider the data center tax, the programmable computer and equipment tax of the business tangible property. I would recommend supporting that raised to the tax if there's some purpose of what this

[01:06:32] board is going to utilize those funds for. One of the challenges we have in Prince William County when it comes to capital projects is how do we fund these park projects? How do we fund these youth projects? How do we make sure there's more money to schools? How do we make sure we foster economic development? Are we development opportunities that we want to take advantage of?

[01:06:48] How do we take advantage of public-private partnerships without having a dedicated revenue stream. The proposal that I sent to each of you is to take 15% off the top. There's already a precedence for this. The recordation tax you already take to utilize for transportation before splitting with the revenue sharing agreement. I would follow that same process. Take 15% off the top before you split that with the revenue sharing agreement. Again, this could go toward funding projects that will support youth in the community, economic development to bring more revenue back to the community. So unless this is just a punitive issue of raising the tax rate, if it's actually an issue to try to figure out how to resolve issues in the county, that would provide you $19.98

[01:07:26] million, according to the five cents giving of $1.8 million, that you would have to be able to discuss what are some capital project needs that we have in the community so that data centers are able to help fund that cost, that quality of life here in Prince William County. Whatever the purpose is for that increased revenue, it would be great to have transparency in that to see where that is.

[01:07:47] Again, my recommendation, take 15% off the top, utilize that, have dedicated revenue stream. With that, the $10 million becomes much easier to fund. You have another $9.98 million on top of that to fund other capital projects. And the only concern that came up with how do we fund the debt service, if you raise that tax to 3.70 and you take 15% off the top, you have the capacity to fund it.

[01:08:10] That's no longer an issue. Operationally, the facility would make sense. So I would encourage this board in that adoption to consider as part of that resolution to have a structure where 15% is off the top. And then that goes to fund capital projects for youth, for community development, economic development, or for tourism.

[01:08:28] Thank you very much. Appreciate your time and your service. Thank you. Next speaker, please. Hello. My name is Moshe. I'm from College Park, Maryland. I'm asking today for traveling animal acts to be banned in Prince William County.

[01:08:46] The suffering that animals endure when used in such a manner is unimaginable. In circuses, they may spend 96% of their lives in transit, where they are trapped in small cages or chained up. The cages are often so small, they end up defecating where they sleep. The training methods are cruel as well.

[01:09:02] Undercover investigations show that animals are whipped, beaten, and attacked with bullhooks. According to the World Animal Protection, every major circus in the U.S. that either currently uses or previously used animals has been cited for violating animal welfare standards. Rodeos are just as awful. Animals are zapped with electric prods, and their necks are twisted as they are violently slammed to the ground. They suffer fatal injuries, including broken necks, broken backs, heart attacks, and aneurysms. Many cities and counties in the U.S., and even entire states, have banned animal acts entirely, or aspects of them. Montgomery County, Maryland,

[01:09:39] for example, has banned animal circuses, and the state of New Jersey has banned all wild animal Acts. Animals are sentient beings who experience all the same emotions that we do, joy, excitement, fear, and pain, and they suffer tremendously when treated this way. Please do the right thing and help ban traveling animal acts in Prince William County. Thank you. Thank you. Next speaker.

[01:10:04] Greetings to the board. My name is Alex Sunderfrank. I'm a Virginia native born in Rockingham County. Currently I'm living in Northern Virginia. I'm here in support of a prospective ban on traveling animal acts. I've been involved in that legal side of the fight against animal acts for some time. I

was in Frederick, Maryland, where care drivers fought tooth and nail to ensure that horses did not have requirements to have things like access to water, the ability to urinate, and not have to be tied to a catheter to urinate, and fought tooth and nail to keep

[01:10:40] that in place. As soon as welfare rules were put in place in Frederick, that led to essentially a ban on animals and I want to make clear that every single time these welfare actions are put in place they effectively lead to a ban because the only thing that these people ultimately do care about is the profit for their animals.

[01:10:58] I fought as well in during the Maryland Renfest to get them to exclude elephant rides from part of their exhibit. The elephant owners in that scenario used testicular torture to break the animals and they did fight tooth and nail as well to try and keep that practice legal.

[01:11:16] Fortunately, in Virginia, there is legislation, HB 1531, which just entered this session that would ban potential testicular torture for elephants, and unsurprisingly, zoos, rodeos, and everything like that are fighting tooth and nail to keep that legal.

[01:11:34] So I want to make it clear the types of people that do these shows and the types of people that have these traveling animal exhibits do not care about the well-being of the animals. They care about their profit motive and above everything else. In particular with the Maryland Renfest, they knowingly brought elephants that were contaminated with tuberculosis to an event full of children.

[01:11:58] And in Virginia as well, we recently had a major event where the Natural Bridge Zoo had 71 animals taken from them, and a jury upheld that action by the police, finding that they'd so egregiously mistreated the animals that they weren't going to be permitted to have them returned.

[01:12:15] So I do want to be clear, in Virginia and in states around us, actions being taken to restrict these individuals from the actions that are taken, and that really the ethical thing is for Prince William County to move in the same direction and ban traveling animal exhibits.

[01:12:33] And again, I appreciate the time today. Next speaker, please. Thank you. Hi, my name is Sita Lamartin, and I'm a NOVA resident who's very concerned about how this county is treating animals who are being forced into slavery, like how humans once were.

[01:12:50] Today is your chance to show kindness and really end this cruel practice that's just for your entertainment. When I was younger, I firsthand saw horses needing to urinate in a bag and clearly being tired from the back-breaking work.

[01:13:06] For a child, this was very traumatizing, and bringing justice happens by working together. So please speak for those who cannot and ban traveling animal acts. Next speaker. Good evening, members of Prince William County Board and fellow citizens.

[01:13:26] My name is Richa Sonnefrank, and I'm a Virginia resident. I'm here to discuss the matter of animal abuse and the distress it costs the public by watching the rodeo seal shows and live animal circuses. Usually, traveling circuses bring only pain and torture to the animals.

[01:13:44] Often, the babies' animals are taken away from their mothers at a very young age to be trained for the cruel entertainment. These animals are beaten and whipped during the training, which is distressing not only for the animals, but also the public who witnesses such actions.

[01:14:01] When I was a senior at GMU in 2009, I saw the back end of the circus. Animals were chained, and it did cause emotional instability to me, my friends, and also anyone who saw them in that situation. So none of us and anyone whom I spoke to who were at GMU at the time did not go and see the circus.

[01:14:24] So at that time, I and countless others took actions against the circus and signing the petition, educating the public, speaking against these acts. And that year, the circus did happen, but a few years after, the Ringling Brothers shut down, basically, because people didn't want to watch the animal being suffered.

[01:14:47] And now they are back, by the way, without animals, and people are enjoying them more than ever. I also remember giving out the flyers, educating the public regarding the treatment of animals at the circus, even in Maryland. After looking at the flyers, there are many, many cars.

[01:15:03] I could count, like, at least 30 cars turned around because the kids didn't want to see animals. Entertainment from the animals who were being abused, they just didn't know. once they saw the flyer, they just did not want to watch the circus, and they turned around. I also saw in Frederick, Maryland, their legislature enacted basic welfare rules for the horse carriages, and these were opposed by the horse carriage owners, and after the rules were enacted, the carriages were just, they never returned, because it was not like they were banned, they just never returned.

[01:15:37] So I would say public perceptions are changing, and the public at large don't want to see the animals being abused for the entertainment. And there are many alternative to the animal abuse. And most of the public, I would say, value, compassion, empathy. Only few bullies wants to feel strong by abusing others. Thank you. Thank you. And our final speaker, Ms. Minns.

[01:16:08] Theresa Minns, Potomac District. I want to thank law enforcement and first responders for all they do for us. Right now in Dearborn, Michigan, we have Muslims chanting, death to America, death to Israel. That's here in America. I would call them terrorists. I realize only terrorists and illegal aliens have rights. Democrat and Republican and name-only dictators make them first. Our borders are wide open, and military-age men are coming across these borders. We have

[01:16:47] terror cells already here and all they need to do is be activated. Laugh at me all you want. Our borders are, okay, I already said that, sorry. Just learn President Donald Trump will not be allowed to attend his son's graduation due to a biased judge. Due to the corruption of George Soros, we have a lot of judges, AGs, DAs in place. Trump is being railroaded and this is election interference. Elections are just around the corner, and most people are not informed about

[01:17:26] the candidates they want to vote for. Example, if you know Joe Biden's long history of racism and still vote for him as president, I call you an informed voter qualified to vote. If you are black or brown and know Joe Biden is racist history and still vote for him, I call you an informed voter, but you should never, ever complain about racism. Own it, you voted for a racist.

[01:17:54] So racism and social justice groups are nothing but a scam to waste our tax dollars. Besides promoting hate and division, they are all George Soros groups. We need Jesus Christ, and our churches are letting us down. Our government wants to be our God. They have no morality. Government wants to enslave us. Okay, and I want to say, because I still have time, these people come into America, many of them, they're not here to assimilate. They're not here to learn our language.

[01:18:30] They're not here to obey our laws because they came across illegally anyway. And my tax dollars are supposed to support these people, and I'm supposed to suck it up. Well, I don't appreciate being a money tree, and for the citizens who don't mind it, shame on you, and I'll stand up to you too. And it's sad that this board gave themselves from before, not the new people, a 70% pay raise during a budget cycle. 70% didn't even finish your first term once again. And the media has

[01:19:06] let us down. The mainstream media lies for the Democrat Party. So you all take care and keep shafting us and keep supporting Black Lives Matter, Bodie. All right. Thank you so very much. this now concludes in-person comment time we are going to move on to remote public comment time i believe we have five speakers oh no we may have three speakers but i'm going to turn it over to supervisor bode thank you madam chair good evening everyone miss van shall we begin yes we have three

[01:19:38] speakers on your first speaker is jessica grove good evening i am again asking that you raise the data center tax to the maximum permissible level. The public expects $3.70. The data centers have enjoyed way too many allowances and favoritism. It's as if the data centers are your favorite child, which I just cannot understand because the residents who elected you to your position

[01:20:14] should be your favorite child. Even more than that, you should be making your best effort to protect, defend, and provide for us. The board should strongly consider an ordinance like Fauquier counties that decouples the data center tax from other businesses and personal property tax to enable setting rates independently. Once done, the county can start to reap some of the long advertised benefits of the data center tax revenue and applying them to legitimate public priorities. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Grove. Next speaker, please. Your next speaker is Margarita

[01:20:51] Moylan. Hi, my name is Margarita Moylan and I reside in the Gainesville District. I've lived in Prince William County for 24 years, and now more than ever, I see how difficult it is for the citizens of Prince William County and how much they're struggling to make ends meet. There are remedies that you as the board control that can help. Please vote to increase the peripheral tax

[01:21:23] rate to the maximum allowable on the data centers. Lower the residential tax rate. Eliminate the county meals tax and cut unnecessary spending. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Moylan. Next speaker, please. Your last speaker is Steve Amato. Good evening, board members, Madam Chair,

[01:21:59] Steve Amato from the Occoquan District. I appreciate you all taking a look at my pitch from the last two weeks ago board meeting where I was encouraging you all to reduce the real estate tax rate by 3 cents. You met most of the citizens' needs of reducing the tax rate, but I really feel going down one more penny to .93 would really show transparency in that you're working to reduce and bring down that tax burden upon the Prince William County citizens. So please take a look

[01:22:38] to go even further to .93. I appreciate the county executive and the staff crunching the numbers to show you last week what that projected forecast would be. So thank you very much for taking a look at that. But just one more cent, I really think that'll really help and the county citizens would very much appreciate that. Myself, along with thousands of other residents, want to see that data tax rate go to $3.70. That will help generate the additional funds. Now let me talk about the

[01:23:13] Affordable Housing Program initiative that the county has taken on. And I have sat in a couple of the meetings with the ordinance and given some feedback about the action plans. I commend the agency in charge of the Affordable Housing Program to take a look at the problem. But have we looked at

what is causing the problem? Have we looked at what is impacting the problem? And I see three big areas. I see the federal government is definitely impacting it with high inflation

[01:23:51] driving up the results of the high inflation. It's causing mortgage interest rates high back in the 70s. That's where these high rates used to be. And the consumer costs throwing up a lot of high costs for living. You have the war on energy causing high energy costs. We have high spending by the federal government. The state has a play in this, which is the personal property taxes, many other taxes, and even the county with our real estate taxes and personal property taxes.

[01:24:27] Have we looked at the problems? Have we looked at how these factors have contributed to the problem? I encourage board members to engage with our state legislators, our federal legislators, to explain to them the impact of their policies, which is causing these high, unaffordable housing.

[01:24:48] Prince William County, in my opinion, should not be the financial institute to fund a lot of these programs. And we should not be growing a tremendous program with a lot of FTE. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Amato.

[01:25:04] And just to be clear, Ms. Phan, was that the last speaker tonight? Yes, that's the last speaker. Thank you so much for your assistance as always. Have a good night. Back to you, Madam Chair. All right. Thank you so very much, Supervisor Bodie and Ms. Mann. We are now on to agenda item four, that is county executive time.

[01:25:20] Mr. Shorten, the floor is now yours. Thank you very much, Madam Chair, members of the board. No items for me this evening. Thank you. All right. And before we actually move on to county executive time, I just wanted to acknowledge a couple people we have in the audience.

[01:25:35] We have Sheriff Glyn Hill, who has joined us today, and we have Chief Justice Kimberly Irving also with us today. And Judge Horan.

[01:25:51] I apologize, ma'am, because we haven't had a chance to meet, but thank you. All right. We are going to move on to county attorney time. The floor is now yours. Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the board. This evening in closed session, we will have consultation and discussion with legal counsel and briefings by staff members pertaining to the discussion or consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose of a homeless navigation center west, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body.

[01:26:22] And this item is appropriate for closed session pursuant to 2.2-3711A3 of the Virginia Code. So moved, Madam Chair. Second. Any discussion? All right, let's vote. Vote unanimous.

[01:26:43] All right, thank you. We are moving on to the main event, Supervisor's Time, Item 6. We are going to be discussing Item 6A, the fiscal 2025 budget markup. Madam Chair. Yes, Mr. Supervisor Bode. Thank you, Madam Chair. Before the board begins at budget markup, I need to declare a personal interest in this matter.

[01:27:00] My wife is a school's employee. As a school's employee, my wife and I are members of a group which is affected by this matter. I will be participating in it because I am able to do so fairly, objectively, and in the public interest. Madam Chair, before the board begins budget adoption, I need to declare a personal interest in this matter.

[01:27:17] My wife is a special education instructional aide with the schools. As a school's employee, my wife and I are members of a group which is affected by this matter. I will be participating in it because I am able to do so fairly, objectively, and in the public interest. Thank you, Madam Chair. All right. Thank you guys so very much. So this is how it's going to work. I am going to, we're going to go around as we normally do. We have supervisor time and everyone has five minutes to discuss the budget markup, what they'd like to see, if they have anything in particular they want to highlight. After that, we are going to move into CNP tax and we're going to take a vote

[01:27:52] on that. It is going to be standard discussion time. Everyone can speak up to five minutes a piece. We are going to do a roll call vote at the end of that to see, you know, as a straw poll to see where we're at. After that, we're going to discuss the property tax rate. Again, standard discussion time. You know, after that, we're going to discuss the PRTC, their funding requests. And for that, I am going to suspend the rules and give people additional time. I'm going to ask board members to really focus in on this issue. Because, I mean, this is, you know, we are being asked for a substantial amount of money. And I want to make sure that I keep moving this meeting

[01:28:30] along. And then after that, we're going to get into areas of individual interest. CXO, you know, Mr. Shorter will be pulling up last week's presentation, or we're going to, you know, identify some areas that, you know, we would like to devote additional funding to, or perhaps we are unable to meet the requests. So with that, I'm going to start with the opening five minutes, and I'm going to start. All right, we are going to go start with Supervisor Gordy.

[01:29:08] Thank you, Madam Chair. As we've been going through this budget process and being one of the new guys on the board, this has been very much a learning experience for me.

[01:29:24] One of the things that I've really tried to focus on is trying to understand our revenue sources. We've talked a lot over the few years about how we reduce our dependency upon our residential real estate tax rate in our residences in terms of their personal property taxes. And I think tonight we have an opportunity to send a message that we are going to commit ourselves to turning the tide on that.

[01:29:56] I do support raising the C&P tax to $370,000, but I also support reducing the real estate property tax rate to 92 cents on the 100. But I want everyone to understand something.

[01:30:15] Every property owner will benefit from that tax cut on real estate, and that includes data centers. So even though we raise the taxes on the C&P rate to 370, data centers will still get a tax cut on the other side of the ledger. So I think we need to be very transparent, honest, and very fully understand what we're doing here. But the only way that I can see us getting to offering our residents a real tax cut, not just a slower rate of growth, but for a vast majority of our citizens,

[01:30:54] nearly two-thirds of them, at 92 cents, I think we can get them a real tax cut. And I believe when we have a conversation about affordability of homes, it's very interesting. In the Wall Street Journal just last week, there was an article about how the cost of home ownership is continuing to increase because of taxes, insurance, and maintenance costs. We can't do anything about insurance. We can't do anything about maintenance, but we can deal with the tax side. And the way

[01:31:30] that I look at this is, you know, we can wait on home affordability and allow the developers to take us down that path, or we can do something about it now. And on January 1, we can actually make homeownership more affordable for our residents by lowering their, giving them a real tax cut and

reducing their mortgage going forward. So I look forward to being able to do that. I hope that's something that we can achieve tonight. I also support reducing the mills tax from 4%

[01:32:03] to 2%. Over the last two years, we have seen food not at home, in other words, food eaten at restaurants, the inflation on that food going up nearly 20%. And essentially, since we've imposed this tax, we're taxing inflation. Interestingly, food not at home or food at home has only gone up about 10%. But we also have some inequities within what the food not at home, where it is

[01:32:39] sourced, and in how it is taxed. If I were to go to Costco or Kroger or any other grocery store and buy a rotisserie chicken and some sides, I would only pay a 1% tax. But if I go to a restaurant, buy those same items, I pay a 4% tax. So we've literally created in an industry, in a business that is one of the hardest businesses to succeed in and a business that 50% of which in our county

[01:33:09] is minority owned and many of them are family owned, that we are creating a disadvantage for these family owned businesses against corporate grocery stores. And I think we have an opportunity to provide more affordability for our families. We talk a lot about food insecurity. I'm on the Cog Farm Committee. I just attended last week and the idea of food challenges in northern Virginia continue to persist. Food prices continue to escalate and they're according to the USDA and

[01:33:48] and the consumer price index it is slated to continue to go up by another five percent this year if not more and many of these things are beyond our control. So I hope tonight we can provide real savings to our families, and I think we can take the right steps tonight to do that, and I look forward to the discussion. Thank you, Madam Chair. Supervisor Franklin. Thank you, and I have a few directives, and so, but I don't think this will take very long.

[01:34:21] One discussion with regards to the CMP tax that I think is important to clarify is that I don't think I've spoken to anyone on this day as who doesn't agree that an increase needs to take place. I think the challenge for at least me is figuring out how can we protect our small businesses. The challenge is because of state code we have to tax all these entities the same whether it's a data center or a small business. We have about 6,000 small businesses that will be impacted by an immediate increase but I think it sounds like many of us agree that the increase should

[01:34:57] take place. So I actually like to issue a directive for county staff to look at creating legislative language to put into our legislative agenda for the General Assembly to push for language to have them basically allow us to make exemptions for small businesses, particularly for the CMP. I don't think that a small business should have to endure the burden. That would be, quite frankly, easy for a data center to do. And so I think what we have not been talking about is

[01:35:32] the impact on small businesses. And so I like, without objection, Madam Chair, for county staff to look at creating some type of policy that we can push the General Assembly on to allow us to create exemptions. So that's the first one. The second is related to the food and beverage tax.

[01:35:53] We've talked about that for many years, and it's the same situation. I remember asking county staff before we implemented it, you know, how can we provide exemptions for certain small businesses disparately impacted by the food and beverage tax?

[01:36:11] And so I like for county staff to also look at crafting some type of policy position that we can send to the General Assembly to say, hey, give us some more flexibility on these taxes. allow us to figure

out, you know, the big chain restaurants can afford to pay it, but what about our mom-and-pop small businesses here?

[01:36:31] So without objection, I'd like to issue that. Also, the library and the senior center that we're pushing in the Woodbridge District has gone through a master plan. It is not in the CIP, so I actually would like to issue a directive, too, For staff to begin planning and design for a new multipurpose facility that will include a modern public library and a senior center in the Woodbridge Magisterial District.

[01:36:58] Would also further like to direct staff to conduct community outreach, develop final designs, and identify funding sources for the future construction of this project without objection, Madam Chair. And then lastly, just a couple of other things. We'd like to issue a directive without objection to have staff look into creating a housing assistance program.

[01:37:20] We've been talking about the Affordable Housing Ordinance and the Housing Trust Fund, but quite frankly, those things are good long-term to address the affordability needs, but it does not address immediate housing needs of those that will be evicted for whatever reason in the next month or for those that lost their jobs suddenly for whatever reason.

[01:37:41] So I would like for a housing assistance program to be considered for creation and would love for staff to come back with some recommendations on how we can provide immediate financial support for those that need it. And then lastly, Madam Chair, we're going to talk about increasing the C&P tax.

[01:38:00] I'd love for us to look at adding additional money to the housing trust fund, and I know a couple of my colleagues are also interested in that. We'll love to look at, if we do go to that max rate, what an additional $3 million per year could look like for the Housing Trust Fund. I don't want staff heads to explode, but I think that it's worth at least considering.

[01:38:20] And I know Supervisor Angry has some concerns about transportation funding and how we can also utilize some additional resources if we do go up to that max rate towards transportation. So with that, Madam Chair, I yield. All right. Supervisor Vega.

[01:38:38] Thank you, Madam Chair. first off want to kick things off by thanking chair Jefferson and my colleagues I would like for the public to know for those of you that are here in chambers and those watching at home that this process has been night and day compared to what we've had endured over the last four years so thank you madam chair for opening the door for dialogue for actually having conversations with I believe every district supervisor and I want to thank my colleagues also for the back and forth whether it was through emails through phone calls there's been a lot of work that your board has put in behind the scenes to ensure that we put the best budget forward for the taxpayers of Prince William for me it's no surprise you know what my priorities have always been

[01:39:18] this is my second term now on the board and I've always advocated for a lower residential tax rate I've always advocated to cut unnecessary spending and like supervisor Gordy I am going to be pushing for 92 cents on the real estate rate and a three dollar and 70 cent increase for the data center rate and the reason for that um is because one of the biggest tasks that we are tasked with as public servants is to listen to you uh the people that have elected us to be your voice to be your representative many of you in this room know that I conducted a survey last week and I would like to report to my colleagues and to the public that it shattered all records in terms of my office

[01:39:55] it's not the first survey that I put out that I put out there many of you know that my style of governing is is that as soon as I get information I like to share it with the general public and I've conducted several surveys in my first term and this term, and we had over close to over 2,000 people complete that survey. And I'm a visuals person. I don't know about you, but I feel like I learned better when I was in school. I learned better when I went hands-on and when I actually saw something. So I want to share with you all. These were the results of the survey. As you can

[01:40:30] see, an overwhelming majority of folks want us to go to $3.70. We had folks from every single district in Prince William County partake in this survey and not just folks in Prince William County but outside of Prince William County those that have been feeling the the the aftermath whether it's Loudoun County whether it's Falkier wherever but it's very clear that this is not just a West thing as many people like to say this is a county-wide concern and three dollars and 70 cents is what the general public is telling us that they want us to do and so for those reasons I'm going to be pushing for this and I also want to highlight that many have said that that's not how we should

[01:41:10] do business in Prince William County that we should do it in increments well I would like to remind my colleagues on the day is that when we've raised taxes let me correct that because I have not voted to raise your taxes when taxes have been raised over the last course of the four years we've never asked you for your opinion on whether or not you would like for the board to do that in increments we just they just stuck it to you so I opened the way that I did because it's a new day in Prince William County and because we're doing things differently and because I'm hopeful that the board majority is going to agree that 370 is where we need to be and that 92 cents is also

[01:41:45] going to provide much needed tax relief for the taxpayers of Prince William County. I'm also very interested in the topic of housing and affordability. I will say that we have a lot of people come into these chambers and request for us to do a whole bunch of things. Supervisor Gordy mentioned a few of them that we have no authority over but at the end of the day it really comes down to us doing what is right if we continue to tax you all we are literally making prince william county unaffordable which is the reason why a lot of people are leaving prince william county we talk so much about wanting prince william county to be a place to live work and raise a family

[01:42:21] well this is our opportunity tonight to continue to make that a reality for so many families here in this county whether it's a first-time home buyer somebody that is struggling whatever the need may be we are here to hopefully bridge that gap and do something meaningful here tonight so madam chair I'm gonna leave it here for now and I look forward to the robust discussion that we're going to be having collectively thank you thank you so much we're gonna go to supervisor Bailey good evening everyone I want to thank first of all the county staff for

[01:42:57] helping to prepare us for this moment in time that happens every year around this time. So we are very appreciative for the information that you provided to us to get us to a point where we are continuously serving the citizens in a higher level. So let me start off by saying I too am very interested in increasing the C&P tax. I think it offers us an opportunity to provide, as I said before, a higher level of service to the community. And I think it offers

[01:43:32] offers us an opportunity to collaborate and talk to those businesses that own data centers to help them to understand what the needs are in this in this county and so I do support the 3.70 C&P tax

increase I'm also very supportive of a reduction in residential tax and because I think the cmp allows us to do that i like that smile so i think the cmp tax offers us an opportunity to do

[01:44:06] that uh people do want to live work and play in this county and we are i think we've done an excellent job uh in the past we will continue to do an excellent job in the future to support our citizens i think it takes a collaborative effort and i think it uh i think we're on the trajectory to do that. And so very much interested in that. The other thing is I would like to offer a directive if I haven't already. I cannot remember if I have, but I'm very interested, which is a very

[01:44:41] something near and dear to my heart. I'd like to offer a directive to put the CRC in the CIP. Have we done that yet? We have? Okay. I just wanted to make sure. Okay. So I'd like to offer another director have been to have a report or presentation to come forward for the board in terms of updates and where we are since the budget season in the General Assembly okay thank you and then additionally how housing affordability is very important here in our County and I think that we've made a

[01:45:17] very strong effort and making sure that we are crafting and framing hiring the appropriate staff to to execute the ordinance that we're creating and I think it's very essential that as we move forward as we sit on these regional boards to learn how to move forward and to collaborate with the county exec staff I think it's very important that we have the foundation to support the ordinance and the execution thereof and so I'm very interested in increasing the

[01:45:49] housing trust fund to the five million that I mentioned before and I'm going to stick to that and so that's another request that I have and then there are other items that the county exec presented to us and I'll come back madam chair I'll come back to mine but thank you very much for that all right we're going to move on to I just want to let you know supervisor Bailey after

[01:46:29] this work and after I speak we're going to move on to our first vote are you okay with it or did you just want to add your piece now would you like me to add yeah just yeah just go ahead I had a minute and 30 minutes 30 seconds hold on well Andrea time absolutely so one of the things that I'd like to request in the budget I don't have much but one of the things that I'd like to add is for

[01:46:59] us to focus on the Forest Park golf course it is in high improvement upgrades has been for about eight years or so even before I got on the board and it is owned by our county and it is a place where people really enjoy to live work and play and that increase to the budget is two hundred thousand dollars and so I would like to propose that and hope hopefully get the support of my

[01:47:37] colleagues for that I have socialized this with the parks and recs department I've gotten a list of what that entails and I can share that with you as well if they haven't already but that is a request for my district that I'd like to have and then lastly the other requests that I have for my district is a fifty thousand dollar funding fifty thousand dollar funding to to do a study a design study in my district my district is prime for revitalization we've tried on

[01:48:12] the onset I mean in the past to do so but I think we need a study as to what's needed in the district where it's needed and we need to hire a consultant to do that. Willing to work with the Economic Development Department to do that, but that is an addition, and then I'll come back with my last request. All right, then, Supervisor Weir. Thank you for my minute and 30 minutes. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll make this brief, because I know everybody really wants to get on with this. Ditto to 0.92, ditto to 0.37. I actually want to thank, well, 370.

[01:48:53] I'd like to be lower, but I'll take what I can get. I really would like to thank my colleagues and particularly staff for, quite frankly, tolerating my budget wonkiness and seemingly unending series of questions, arguments.

[01:49:09] It's not personal. It's been exhausting. But I would also like to really give my thanks to my staff. Putting up with me during budget season is, shall we say, challenging.

[01:49:28] And they have been troopers. The amount, the countless hours that we've spent over the last couple of weeks, and this is everybody on staff, looking up numbers, putting some packages together, contacting other chiefs of staff, working through stuff with other supervisors so we can sort of try to get to some acceptable adjusted tax rates and adjusted initiatives, I couldn't have done it without them.

[01:49:58] To be honest with you, I'm very happy that we're here tonight. This is much different than last year. I think we're going to have an actual markup discussion, which to my knowledge hasn't happened in quite some time. I believe it is crucial to good governance to do this, to examine things, to suggest changes.

[01:50:21] You may not make them all, but I think that discussion is helpful on a variety of fronts. even on particular additions or subtractions that I can't support or will grudgingly support or fully support, we shall see. I just think everybody needs to bear in mind that when we start talking about long-range financing, we have a considerable number of relatively new CIP projects that have been brought on board in the last couple of years. They carry a significant

[01:50:57] debt service so it's going to be difficult to add large capital projects especially given what the school may or my school division may or may not do with respect to the 14th high school and other renovations and other new facilities that may or may not be required and I'll address that later and I'll leave it at that madam chair because I'm sure I'll be speaking far too much in the next couple of hours all right supervisor bode thank you madam chair wanted to ditto uh kudos to my my colleagues for the robust discussions we've had over the last week or so

[01:51:35] uh wanted to thank my staff and my budget committee for the time they sent spent pouring through sometimes excel spreadsheets sent by county staff which i know can be very riveting at at best um also want to thank uh dave sinclair michelle attreed county exec chris shorter for the constant, and sometimes as of even this afternoon, getting back to our various questions, so I wanted to raise that as well. Now, to get to it, you know, right now, some of the richest companies in human history are receiving a tax credit, a tax break in this county, right? At the current tax rate of 215, data center is still paying almost half at here, as they do in Loudoun

[01:52:15] County, which is data center capital of the world. We know this to be true. While I've been proud to support some of the more incremental caprices over the last few years, I have often said that we're not, they are not paying their fair share. This year with this FY25 budget, we can make an even more meaningful step in fixing that, as my colleagues have said so before. I'm going to be supporting the 370, like my colleagues have already said, which is the maximum we're currently allowable to do, because it has to be commiserate with the other personal property taxes, because we no longer need sweetheart deals to attract this industry. They are here, they are maturing, they are going to be here to stay. We can still also at the same time fully fund our staffing plans for

[01:52:54] our public safety officers. We can still make important investments in our schools and further seed our affordable housing trust fund without increasing the tax burden for our residents. So I will also be supporting the 0.92 on the real estate. And here's why that's important to me, especially that last part with housing. If we get housing right, people in our community won't have to spend as much money on rent or mortgage, drastically bringing down their cost of living.

[01:53:21] If we get housing right, we can curb traffic congestion by creating compact, walkable communities closer to work, groceries, and other important amenities. If we get housing right, we can attract more quality jobs to the county and ensure folks can live where they work and work where they live.

[01:53:37] And if we get housing right, we can ensure we create the kind of community where our children and grandchildren will want to stay and thrive there's been a lot of talk about the housing trust fund what we are going to do and we're not going to do with it i support getting that five million dollars this year and building that up over time because frankly seeing beyond our current difficulties with housing we know that this county has continued to grow we also know that frankly we're in a situation where we as a county in the past have driven out affordable housing developers because we don't have the tools in order to help them make these deals work.

[01:54:14] We know that it's been to our detriment. We know that slow rolling affordable housing in the past has done nothing for housing affordability in this county as it pertains to our residents. If we take this moment to invest what we need to to get that trust fund started, we pass an ordinance in July, we will in the next few years start to see us make real gains in that space.

[01:54:37] And that will have ripple effects over the economy, over our families, and again, frankly, over our children, our grandchildren's ability to stay in the county that we're raising them in currently. And that's near and dear to me. So to sum it all up, we have an opportunity tonight and a budget adoption next week to put us on the path that many of us have talked about for a very long time, which is getting some of that burden off of you with your residential real estate taxes and put some back on where it deserves on some of the richest companies in human history.

[01:55:11] I hope that the directive that Supervisor Franklin gave earlier can cause some good discussions in Richmond about allowing us to not only making it so right now the data center tax rates can be the same or lower than personal property taxes, but also higher as well.

[01:55:27] Things that I know Valk here is looking at, as folks have said before, because frankly, those computers and peripherals used in data centers are used in a much different way in a data center than it is in a mom-and-pop pizza shop, and there needs to be acknowledged of that by the state as well.

[01:55:43] So I'm hoping to have a great discussion with my colleagues today as we continue this discussion. I know that housing is on forefront, which I appreciate, and I think that we can come together and come up with a consensus budget that I think that most of us, if not hopefully all of us, will be able to support next week.

[01:55:59] Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Supervisor Angry. Thank you, Madam Chair. So this is my fourth budget season with this county. Let me just start by telling you all, the board, I am very proud of the work that I have done in the last four years or five years in Portis County.

[01:56:20] Very proud. I do not support a 370 hike on the C&P tax only because I think we're ahead of schedule on this. And I've been saying this since I got on this board in 2019. Housing has always been an issue.

[01:56:35] We've always looked at trying to get a commercial tax base that makes sense. I think there's a delicate process and a balance that goes with all that and how you get there. However, we are here. So if we're going to be here, I will tell you that as we were, and I said it last week when I spoke about the Housing Trust Fund and everyone was excited about jacking this up just to get another $2.5 million in that budget.

[01:56:58] I had lunch with Supervisor Gordon, and I will thank him for presenting that option of the 92 cents because it actually makes sense when you look at one of the immediate things we can do for our residents and their housing and those who really have an opportunity to have zero tax.

[01:57:16] Granted, we know that there are people who live in million-dollar homes, so of course they're going to have a slight tax increase when we see that, but I think they'll be happy to deal with that too. But as we talk about affordable housing, it's more than just a program. It's more than just a HUD or a Section 8 or a LIHTC project.

[01:57:32] It's about getting people to actually be able to live in a house that they can pay. And I've said this many years on this board that that's what we need to be getting to. So I'm happy to see that. I also mentioned we had a discussion about the millsacks, and I would agree to cut that in half because one of the biggest things that I've been looking at and talking about with you all is this county needs something in it to bring people from outside so we can actually, and I'm going to coin Christina Wins comment, that we can spend other people's money traveling through the county, which is the design of that.

[01:58:01] That mills tax shouldn't be that we're looking at citizens and what their spending habits are. It's really people who are coming through. And what do we have in this county? I just hit the tulip farm this Sunday. About 75,000 people will have crossed through that thing by tomorrow.

[01:58:17] We really don't have a way to create that to be a revenue stream that this county can benefit from. A discussion I know that you're working on, Supervisor Gore, to try to figure that out. And I think those are the opportunities we're talking about because that's what that tax was designed to do. Secondly, I will say, as we heard about the Americans in wartime, I'm hugely in favor of that.

[01:58:40] I know we've all been in discussion of that. I want to see that happen, so I'm heavily supporting that to make sure we can help get that project across the finish line. I know it's been working for a long time. I feel like this is the thing that will help us get there, and I'm going to monitor that, so you all have my word on that.

[01:58:56] I'm hoping that you all will support that. I just want to be on the record to say this. I'm not a fan of the county-sponsored community special events 250K because I think that's going to create confusion with our offices on how we want to spend that money. So unless there's a clear-cut pathway written of how we're going to allow that fund to exist and what projects or events will be in that, I really want to make sure we spend some time discussing this.

[01:59:21] I think what we have in our partners program, I think this was born out of that. And if our partners program is a way that we can give money out, if this special events, if we're trying to do something different for the county by having county-sponsored events, then I really want to see this

written out to a point that it just makes sense and it's very clear-cut so that we don't have any confusions with our offices on how that's going to be carried forward.

[01:59:51] And then there was one other piece. I'm going to chair if I – okay, I've got about a minute. Oh, the PRTC. So the actual funding that we need to figure out on that, you know, there's been some discussions about if we're going to take this C&P tax at this point.

[02:00:09] I've already asked to look at a penny, but I'm asking the board to have a discussion about if there's some funding we can do because here's the deal, and I've always said this. We've taken the boats, we're on the island. We've burned the boats, we're not going back across. This bus system is ours in the city of the states. We need to figure out how we're going to fund it.

[02:00:25] I know you've all gotten the data about what routes could potentially be cut if we have to pull out some revenue. So I just want us to have a real sincere professional conversation about what's next for OmniRide and how we're going to fund that and what it looks like. I'm pretty much out of time, so thank you, Madam Chair.

[02:00:43] All right. Thank you, everyone. I actually want to start with a conversation I have with a former elected official who told me, point blank, Dishandra, your biggest challenge in your seat is that people don't know what leadership looks like anymore. People don't know what leadership looks like. And I took that to heart and I actually felt like that was very good advice. You know, I've had people who have come to me and say, you know, I really like the way the board meetings are running. They seem so much smoother. You know, I still have people who feel that if I'm not sticking my finger in, you know, someone's eye

[02:01:20] every meeting, then I'm not doing a good job. And I just want to take a moment because I appreciate your comments supervisor vega um i've been trying to work with everyone to understand you know where you have concerns what are things we can do better and to hopefully um create a more you know cordial environment we'll see how that all plays out during markup i do expect some spirited discussions and but i do think we're going to have some really good points of agreement i do want to also really name supervisor weir and supervisors about bodie thank you guys

[02:01:56] particularly you know and supervisor we're your team for helping through this budget season you know we have had a lot of late night early morning conversations um you know and supervisors we're team put together a spreadsheet we're not going to all agree on everything but it's just going to help give us guidance about some of the things that you know people we've talked about collectively or individually um that we can actually not talk about it collectively i also want to thank my team because you know we're new we're all very new to this process it has been you know trial by fire We're learning a lot as we go along.

[02:02:27] So I also, you know, want to thank my board members for their patience in this process. I'm not going to say a lot because I think we all know, you know, we don't have, you know, a huge audience here, but I think that we all know what's next.

[02:02:44] And so let's get to it, you know, let's roll. I would like to first begin with C&P tax. and i would like to entertain a motion to raise the cmp tax to three dollars and seventy cents which is the highest advertised rate or it's the highest rate we're able to go to and that is the rate that we advertised so moved second i don't know how to parse that i i think i'm going to

[02:03:16] give it to weir as the motion and who's i heard bodie so that's bipartisan boardy gordy's trying to get into the boardy um all right so any discussion madam chair all right um y'all you need to use this. All

right, Supervisor Bodie. Thank you, Madam Chair. Just very quickly, I appreciate the discussion about small businesses, and I don't want to seem like I'm disensitive to them. I have talked to a few small businesses and small business owners who live in my district, and frankly, they have told us, hey, if you scale back that real estate tax rate

[02:03:54] while doing the 370, they're more than happy to pay a little bit more, knowing that, again, the data centers will be paying their fair share. Just wanted to add that. Thank you, Madam Chair. Hold on, I have Supervisor Weir. You don't have a thing? So I'm going to go to Supervisor Weir because he was already in queue.

[02:04:11] Then you, Supervisor Franklin, then Supervisor Bailey. Supervisor Weir. Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to confirm with staff that the most recent number in terms of revenue that that increase would generate is $54,700,000? Yes.

[02:04:32] Just nod, yes. That is correct. That is still correct. Thank you. Yes. The more refined revenue per nickel is $1,765,000. We rounded it up to $1.8 million, but that is the most precise number at $370,000.

[02:04:54] All right. If you're done, I'm going to go to Extra Supervisor Franklin because she raised her hand before she was having difficulties. Yeah, just wanted to clarify about the small businesses. There may be a few small businesses that are okay with paying it, but there are 6,000 that will be impacted by this.

[02:05:10] And this is why I issued the directive to have staff really go and push the General Assembly to give us more flexibility in creating these waivers and exemptions for some of these taxes that we're able to collect. So let's be clear.

[02:05:25] We've got 6,000 small businesses that will be impacted by this. I'm going to support this measure, but only because I want to make sure that those small businesses in some way are addressed and taken care of, at least in the long term. All right. Supervisor Bailey. Thank you, Madam Chair. I agree with Supervisor Bode in saying that we're not being insensitive to our small businesses. I think our small businesses do understand that they are a focus of our governing, especially since we provided a lot of ARPA

[02:06:03] funding during the COVID. And I bring that back because that was the focus primarily from an economic development standpoint and it has continued and so I think that this is a good decision just based upon the fact that we're trying to be all-encompassing as we go forward not to harm anybody but all-encompassing so big business needs to participate it gives us an opportunity to have more robust conversations even with our chamber as we go forward and so I look forward to that kind of discussion as well and so just thank you Madam Chair for the

[02:06:35] opportunity to have such a robust discussion on such a important decision. All right, Supervisor Gordy. Thank you, Madam Chair. A couple of points. First of all, I love the directive that you offered. We do have, having more flexibility in how we can support our small businesses, I think is going to be essential going forward. But one other question I did want to ask on this is, and and it's something that Supervisor Bode had mentioned in his proposal that he handed to us last week,

[02:07:10] was the $0.70 being, what's the right way to describe it? It would all come to us that it would not be part of the revenue sharing agreement. And so we would need, you know, I would, would we need to amend the motion to also include some element of that directive in terms of how it gets allocated?

[02:07:41] We do not. We can, at the end, talk about what we want to give to schools, because I do want to give schools money. And I want to make clear that that's also one of the reasons why I'm very interested in going to 370. I have said many times over that schools, our education system, is what draws people in.

[02:07:59] It draws residents, and it draws businesses. So we'll have that discussion about making sure they get additional funding. Okay, and again, I just, you know, I think on the, in terms of our small businesses, you know, with this C&P tax, just remember, there is a depreciation schedule that goes with this tax.

[02:08:18] It's 50% depreciation the first year, and then by the fifth year, it's depreciated down to 95%. So, you know, I think offering our small businesses a real estate tax break, which is something more permanent, something more consistent, but the 370 will not be, you know, the impact will diminish over time.

[02:08:44] So I think this is, it may be, again, looking at ways that we can continue to support our small business, but I think that, you know, tying it in with the real estate reduction is also going to help them. Thank you. All right, Supervisor Bailey. Thank you, Madam Chair.

[02:09:00] I just want to, I really would like to entertain the discussion, and I know we're going to have robust discussion about the revenue share agreement, because our schools, I agree with you, Madam Chair, are very important. And our children need the support in terms of their academics because of COVID.

[02:09:21] So I think really talking about the importance of the revenue share agreement, how we utilize that in detail going forward is very important. And, you know, with the decision that we're making, that's an even vast decision. So, you know, we need to talk about that honestly and in depth as it relates to our kids and the learning of our kids.

[02:09:43] Supervisor Franklin. Thank you. And thank you, Chair Jefferson, for your comments about the schools and Supervisor Bailey. There is no way in the world in which I think we should be going to 370 without making sure and guaranteeing that our schools don't get their fair share of this cut.

[02:10:04] The schools are probably one of the most important entities that we have. And certainly guaranteeing that they have their share that we've agreed to, 57% to be exact, is something that I think is incredibly critical. And I just think it has to be an important part of the discussion.

[02:10:22] Thank you. Supervisor Vega? Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm not sure if we have anybody from the school division here. But as we have this conversation, I would be interested also in getting numbers as to how much they're getting in federal and state funding. Because I think that's also important to the conversation that we're going to have.

[02:10:40] And we will certainly get into all that. So let's go ahead and take our vote. So we'll be doing a voice for these. These are not on the iPad, so I don't want to hear. We're doing roll call. Supervisor Weir. Supervisor Bode.

[02:10:57] Aye. Supervisor Angry. Supervisor Bailey. Aye. Supervisor Franklin. Aye. Supervisor Gordy. Supervisor Vega. Yes. Chair Jefferson. Motion passes, 7 to 1. All right, thank you so very much.

[02:11:14] We are going to go now into the residential tax rate. I would like to, or someone else, I'm looking at you, Weir, do you want to make the motion? Madam Chair, I would move .92. Second. All right.

We have Weir, and then we have Gordy.

[02:11:32] Second. Any discussion? Chair? Sorry. Supervisor. Wait, hold on. You ain't going nowhere. Supervisor Franklin is still having issues with her mic. So, Supervisor Franklin. Thank you. And if Steve Carwell is listening, please come see me at the dais. My only question to staff is, if we go to the 92, does the 370 make up for what schools will be losing?

[02:11:57] If the answer is yes, then I'm totally fine. We've done some math. Supervisor Weir. Just to follow up on that, I want everybody to be aware that setting it at 92 takes away $21.1 million of the $54.7 million that we just added.

[02:12:16] So your net net is $33,600,000. and my understanding is the school is fully funded at the budget recap number, correct? Based on what the Prince William County Schools presented to the Board of County Supervisors on April 2nd, the schools are funded with the county transfer that was presented in February.

[02:12:57] I'm sorry. No, he was answering where. She was busy. You're getting... All right, Supervisor Bailey. So, translation, Dave, what does that mean? it means with the budget recap presentation the county executive provided last week that would provide at 94 cents an additional 4.6 million to the schools above what their

[02:13:25] budget is based on an additional 6 million you said 4.6 4.6 all righty we have no other speakers so we're going to do another roll call supervisor weir all right supervisor gordy supervisor angry yes supervisor bailey supervisor bode aye supervisor franklin aye supervisor vega yes chair wheeler i'm so sorry oh my goodness it comes out we look exactly alike i mean when i

[02:14:03] look in the mirror this is the second week so sorry chair jeffrey i have a very good sense of humor i'm so grateful for that oh yeah i he's wrong to me he's just like you want your eye all right all right all right all right folks all right so um the next now at this point i am going

[02:14:38] to want to suspend um the rules for additional time because we are going to get into prtc next and i want to have a road bus discussion so is that something do i i don't need a motion do i need a motion all right everyone no they said i don't this has been the rule our rules these are our rules so i think everyone is there anyone who doesn't agree with me please raise your hand i don't think anyone doesn't agree so let's discuss prtc i don't know if um thank you i see mr canizales um is there any way that we can put their budget requests on the screen so that we can

[02:15:15] we weren't prepared to put their budget requests but maybe what we can do is maybe uh ask the team to put the slide from last week's presentation and it shows numbers for PRTC.

[02:15:35] Yeah, that's what I was looking for, if we can see. Thank you so much, and I apologize. And just so that you're prepared after this discussion if you can put the budget recap. That would be great. All right.

[02:16:07] So I, since Supervisor Angry, did you want to speak first since you represent? The issue here is that there is a shortfall. And, you know, one, the questions we have to ask Is this something that we want to plug this shortfall?

[02:16:26] Thank you, Madam Chair. So let me say, even though I'm the chair of PRTC, it's all of our bus systems, PRTC. So, you know, I don't need to leave this discussion. I think, honestly, again, this is democracy and it's going to come down to a vote. We fund roughly 95% of this operation.

[02:16:42] And so we know that what was presented was a large number. I've heard some of your concerns. The numbers are presented. Dr. Snyder sent us another email that put out what some of those cuts would look like.

[02:16:57] So the real question here is, how do you want to go forward? Now, I'm all in on OmniRide. I've said that I'm all in on PRTC. So, you know, I think the real issue now is that we've always known that the well is going to run dry and the motor fuels tax. We have a transportation department that literally has rural projects that's tied to this whole thing.

[02:17:16] And so there was a split that was supposed to go out. And so now we need to have a discussion, Which is why I asked about a dedicated revenue stream looking at the C&P tax and if we could carve out a portion of that to start creating a revenue to make that pot its own pot for transportation.

[02:17:32] So I will pause there just to kind of let you all, I mean, at this point, it's a discussion for us. So how do you guys want to proceed? Before I go into the next, I just want to say, I believe per the county attorney, we cannot dedicate any funding for a particular area because we cannot tie the hands of a future board.

[02:17:50] correct? Madam Attorney. Madam Chair, members of the board, this board cannot bind future boards. We've discussed whether you can do earmarks. The Code of Virginia dictates on some taxes that they must be used only for certain uses, example, the TOT, etc. However, if the board wants to give policy direction to the staff to say that X cents on Y tax should go here, the board's policy direction would be if X cents on Y tax is $5 million, the policy direction is $5 million

[02:18:25] would go for this item, and that is the policy direction that you would be giving to staff, and that would be the direction for this year you would be needing to do it for future years. You could say your intent is on future years to remain with that policy direction, but that is not legally binding intent. Yes. The only other way you were saying that we could do this I think we're talking about a C&I tax and I know that's not something that I've sat and talked to supervisors about that even businesses have come and told me they're

[02:19:02] not really in favor of that but if that was that tax and that tax doesn't go to revenue sharing can go to transportation projects such as this which then puts us in that predicament to either figure out if we want to do something like that and how do we help those small businesses that are creating that so I remember that conversation just want to put that back out there as well Madam Chair, members of the board, Supervisor Angry, you're correct.

[02:19:25] The General Assembly has dictated on some taxes that they can only be used for certain portions, like with the TOT and the CNI tax. All right, thank you so much. We're going to go on to Supervisor Franklin. Sure, thank you. And just to clarify, I mean, you used the term earmark, but we can essentially provide each year a line item.

[02:19:46] Madam Chair, members of the board, each year you can give staff guidance to say you would like X dollars to go towards Y project, and if that X dollars equals X cents on whatever tax. Yes, thank you. So the way I look at this is a couple of different ways.

[02:20:04] I've always talked about the importance of finding a dedicated funding stream for transportation that's more steady other than the fuels tax. I've also said that the state has to do a better job of playing its role in local transportation, and they've been trying but I will say that when I look at the 3.9

shortfall that we have this year to me that is different than what we're talking about for the future in terms of providing a line

[02:20:37] item in the future when I discuss those transportation needs it's to not to take care of the shortfall but to finally provide some type of permanent transportation funding source that doesn't vary based on how many people are going to the pumps.

[02:20:57] And so I think that is a separate discussion than the 3.9. Quite frankly, for this FY25 budget, I think that the proposed budget is a good budget. It does leave the 3.9 open. I think that we've done as much finagling in this budget to help PRTC where we could.

[02:21:18] And I think Dr. Schneider can kind of figure out, at least for FY25, how to make that work. And I think alongside, we should be talking about, in the future, how do we make sure that we provide a steady funding source.

[02:21:34] But I think that 3.9 is something that PRTC can kind of work internally to figure out, because we've done the brunt of the work in basically taking care of the rest of the deficit that was there. It wasn't a 3.9 deficit. It was much larger, and we took care of most of that.

[02:21:52] So I think that they can look at the 3.9 for themselves, and I think that we should still discuss line items moving forward, whether that's a percentage or a certain amount, that we can guarantee towards transportation for the sake of funding transportation, not for the sake of taking care of a deficit.

[02:22:10] The purpose of the funding transportation source is to prevent the deficit. I'm going to let you go real quick, and then I'm going to go on to the rest. I just want to add that that's what that email he sent that really was how how he managed the 3.9 and what that solution is so and you're right there's more to go with that that he can clean up next year and I think that's the difference that we have between now and next year to really figure out the new version of OmniRide based on some of these deficits and figure that out so there's more discussion to go with that thanks manager all right supervisor Bodie thank you madam chair um I'm not going to disagree with anything that's been said already but I will say

[02:22:50] that I think that building a dedicated funding stream for PRTC has to start this year. It's not something we're able to do from zero to 100% or however much we want to fund of their budget in just one cycle. And even with the C&I tax and conversations about that, it won't be able to fund everything over the course of the next five years when, again, they're going to be asking upwards of $92 million, which has been studied by our own transportation department. So my proposal from last week, I would love for us to dedicate $5 million towards PRTC this year. Now that does

[02:23:27] happen to more than fund their whole, but my saying that isn't to fund their whole. My saying that is so we can start building dedicated funding streams for PRTC, understanding that in the future we ought to find other ways to do as well. And as Supervisor Franklin said, the state will also have to step up for that regard. So my proposal is $5 million, which then goes into a question where, again, $5 million right now more than makes up for that $3.9 million hole.

[02:23:54] And so my question is for Rick Canizales, knowing that whether it's the grantor's tax or the transit occupancy tax, which amount of that money would you peel back then if we don't have to fund as much from that? Madam Chair, members of the board, Rick Canizales here, Director of Transportation.

[02:24:10] Thank you for the question, Supervisor Bodie. From my opinion and my suggestion, my professional look at it, I would peel it back from the grantor's tax, which is the most flexible tax that we have listed up on there to be used for transportation purposes. I appreciate that. Because ultimately, I completely get folks really wanting to have the executive director have more discipline with his budgets.

[02:24:31] And that conversation still needs to play out at PRTC, regardless of what we do here. I'm just still concerned that in the back and forth on this, the people who will be hurt by this are the people who take those buses. And I am concerned about those people that, especially the folks that rely on those buses, to get where they need to go.

[02:24:52] Because, frankly, some of them do not have another option on how to get to where they need to go. So we can have discussions at PRTC about discipline and how Bob Schneider crafts his budgets moving forward. But for this year, I am not comfortable with leaving folks out on the lurch, knowing that, again, some folks rely on our bus system as it currently stands to get where they need to go.

[02:25:14] Thank you, Madam Chair. Supervisor Weir. Thank you, Madam Chair, and now we get to the normal Bob part of the show. There aren't many hills I'm going to die on tonight, but this is one of them.

[02:25:33] And let me be very clear. The issue isn't fuel tax revenue. The issue isn't the county's share of the subsidy. The issue is the management of PRTC's budget. There is no arguing that.

[02:25:50] In my view, they've engaged in poor budget practices. They haven't used any creative strategies to raise new funding. We've talked about some of those possibilities, and quite frankly, they've given us a false narrative on the use of COVID funds.

[02:26:07] Their claim was that over the last three years, they've used COVID funds to keep our subsidy down. That is not the case. They applied the COVID funds generally across the top of the budget and increased their budget in totality without giving us very much, if any, relief to our local subsidy.

[02:26:27] I had to get the six-year look back from their staff because this is the information they would not provide the board members. The increase this year is 59% year over year from last year. If you go back one year further, it is $20 million more than FY23. That's a 250% increase. This is

[02:26:58] unsustainable. And the PRTC, CXO, and CFO need to get their act together. And this is not the first time this has happened. We had this discussion last August. I can't give the public the specifics, but most of you know it. Lastly, with respect to the emails that we have received from the CFO, in my view, they are nothing more than thinly veiled threats. They are threats aimed

[02:27:37] at particular board members, threatening to reduce the ridership of the options and the routes in their district. You attack one of us, you attack all of us. I am not going to put up with this.

[02:27:52] And if he thinks he can make these changes without PRTC board support or authorization, he is sadly mistaken. But that's a discussion that we're going to have to have next month at the PRTC board meeting, and I would strongly encourage all board members to show up.

[02:28:10] Thank you, Madam Chair. Supervisor Gordy. Thank you, Madam Chair. As I really appreciate Mr. Canizales, you know, last week when we asked you about this on the TOT, transient occupancy tax, they're taking the proposals to take full $4.5 million.

[02:28:38] And last week you said you had mentioned that at least $1.5 million of that could result in downstream limitations on meeting our county's transportation goals. Can you further elaborate on that or

correct my understanding of it? Madam Chair, Supervisor Gordy, great question as well.

[02:29:03] Yeah, what I was mentioning last week is that the transit occupancy tax is broken down into three percentage points that go directly to transportation. Two of those percentage points are codified for public transportation use. So if PRTC takes those funds or are given those funds from the county, they're going to the right use.

[02:29:25] They're going to the public transportation realm that they were codified for. There's 1% that was given at a later date and codified at a later date that goes to any transportation use. So that 1% can be used for any transportation funding for roads, sidewalks, trails, safety improvements, public transportation, anything to do with transportation so they're more flex that one percent is more flexible yes so that one percent that adds up to about 1.5 million in the coming year estimated uh would be going to prtc but but could be used if not going to prtc for your transportation pedestrian

[02:30:03] and safety program that you have so over the course of the next year not having that does that you know, weaken your future buying power. It does. So that 1.5% is part of the overall total with the grantor's tax and the 30% that we would continue to use for the transportation improvements that we leverage other funding sources with, and that we put away in capital and reserves to make sure we have the money to do some of the things like what's listed up there, the Miniville Road project and not have to take out debt service. That does go against that.

[02:30:39] Thank you, Mr. Kahn. Yes, sir. You know, I'm a little concerned that, you know, we're throwing good money after bad with PRTC. I asked at PRTC board meeting, and I asked again when they presented here, if you don't get your full funding, what are you going to do?

[02:31:00] And there was only one option, cut service. Not once did they talk about trying to find or create their own source of revenue, whether through passenger fees or whether just using the buses for advertisement. They just put the new bus wraps on the buses.

[02:31:22] What a missed opportunity to let somebody else pay for that and then leverage that wrap for future income for PRTC. I think there's just a lack of creativity and that, in my view, we're being taken advantage of And that there is to some extent, and I just use the word arrogance, that somehow a 60% budget increase can be thrown at us and that we would somehow just take it.

[02:31:55] That is an outlier within this budget, a 60% increase. So I am not in favor of in the short term of until we have a better management plan going forward, committing anything, any long term for PRTC.

[02:32:17] there's got to be a better management plan and um and we we must um and most of us are on that board and will help solve that problem so we're going to have to roll up our sleeves and and try to work through that but um i don't want to give up our future buying power uh because we're going to need roads we're going to need i had had conversations today our roads are being torn up significantly torn up in this county right now due to dump trucks hauling dirt and literally not

[02:32:52] just breaking asphalt it's literally destroying road beds and these are roads that were repaved last year that are now all going to have to be redone so I think we've got this we've got a huge cost coming and we're going to have to figure some with all of our transportation we're going to have to figure something out and but i think prtc is going to have to find a way to operate more efficiently in the short term thank you supervisor bailey thank you madam chair i appreciate all of my colleagues comments because they're all on point and as supervisor angry you don't have to

[02:33:30] bear the burden by yourself just being the chair because we're sitting right there with you and i'm just saying you know we're sitting there right with you when we're making these decisions and so the email that we got you know the input that we got from PRTC was kind of heavy-handed but what I don't want to see is for us to make a rash decision because one of the districts that's going to be impacted the most is mine and so I you know I support uh the supporting the shortfall for now

[02:34:01] and us having more of an input more of a more hands holding hands with Dr. Bob as we go forward because we've just gotten to a point where the services have been increased during the mismanagement of funds.

[02:34:19] And my district specifically is about to be enhanced because people don't have cars like we do to be on the road. So I'm just putting it out there because I think we don't need to yank the rug right now.

[02:34:35] We need to do it in a very succinct but strategic and lead in a different way. I think the leadership has to be in a different way. So that's where I'm coming from. The 3.9, I think we need to support it because we're at a good place in terms of the level of service.

[02:34:55] But I think that we do need to help PRTC manage the funding a little bit better by sitting on the board. I'm going to interject before we go to some of the people who are going to speak again. This one's a hard one for me.

[02:35:11] I do take PRTC. I do see the value, but I take offense. I do take offense at some of those suggested route cuts. And I apologize because I hadn't had a chance to speak to Dr. Schneider, you know, and Supervisor Anger graciously shared his contact information.

[02:35:30] I didn't think his suggestion for route cuts was funny. It felt too political to me. And I will be frank. I will probably support the funding shortfall for now, but the emails give me no confidence in PRTC leadership.

[02:35:49] And I generally don't go to the meetings because I have NVTA, but maybe perhaps I'm going to have to look at my schedule a little bit harder because we're going to have a serious conversation. This is not something we're going to kick the cannon on the road. We're not going to be at this point next year, okay? I am a longtime PRTC writer. I support the bus service, but I also support us being smart. I appreciate Supervisor Gordy's recommendation about, you know, why don't we have the buses? Why aren't we selling advertising? You know, we have local lines that are not generating revenue but you know what we need them i feel because for the people who rely on it i

[02:36:27] don't want to take away that service but the commuter buses they're making money and i'm a little confused maybe i need a roll tape from last week or when when um prtc was here but i had a distinct impression that some of the buses like the um line that i read the montclair express actually make money so i didn't understand why that was on the chopping block i don't understand where we're going to cut a bus to the Pentagon. Because a lot of people in this county still work outside of this county. And we want to get cars off in 95. So I'm just going to leave this right

[02:37:00] here. I will begrudgingly, and I mean begrudgingly, vote to fill the shortfall. That's painful to say that. But we're going to have a serious conversation because we're not going to be here next year because certain people aren't going to need to be here giving the same presentation that they've given before. So I think that that clears up where I stand on this issue. You know, I'm just not at all happy again if you can't think of other ways to raise revenue if the thing is you're going

[02:37:38] to look at taking cuts and he said you know they'll probably have political impact i i feel the cuts were political i feel the cuts were absolute his suggestions were absolutely political so i'm going to name that um i'll go to supervisor we're next thank you madam chair as i said this is a hill i'm going to die on i will grudgingly very grudgingly support slide nine but not one damn cent more You've got to remember, we have never given general fund support, ever, and now it's $3.9 million.

[02:38:19] But what everybody's missing is that part of that total subsidy on the motor fuels tax includes raiding and emptying the motor vehicle fuels fund balance. It's $3.2 million. So next year, if everything stays even, it's not a $3.9 million ask, it's a $7.1 million ask to fill the gap.

[02:38:43] As I said earlier, this is not sustainable, and you're right about the route selection. In my view, it was punitive, and it was designed to cow us and break us down and force us to do it.

[02:39:01] I don't respond well to threats, and I sure as hell don't respond well to blackmail, and that's the way I view this. But if someone makes a motion to stick with slide 9, I will very grudgingly agree to it, but they need to make up the other 3.9.

[02:39:20] And for my vote on PRTC, we're not cutting revenue-generating commuter routes. That's the silliest thing I've ever heard in my life. Supervisor Anchor. Madam Chair, so I'm trying to contain myself here because you don't have the right, nobody has the right to sit here and make accusations and say that man is lying.

[02:39:42] What he presented to you was a solution that is not guaranteed until the commission says it is. So to make all these acquisitions, if he's done all this, is wrong. That's very wrong. And if you want to get to the bottom of this, I'm working right now to put together an emergency PRTC commissioners and executives and anyone in this staff and this board to be in the room to get these answers, questions before we go off saying that he's politicized, trying to make routes and take away because of you guys' positions.

[02:40:09] That's wrong because we can't sit here and do that. Now, we're elected officials and we're professionals, and to sit here and make these accusations that that's what he did is very wrong, okay? Until we find the truth in all of this, that's what we're going to find. If you don't want to fund a 3.9, we can go there. If you don't want to fund any of this, we can go there.

[02:40:25] But I guarantee you something's going to be cut, something has to be cut, and it's going to affect the people. And the bottom line is we do know that our citizens take the bus, those who rely on it to go to grocery stores. Okay, so like I said, we've burned the boats. You are not going back across this water. You need to figure out how you're going to fund this bus system because it is our bus system.

[02:40:44] But to sit here and make accusations about him or anyone on that leadership that works this funding stream for this bus system is wrong. And I'm just going to say that. And until we get these questions answered, none of this is necessary and none of this is right.

[02:41:02] I respect your—oh, can you guys hear me? I feel like my mic has gone out. All right. IT help. I'll go over to Supervisor Vega. They're all out.

[02:41:21] But I project well. Can you all hear me? So what do we do? Do we wait for IT or do we speak? Do you want to, I do not feel comfortable yelling out. I'm not yelling. I mean, I just. What we're going to do.

[02:41:36] You know what, take a 10 minute recess. We're going to take a 10 minute recess and then we'll go. Now my screen isn't working.

[02:42:00] All right. We are going to, thank you everybody.

[02:42:17] We are resuming our session and we're going to resume where we left off with Supervisor Vega, then Supervisor Weir. Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to say that I agree with a lot of the things that my colleagues have already stated.

[02:42:33] But for me, it goes a little bit deeper. I was at one point a voting member, and when Supervisor Weir was elected, I decided to request that I be an alternate. And the reason for that is because we see a pattern here.

[02:42:50] This is not anything new. It's reoccurring. Every single year, it's the same thing. And I hear the chair and I hear Supervisor Weir saying that they're reluctantly going to go ahead and support it. but I will not, because I'm not going to continue to reward poor planning, poor budgeting.

[02:43:06] Because here we are, again, coming in and saving the day. What's going to happen next year if there is another shortfall? We're going to find ourselves in the same position of having to bail them out once again. And as you all have those conversations, when you all go back to PRTC, I would suggest that we also look at, you know, I always talk about ridership levels, because it matters.

[02:43:27] When we talk about making cuts, they're all not necessarily bad. We have some routes that are literally operating in the red. Perhaps getting creative and thinking of a voucher for one rider for two rider is a better option than having an entire route that is costing us money. And so just wanted to throw that out there.

[02:43:44] I don't want to, you know, drag this out anymore because I think that a lot of what I agree with has already been stated. But I will not be supporting this because it's a reoccurring thing. And, again, I'm not okay with, you know, rewarding something that has been an ongoing issue that should have been fixed years ago. All right, Supervisor Weir.

[02:44:03] I just want to be clear. I don't think anybody here has used the word liar, but with respect to the emails that we have gotten, they are clear, they are direct, and they delineate the routes that are going to be removed. It's that straightforward, and in my view, that's a threat. That is no different than perhaps playing with the county police department's budget and the chief threatening to cut patrols of our neighborhoods. That's the equivalency I see,

[02:44:42] And I'm not willing to reward that type of behavior with another $3.9 million that, quite frankly, they have not justified. I will grudgingly go with this slide and leave the $3.9, but nothing more than that.

[02:45:06] Supervisor Bode, and then we're going to bring this up. Sure. Thank you, Madam Chair. It sounds like there's not very much support for the $5 million I put out there, So I will also begrudgingly support what's on here between the T.O.T. and the grantor's tax. Again, understanding that we have a hard conversation to have once we go back to PRTC because Supervisor Angry said it.

[02:45:28] And I think Supervisor Weir alluded to it, too. These are the email we received from Dr. Snyder is proposed routes to be cut. Right. Until we give authorization to do that, he can't do it. So we're going to have to have real conversations with him in the long run.

[02:45:45] And I know that I'm not speaking out of turn here when I say this, but I think we need to also have conversations about how we create more accountability and auditing on the PRTC side of things to

make sure that we're seeing this with eyes wide open and we're looking at all of our options on how we do things.

[02:46:01] Because I agree with what's been said already. There are revenue funding streams in terms of user fees, in terms of advertisement, in terms of other creative things that other bus transit systems do in order to generate funding. But to me also there's... I don't want to use the word systemic, but there is obviously an underlying issue with how he crafts these budgets when you get outside eyes looking in, and that's all I'll say for now.

[02:46:23] Thank you, Madam Chair. All right, thank you so very much, everyone. We are going to do a roll call to accept slide nine. Supervisor Angry? Aye. Supervisor Bailey?

[02:46:39] Aye. We don't need a motion. It's a stronghold. You're fine. We don't need a motion. You're good. Supervisor Bodie? Aye. Supervisor Franklin? supervisor gordy supervisor vega no supervisor weir chair jefferson aye motion passes seven to one madam chair just to be clear on the 3.9 yes yes so that means 3.9 will remain unfunded do we

[02:47:16] do you want to change your vote supervisor frankly it's like nine so all right hold on we're going to do that again because there's confusion real quickly supervisor angry real quick just really because i i don't think you need to do it again because there's no other um option out there so if you vote no it is then you just voting down everything so so yeah all right so we're going

[02:47:48] to do this again we are going to strike the rule i guess that's we know we are going to vote whether or not to provide additional funding the 3.9 million to prtc supervisor wait wait so madam sorry for clarity's sake we're not funding the 3.9 hole we're leaving a 3.9 million dollar hole by funding 4.7 for grantor's tax and 4.5 from transit occupancy so i think that's where the

[02:48:18] confusion is people want to plug that 3.9 million hole no no sorry supervisor bailey please put on your microphone so we can hear oh my phone it's back it's back okay madam chair i move that we fund the $3.9 million for PRTC for this budget cycle.

[02:48:45] Second. In addition to the... And this is, so this is a roll call vote, not a resolution, but I appreciate it, you know, so it gives us additional clarity. So, yes. Madam Chair.

[02:49:07] Yes, Supervisor Vega. So that we can be even clearer. So it's 9.2, Supervisor Bailey, plus the $3.9? Yes.

[02:49:23] Is everyone on the day as clear about what it is we're going to be voting on? All right, roll call. Supervisor Bailey. Supervisor Bode. Aye. Supervisor Angry. Aye. Supervisor Franklin. Aye. Supervisor Gordy.

[02:49:42] Supervisor Vega. No. Supervisor Weir. Chair Jefferson. No. That motion fails, four to four. So now, Madam Chair, just point of clarity? Yes.

[02:49:57] So since that failed, four, four, we're going to just default to what this is, which is 4.7 PRTC for grantors, 4.5 from transit occupancy tax, and leave the $3.9 million hole. Yes. Madam Chair, that still requires a straw poll because we have to allocate it.

[02:50:12] So I would move slide nine again. Yes. No, but we have to because we struck that. We did a new vote. So now we're going to go back to slide nine. All right. So on slide nine, to be clear, we're going to do a roll call vote.

[02:50:30] It will leave a hole of $3.9 million. Okay. So that means $3.9 million of the PRTC subsidy requests will remain unfunded. Is everyone clear on that? All right.

[02:50:49] - Roll call. - Supervisor Angry? - Aye. - Supervisor Bailey? Supervisor Bodie?

[02:51:04] - Aye. - Supervisor Franklin? - Aye. - Supervisor Gordie? Supervisor Vega? - No. - Supervisor Weir? - Chair Jefferson? - Aye.

[02:51:20] - Madam Chair. - Motion passes, 62. - Supervisor Franklin. - Sure, it may be too late for this, but I was gonna, like, for clarity. - That's too late. - Why y'all keep, okay. But. - Question.

[02:51:39] - So, I just wanna understand. So the first vote, we struck, we redid it. There was an option to find money to plug the 3.9 that remains unfunded. And that did not pass.

[02:51:56] So on the second vote, we voted on slide 9 to fund it, except for that $3.9 million. That was it? Do you have another alternative? Okay, I just, all right. I just want to make sure.

[02:52:12] Supervisor Bailey. So there's no other alternative. So let me just get clear now. So for those routes that were recommended in that email, we have that. Okay, that's what I need to be clear about.

[02:52:27] And so I just want to explain why I voted as I did. It's because I would like for PRTC to start thinking outside of the box about how to put more money into the kitty, about what more that they can do.

[02:52:42] I don't want to come in and rescue them. I want them to have some skin in this game. I don't agree with the proposed route cuts sent to us, and that is going to be a discussion. So that is why I voted as I did. That's what I need to hear, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. All right, now we're going to get to the real, real fun, and that is our, lack of a better word, areas of individual interest.

[02:53:06] This is when we're going to talk about some of the funding requests that we have received. So if you can go on to, I guess, I don't know if it's like the next, let me look at my 13, hold on.

[02:53:30] Let's go to 13. And actually, we do have a spreadsheet. I don't know if everyone printed that out. I have a copy. Let me get my, I'm also getting out a spreadsheet that Supervisor Bob had shared, because I know it calculates some of the things that we want on there.

[02:54:05] I'm just going to go ahead and start with slide 13. Retiree health credit increase. Now, this is something that I know that our police and fire union have pushed for.

[02:54:23] You know, there was some discussion because this is something that is outside of the collective bargaining agreement is something that we can pick up. But I actually heard from rank and file officers about this is something that, you know, they'd like to see us go higher immediately.

[02:54:41] And there was a request to go to $8.50. Now, I know that that is going to have a significant cost. I know there's concerns about doing that outside of the collective bargaining agreement and the next round will go up. You know, right now, I believe what we're at $5, $5.50. And it hasn't changed in like 20 years. So I just feel that that is something that we should tackle immediately, even if we don't go to the full $8.50 right away. I am very much in support of including this

[02:55:14] in the budget. So I am going to open it up for a discussion to see if anyone has anything they want to say on this and we can set you know or not what we think this could be and supervisor bode here first sure thank you madam chair and i appreciate how you you preface that because yes we we have heard

a very ambitious and bold ask from from folks in the associations as well as rank and file and and i do support uh um raising this but i i think that everything being

[02:55:48] fair it doesn't necessarily need to be all to 8.50 like you just said so I for my one-eighth I say let's go up a dollar this year and then revisit it in the future years knowing that as was said before there will be a reopener for collective bargaining agreements here in a couple years and there'll be other opportunities to address this in future budget cycles. Supervisor Bode said six dollars and fifty cents so going up one dollar. Is there anyone else who wants to speak

[02:56:20] on this if not we can take a roll call this on the 650 650 okay we're gonna go up a dollar supervisor angry aye supervisor Bailey aye supervisor Bodie aye supervisor Franklin are

[02:56:46] you a no supervisor Gordy aye supervisor Vega aye supervisor Weir aye chair Jefferson aye motion passes seven to one yes supervisor Franklin um so I guess we're supposed to treat these like actual votes because in that case I would have I guess I would have made your motion for the eight dollars and fifty cents if it is easier for people because I'm open I mean because this is we don't have resolutions but if it's easier procedural wise for us to do motions and second and then

[02:57:26] have discussions so I guess I'll just go on record and saying I voted no so that I could vote for the eight dollars but then we'll never get there so I do support this all right so if we can put on record the supervisor Franklin do you want to put on record that you do support it okay so she's an eye i mean i'm helping you out trying to help us out you know all right the next one we're going to go to is americans and wartime museum um someone again i know it's a struggle but you want to make a motion i motion to prove it 833 for the next three years with the

[02:58:03] understanding that there is no ongoing expense uh in the future out years of this project madam chair supervisor vega oh well you need a need does he need a second for discussion i'm not going to second it, but I do want to partake in discussion. Are there any seconds? Okay. Supervisor Fankrin. All right, so let's discuss. Supervisor Vega first and Supervisor Weir. I thought I saw a Gordy part of Bordy in there, but I don't know. All right. I do. Thank you. My question is for

[02:58:41] the county attorney. Supervisor Angry just stated with an understanding that there will be nothing else after the three years. Is there anything that legally binds us to that? Madam Chair, members of the board. As I said, this board cannot bind the future board. So you would be budgeting and appropriating the eight, you would be budgeting $833,000 this year. That would then remain for the matches that the General Assembly passed. You would have to consider next year whether you're going to do it. You could do it all in one year. You could do some this year and none the next year. I'm not

[02:59:18] sure how that would then impact what the General Assembly passed. It would probably reduce the amount that the General Assembly passed, but you are only budgeting for this year. Thank you. Supervisor Weir. Thank you, Madam Chair. I've got several issues with this. One, the late date at which it was added, and the fact that it comes as a result of a budget amendment initiated without the knowledge of the rest of the county delegation. I would also suggest that there is a very good chance that the budget is not going to get adopted anytime in the near future, if at all.

[02:59:59] That being said, I don't have a full grasp of what the language of the budget request is from the General Assembly. I don't like having what is essentially another unfunded mandate being delivered on to us because it's pretty much the same kind of thing.

[03:00:22] If we're going to do this, I would rather push it off until next year when we actually know if that budget is going to survive, what is likely to be a lengthy budget discussion potentially over the next couple of months.

[03:00:40] So rather than sticking $833,000 in right now, I would prefer to wait until next year when we have a final number from the General Assembly and perhaps provisions that we don't know about now in terms of when the match has to be provided and what time period it has.

[03:01:01] I just don't think this is ripe at this point in time. Supervisor Brody. Thank you, Madam Chair. And I appreciate you mentioning, Supervisor Ware, about the language of the actual budget amendment. All it really says is, out of the amounts of this item, $5 million, the first year from the general fund is provided to the County of Prince William to support activities undertaken by the National Museum of Americans in wartime.

[03:01:25] These funds shall be matched by $2.5 million provided by the County of Prince William. It doesn't stipulate when we have to encumber that money, just that we have to do it. Now, while I also have concerns about this project, knowing how long it sort of sat on the shelf and the inability for them to really get it off the ground, and I question if the General Assembly is giving $5 million, and we've been told by people that there's all this private investment that's going to be going into it anyway, why we have to put any skin in the game.

[03:01:57] I understand there are folks out there waiting to make sure that the county is serious about this. So while I'm not in support of doing the 833 this year in full, I have a question for staff. Would we be able to add to this some sort of performance agreement or some sort of request to know that, like we've dealt with other deals with economic development, saying that after a year or so, if it's shown that they're not living up to their side of the bargain with what they said they would do with this, that we can somehow have assurances that we can claw money back in the future?

[03:02:31] I don't know who would ask that. Thank you very much for the question, and I would say this is not an economic development project. So we would not want to suggest that we would be using the same standards that we would if economic development had vetted this project and were moving the project directly.

[03:02:54] Sure. So that being said, we saw a mechanism say, hey, if we do 500,000 this year, and then next year it's clear to us that this is not moving or to the sewer. where's point it gets somehow stripped out of the budget and we don't know what's going on there again we're not incorporating future boards that give another 500,000 or whatever else would be left on the balance so my one-eighth is I'm going to not support the 833 I say let's just do 500,000 dollars this year and look to see what they do in the future years but that's just my one-eighth all right so then what Bodie wants is 500,000 all right we're going to move on

[03:03:33] Madam Chair, so is that like a new motion, an amendment? What is it? Because Supervisor Angry made a motion that was second, so what are we calling it? So is that a substitute roll call? Okay, and then we'll move on from there.

[03:03:49] All right, Gordy go. Yeah, I feel like I've come into this either late or because I'm completely missing something. At what time did we as a county ask to be put on the hook for this money? We never did.

[03:04:06] So we can't bind future boards, but our state delegation can bind us? Is that what I'm understanding? So we're being asked to fund $2.5 million from something we didn't ask to fund.

[03:04:27] I appreciate the Americans at Wartime Museum. I appreciate what they do. I've supported different organizations who do similar work in recording the stories. I've actually helped support those organizations as well.

[03:04:45] I think right now with where we are, this is ready, fire, aim, and we need to pull back. I like what Supervisor Bodie said. I would prefer to go to 10%, to 250,000, and let's figure this thing out.

[03:05:08] For me, there's a lot of unanswered questions about this. I know it's a priority for Supervisor Angry, but I'm still sort of at a, there's a lot I don't know about this. I've been briefed on it. I do have some concerns about firing artillery in the neighborhoods around there.

[03:05:28] That's a big concern for me, and I need to understand that more because that was told to me that they were going to be firing artillery. Not with rounds, but just the cannon. But that's very loud. And so I still think there's a lot more we as a board need to get our get understanding over to make sure that this is something we're actually willing to commit ourselves to.

[03:05:55] And we get on the same page with our delegation. So I can support some level, but keep it at 10 percent and then figure out the details. And then from there, we figure out where we want to go. So I'm going to jump in before we go to the next round.

[03:06:13] This sounds like a great idea, but I had a lot of questions, and I still have a lot of questions. And I am very nervous that we don't have a budget. I'm very nervous about even committing a minimal amount. For me, I will not support this, not because I don't think this is a worthy project, but I personally, I just want to be transparent, I personally would rather wait until next year and revisit this.

[03:06:39] And so, you know, that's where I'm standing. But I'm going to go back to Supervisor Angry and Supervisor Vega. Thank you, Madam Chair. I got five minutes right, so let me start this. So Mr. Alan Kors, the largest tank owner probably in America, has over 100 operational tanks that he keeps down on Aiden Road with what's called the tank farm.

[03:07:05] Every year he opens that up for an open house. All the families, all the veterans, all the kids, everyone gets to go out there. It's a hands-on experience to touch these tanks, learn about military history. And it literally is the place where, as you heard Mr. Dennis talk about, where veterans come out, older veterans come out, and it's the first time they share experiences of some of their careers in the military that their own children are for the first time hearing.

[03:07:28] I literally witnessed this. So the point here is that Mr. Allen Coors wanted to stand up an American's in wartime experience where he sets up battles over time. Literally, we have the Marine Corps Museum, the Army Museum, right between both of those sits. This one day, hopefully, Americans in a wartime experience that literally lives out battles over time.

[03:07:49] Now, this is the last project that Mr. John Jenkins on this board that I feel obligated to see finish on my time after replacing them on this board. So I'm heavily committed to this. this was brought to me I brought this to the board when uh Mr. Pierce Homer uh who's former delegate who you know anyway he is a part of this project now literally got Richmond to commit to five million as long as it was a match by the

state 2.5 million by by the by the county by Prince William County so that's where we brought this up and we didn't have to give the whole 2.5

[03:08:24] at once we could do 833 for three years to match that match so they could get that funding the goal here is to build out that first building so that these investors can see that they are serious about getting this project done. If you've been there in the recent months, you'll see that they literally have the groundwork done and the entire project is ready there. They just now need to start building and bringing tanks over and setting things up and making it get there so they can get these experiences created. There is a full-blown staff over at the tank farm of veterans who are out of military who love their life and coming to work on these tanks and they do it for free they have

[03:09:01] literally found their place at home this simple ass right here of 833 for three years i don't think as much to ask there is nothing to master this this does and help me out michelle i'm going to use this this does uh it's the funding from a commonwealth and principles of sound financial management so we i want to i want to just understand that we are staying within the parameters of what that means now we can monitor what they want to do you guys can figure out how you want to do this but i just don't think that uh simply saying no or pushing this out to next year is really viable i don't know when they need this 5 million but i know that richmond is in shambles right now with approving their budget but this is something that we literally can do

[03:09:40] right now and i think that story explains it well of how we got here i've hand walked this through all of you to talk about this um it's a simple ask i think at this point it's the final thing This county, by the way, has given, I think to date, $1 million, and that was during the Corey Stewart, if I'm not mistaken.

[03:09:58] I think we did make a financial contribution somewhere back in 2016, 17, somewhere back there. They did do this one time. Again, I get it. This project has been sitting there stagnant for a while. But this is the final piece that gets it over the hurdle so we can get this thing up and running. I think to Mr. Allen Core's life, I would love to see a ribbon cutting happen sometime soon so he can know that he's done his part to create this opportunity for all veterans in all of America.

[03:10:24] There it is. Thanks, Madam Chair. All right. Thank you, Supervisor Vega. Then after that, we're going to, because I'm also time-checked. It's 10-13. You know, I want to keep moving, because we have a lot more to discuss with Supervisor Vega. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm the wife of a veteran.

[03:10:41] I think we all have been out there, and it is a pretty neat idea. The concept in itself, it's great. However, it's not an easy ask because these are tax dollars, public funds that we're utilizing to fund somebody's project and vision that has been long overdue.

[03:11:01] This is not a new project. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that this has been going on for about a decade now. And when it was first pitched to me before I was elected, it was going to be funded through private investors. It has all been done wrong, in my opinion, in the manner in which it's been brought to this board.

[03:11:20] I cannot in good faith say that I'm going to allocate $833,000 for something that hasn't been fully vetted. It's not part of our Department of Economic and Development. And to say that it's ready for prime time for us to go ahead and sign off any amount of money, I think it's irresponsible of us to do.

[03:11:37] I would like to see some proof, some evidence that indicates otherwise that, yes, they're going to be having a ribbon-cutting ceremony. What's the timeline? Where are they in terms of how much money they've already invested? I don't feel comfortable allocating any funds to go towards this project until all of those questions have been answered to include the concerns of the chair and some of my other colleagues on the dais.

[03:11:58] So I would be open to the idea of revisiting this, Madam Chair, next year if possible. But until we've been diligent and done our thorough, I would say, assessment of this project, I don't feel comfortable allocating any funds, any tax dollars to go towards this. Because I will say, before I close, Madam Chair, we opened this door, we're not going to be able to close it for other asks of the like.

[03:12:21] All right, so we're going to do a couple things, because we already have something. We're going to do what's already, you know, 833, and then we're going to go, I think, did you still want to do 500? I'll jump in as being the other half of 40 and do 250.

[03:12:37] Okay, so then we're going to do, what we're going to do is we're going to do what's on the table, and then we'll go to, you know, 250. All right, so if you can do the roll call. Supervisor Angry. Aye. Supervisor Franklin? Aye. Supervisor Bailey? Supervisor Bode? No. Supervisor Gordy? No. Supervisor Vega? No. Supervisor Weir? No. Chair Jefferson? No. Motion fails, 6 to 2, 2 to 6. All right, Gordy, make your move.

[03:13:09] I move that we dedicate $250,000 as a local match requirement to start and then re-evaluate. But we need to, before allocating any of those funds, we need to get a briefing on the program, its current status, and its plan for completion.

[03:13:32] Second. All right, we're going to do a roll call. Madam Chair, can I ask a question? Yes. So if, in fact, that this whole $5 million from the General Assembly required the $2.5 million match, and we're saying $20,000 to $50,000 just this year, does that meet the requirements for that match?

[03:13:51] Because if we're going to do this and it doesn't even meet that match, then why are we doing it? So can anyone answer that question? Because I, you know, I, and maybe I can turn it over to someone else, but I believe, I don't know if we need the county attorney or Mr. Shorter, but we have three years to do the match now that it has to.

[03:14:10] Am I correct? Mr. Shorter. Yes, Madam Chair, as far as we know, based on the current language, there are three years, as you stated, to make the match. If the board decided this evening that you wanted to allocate some funds this year and then in the next two budget cycles allocate additional funds, We just needed to make, if the board desired, for that to add up to $2.5 million.

[03:14:39] And that's my point of the fact that Supervisor Gordy's motion is only for $250,000 this year. Is that not saying that next year we're going to commit? In other words, if he's making that motion for $250,000 this year, is he committing to saying $250,000 to go out in the out years to get the $2.5 million?

[03:14:59] And I know Ms. Robles just said we can't commit future boards to future budget, but that's the whole purpose of this 833 per year that we're locking in and say we're going to do this, even though we've got to come back next year and just basically paper stamp that 833.

[03:15:15] But if we're only saying that one motion for $250,000 for this year, we aren't saying we're going to do this for next year. We could have the same discussion and not do it. Does that commit Richmond to

say they feel in good faith that Prince William County has obligated that they're going to match this $5 million with the $2.5 that they're saying we have to do.

[03:15:33] I cannot speak to how Richmond may take the board's action. What I can say is that the board reserves the right in next year's budget to not allocate additional funds. And my understanding is that if we do not allocate funds up to $2.5 million in three years, that this $5 million would be lost.

[03:15:56] Thank you for that, because that was clarity of where we are, so it literally leads back to 833 for the next three years, and that this 250 really doesn't matter. So if we're not going to approve this, then going out five years, 10 years won't really matter.

[03:16:15] Well, I just want to clarify, clarification to clarification. So the number on the screen is if we divided the 2.5 million evenly over three years. Now, if people want to put together a little something in there just to have a placeholder, I think that that, if I please, you know, correct me if I'm wrong, Supervisor Gordy, you know, we can also next year just say, hey, we're just going to wait until next year to see what the General Assembly does.

[03:16:40] We can do the $2.5 million one year or not. I mean, we have options. For me, I'm just saying this year, I'm not comfortable with this. I'd rather see what Richmond's going to do, and I have other questions. So, I don't know if you want to clarify anything, Supervisor Gorda, before we go on to the other.

[03:16:59] Well, I do have one question. When we say local match, I mean, is it only money from the county? Or could other funds go be raised in order to help support these funds? The language specifically calls for the county to leverage local dollars.

[03:17:16] Okay. Then, I guess, based on what I'm hearing, I think there's still, there's so much uncertainty on this that I guess I'll just withdraw my motion and we'll just have to look at what happens with what Richmond does and then we can take a crack at this again next year to figure out what the right approach to that would be. So if you're withdrawing your motion, Supervisor Franklin and Vega, do you guys still have anything you want to add or should we move on to the next

[03:17:51] session? We'll move on. Supervisor Franklin? Yeah, no, thank you, Supervisor Angry, because that was the point i was going to make in terms of i don't think we understand what what that slide says at some point we're going to be paying um two and a half million or or the five million will be gone and so we may as well make a decision now um or i guess next year in terms of do you do you want them to get the five million or not because the way to get the five million is for us to do two and a half million at some point so i'm glad you raised that i think that was missing um and Supervisor Gordy, thank you for removing that.

[03:18:27] I mean, I think it's, you know, still worth the discussion. But, you know, we need to be clear with Richmond also, like, where we are with this. I mean, some people are watching this tonight. But we just need to be very clear, and we need to make sure we understand what we're voting on.

[03:18:43] So I just wanted, before we go on with any other comments, does everyone understand that what we voted on, Is there any clarity or anyone feel that they want to redo, reconsider the vote? Because, you know, in my mind, I think it's clear that next year, this is something we can address.

[03:19:01] There's uncertainty. But I want to see if anyone else felt that this we needed to reconsider, you know? And I know we have two other people speaking. I'm just going to be honest with you. I think we've

already voted on this. We've made it clear. Unless someone has something that they want to, knew they want to say in advance, I have Supervisor and we're Supervisor Vega.

[03:19:20] Because we do want to move on to the other things we have. So, Supervisor Weir and then Supervisor Bailey. Madam Chair, I would just note that I'm about as clear as mud right now. Because when we started this discussion, there was no time frame that $2.5 million had to be made. And now suddenly it's three years.

[03:19:35] It's been three years. The question is, is it three years? And where is it written that it has to be over three years and not four or over five? And does the three years have to start this year or can it start next year or can it start five years down the road?

[03:19:51] This is the kind of information I think we need before we can make a judgment on what to allocate, and that's my problem with it. And, Supervisor, I'm sorry, County Executive Shorty. I am not Ann. But y'all look so much alike. I'm going to actually pull up the language as it reads.

[03:20:15] Yes, Supervisor Bailey. So just a question. While we're waiting for Richmond to approve the budget, once it's approved and we get the $5 million, can we bring the project back to discuss the level of support that we give to it?

[03:20:37] If that is something where, I don't know, Supervisor Bailey, that is something we can do. And I'll ask, Mr. Shorter, if you can also answer that question while we're throwing lots of stuff at you at once. We want to first know about the three-year match.

[03:20:56] When does that start, if you have any additional? And Supervisor Bailey was asking, if Richmond does come back with an actual budget, can we revisit this? Perfect. While Nikki makes her way down, the language I have now is, out of the amounts in this item, $5 million for the first year from the general fund is provided to the county of Prince William to support activities undertaken by the National Museum of Americans in wartime.

[03:21:28] These funds shall be matched by $250 million provided by the county. $250 million? Oh, $2.5 million. I'm sorry. $2.5 million. Nikki, so maybe if you can just add to the language. Sure.

[03:21:46] So Madam Chair, members of the board, Nikki Brom, Director of Communications and Engagement. There isn't a lot of definition, I would say, in the language provided by rich men. Typically, when they provide a match or funding, they like for it to be done in the biennium.

[03:22:02] It does not state that in this language, so happy to clarify that. We are still waiting to see what happens with the budget. There's still a lot of uncertainty at the state level, but happy to talk to Chairman Torian and his office just to see what the expectation is and let you know.

[03:22:20] I appreciate that, and so before we go back, I just want to be very clear what we've already done because I feel like we're also starting to talk in circles. And I do want to keep the meeting moving forward. It's almost 1030, and we have a lot more ground to cover. I'd just like my question to be answered.

[03:22:36] Yes. And my question was, Nikki, once the budget is approved for the $5 million, can we bring the project back for the remainder of the funding to support the match and all? Can we bring the project back once the General Assembly approves the budget?

[03:22:55] I think I understand. If we don't approve it tonight, can we bring that back? Oh, yes. So certainly as part of any of our board meetings, we could bring an item back by way of resolution once we

get clarity from Richmond how they're going to move.

[03:23:17] So yes, to answer your question, we can. And, Madam Chair, if I may, I know it's late, but the reason, thank you very much, County Exec. The reason why I say that is because it is such a great project, and it has been in existence for such a long time. You know, it deserves to be crafted and framed in a very solid way so that when we vote on it, it's approved, and it can move forward without any discussion.

[03:23:42] That's the reason why I say that. Yes, and I appreciate the clarity of that question. We are, I'm sorry for other people, we're going to move on. We can, after Richmond, we can have a further discussion later, see what Richmond does. because I feel at this point we're starting to go down in circles. We've already taken action on this, so we're going to move forward.

[03:24:00] We're going to move forward to the next slide, slide 14. Commonwealth's attorney, additional ask of eight FTEs. I would just, again, so that we are clear where we're at, I'd like someone to give me a motion in a second. And discussion if we have some serious, or if we disagree, or something serious about this, because I want to keep this meeting moving forward.

[03:24:25] so does anyone like to make a motion for second all right any any discussion or can we go ahead and supervisor vega thank you madam chair um the board has already seen some of the email exchange between myself and miss ashworth i don't believe that she's provided the data necessary to support her ask i will reiterate again publicly uh that we're only seeing a two percent increase based on the information that she provided to us which is on page 297 of the budget book and so I don't see

[03:25:00] the need in terms of giving her everything that she wants. I would be open to something less and I've spoken to Supervisor Weir and I know that he has a proposal that perhaps we can all consider. Supervisor Weir. Thank you Madam Chair. I don't think there's any total agreement on this so I've tried to split the baby and make everybody happy. What I would suggest is one FTE for a senior

[03:25:35] attorney, one FTE for an assistant attorney, one FTE for a paralegal, one FTE for an administrative specialist, and one FTE for a victim case manager, victim witness case manager, with the understanding that the Commonwealth's attorney will come back to us next year with some data that we can compare one Commonwealth's attorney's office to another and kind of get a sense, because at the FTEs requested, we would become the largest Commonwealth's attorney's office in terms of sheer FTE

[03:26:10] in the Commonwealth, and by a significant number. And I have a hard time trying to understand why Fairfax County, being larger than we are, and I would assume with a larger caseload, is seemingly much more efficient than we are.

[03:26:33] Both the initial budget request from the CA's office, Mr. Shorter's recommendation in his initial budget and his revised recommendation in the second round, I can't go with that.

[03:26:54] I have difficulty with that, so I would suggest these five FTE with some provision for additional information next year. All right, so wait, hold on. So basically you're saying you want a substitute motion? All right, so Supervisor Rear wants a substitute motion for instead of eight FTEs, five.

[03:27:17] Five specific positions, correct. Five specific positions. Madam Chair, just for clarity, if I could ask a question. I just want to make sure for the record that folks don't believe that this slide means that the county executive is proposing eight additional FTEs. I think the staff recommendation has remained the eight from February. Is that correct, Mr. Schultz? That is correct. Thank you very much. Happy to explain

that further. But yes, my recommendation is consistent with what was recommended on February 20th in the initial proposed budget. So what we're going to do, we're going to vote on the substitute. And if that should fail, then we'll go on to the original motion. Okay, that's fine.

[03:27:56] My apologies, Chair Jefferson. A point of clarification. Is this five FTEs in addition to the eight in the county executive's proposed budget? No, no, it's five instead of.

[03:28:11] And so what he is looking at, five instead of, one FTE, a senior attorney, one FTE assistant attorney, one FTE that's a paralegal, one FTE that's an administrative specialist, and one FTE that is a victim witness case manager.

[03:28:27] So we're going to do a roll call. Madam Chair, real quick, just again, the number of cases prosecuted in FY23 were 20,551. I think it's important to note that numbers for FY24 were not available and that she's projecting to prosecute 2,100 cases.

[03:28:46] This does not justify the ask for eight full-time employees. And so I think that I agree with what Mr. Supervisor Weir, sorry, is proposing. All right. So we're going to do a roll call on the substitute amendment. Supervisor Weir, Supervisor Angry, Supervisor Bailey, No.

[03:29:09] Supervisor Bodie, Supervisor Franklin, No. Supervisor Gordie, Yes. Supervisor Vega, Yes. Chair Jefferson, No. So then we're going to go back to the original motion, which is eight full-time employees.

[03:29:27] So if we can get a roll call on that. Supervisor Franklin, Supervisor Bailey, Aye. Supervisor Angry, Aye. Supervisor Bodie, Aye. Supervisor Gordie, Aye.

[03:29:44] Supervisor Vega, No. Supervisor Weir, Chair Jefferson. Aye. All right, so we're going to go on to, I'm sorry, I know you had to announce the results. Struggle results. Motion passes, 5-3. 5-3 or 6-2, 6-2.

[03:30:05] All right, next we're going to go to the Data Center Ordinance Update, $600,000 for Zoning, Design, Construction Standards Manual. Can I get a motion? Move to approval. A second?

[03:30:22] Second. All right, any discussion? Madam Chair. Yes. I just have a question. Just to dive into this a little bit, and there's going to be sort of a tongue-in-cheek question, but I think it's still pertinent. I know that Supervisor Weir previously put forth the idea of getting rid of the overlay.

[03:30:42] Does this link at all to the update of the ordinance? If I may, Madam Chair? Yes. No, it does not because the DCSM and the other text will still be required regardless of whether the overlay exists or not because they will still have a place in zoning.

[03:31:05] Most of this is still going to be required because we're not going to totally – I don't believe we're going to totally eliminate them as a use. So, yes, the requirement would stand. Okay. That's what I thought. This is in addition to the budget.

[03:31:21] correct? Yeah, that's what I figured, but I just wanted that to be clear as folks look at that. Thank you, Madam Chair. All right, let's do a roll call. Supervisor Bailey? Aye. Supervisor Gordy? Yes. Supervisor Angry? Yes. Supervisor Bode? Aye. Supervisor Franklin? Aye. Supervisor Vega?

[03:31:44] Yes. Supervisor Weir? Chair Jefferson? Aye. Motion passes unanimously. All right, the next thing is Parks and Recs Facilities Maintenance. Can I get a motion? Second.

[03:32:08] discussion is this new people yes um do we have um seth or uh janet available i saw janet and and seth there we go had to wake them up back hey seth thanks for coming down um so what would

[03:32:44] you characterize as being your today i had a meeting out at nokesville park we need new playground equipment um we also understand chin needs some new playground equipment and there's is more desperate because it's tied to a preschool um with this six hundred thousand dollars um how far does that take you in addressing uh and then of course uh uh supervisor bailey also has a

[03:33:14] request for about 175 000 for uh the golf course and uh prince force uh yeah thank you and and so So what is our maintenance requirement right now compared to this $600K request?

[03:33:31] Madam Chair, members of the board, Seth Hendler-Voss, honored to serve as your director of Parks and Recreation. So we currently have about a $20 million backlog of defined deferred maintenance projects in the master plan approved by the board in 2020. Our annual depreciation rate for assets from a maintenance perspective is about $14 million a year.

[03:33:52] We have only one consistent source of funding year after year, and that's $1.4 million of capital maintenance program money in our operating budget, plus the BFP, which is in a five-year plan that's always subject to change. So we're far beyond where we need to be, but we try to keep up with the most pressing needs with the funding that we have.

[03:34:12] ARPA funds have been a great help to try to infuse some capital into our efforts. To give you a sense of scale, replacing a playground could be upwards of $300,000 to $350,000. So $600,000 as proposed in this initiative would cover probably two playgrounds.

[03:34:29] Okay, you know, as we go through, thank you, Seth, I appreciate that. As we go through these land use cases, we have a lot of people who want to donate land for parks.

[03:34:47] But we don't have enough money to maintain the parks we have. And I'm afraid we're spreading the peanut butter too thin. And we really need to get after – I think we've got to become more strategically focused, make sure we're maintaining the parks that we have because these are getting aged and nothing is more disappointing, you know, to take your kids to a park and all of a sudden you get there and the swings aren't working or closed off or the slide is shut down.

[03:35:15] So, you know, I would like to double this amount to try to catch up on some maintenance issues within our parks. How much do you want to go to? All right, how much are you, 1.2?

[03:35:32] I'm going to go to 1.2. All right, so we're going to do a substitute motion, y'all, for $1.2 million. All right, for $1.2 million.

[03:35:55] I'm sorry. And then I'd ask for next year's, we need to kind of identify what these shortfalls are and then come up with a plan to get ahead of them rather than being completely reactive. So thank you.

[03:36:12] Madam Chair. I'm going to let Vega go, Supervisor Vega, and then Supervisor Bodie. So how exactly is this going to work? How are we going to prioritize which parks need what? I'd leave it up to Seth and his team to give us the most, the parks most in need.

[03:36:31] Supervisor Vega, Madam Chair, members of the board. So we have a list of priority maintenance projects by district. We try to split the money in a way to where we can cover a little bit in each district. First thing we'll look at is ARPA projects to see if we need a little bit more funding to to complete those projects in full those projects were always meant to to spend up to the amount that was appropriated and then we'll from there go through the list of other non-arbor project related deferred

maintenance deeds and work through those with you all but we'll try our best to make sure that every district sees the impact from from that funding

[03:37:06] if i know this board this is going to be a problem okay what do you mean what do you mean just putting it out there because you know every district has priorities and my park is more important and more in need than yours victor just hypothetical here right and so i just want to make sure we know exactly what we're getting ourselves into well i also know that i've looked at my the proper accounts and if i don't get the money this year i will use my proper money i'll take it out

[03:37:40] of my proper money so to take care of this because um the nokesville park is in shambles i mean it really needs a lot of work um and and so um i'm not going to fight over this i'm not going to do any leg wrestling or anything like that it's just i'm going to leave it to these guys figure out what the priorities are but we can't keep resting on small maintenance things and think we're ever going to get caught up we've got to get after this we've already invested money in these parks

[03:38:14] we own these parks and so we need to take care of them and i would rather not be taking on new land for more parks when we can't take care of the ones that we have now and let's let let let's focus our efforts on putting the money into the parks that we currently have and making sure that they're the best that there's they can be all right so right now we have 1.2 million on the and i have i'm going to go to bodie angry and bailey and i do respectfully request if you guys have questions or need some kind of clarification because 1.2 million yes it would you got to pay attention

[03:38:52] things go up real fast all right so supervisor bode yeah all i will say madam chair is that i i will just ditto everything that supervisor gordy said um especially understanding that what seth just said that if we don't start making more investments in this we're going to just see more and more deterioration of our existing assets and to me it only costs more to replace those things even farther down the road unless we get after them now so i'm going to support this thank you supervisor angry thank you madam chair it's really quick thank you supervisor gordy 1.2 mil is still not enough, we know that our parks and rec and maintenance team need more funding.

[03:39:28] I'm okay with how you allocate or figure out your maintenance schedule. I will say that I think Supervisor Gorda is right because in our distance, we know our priorities, and we have funds to kind of do those things, too. I mean, I'm not even really looking at the obstacle because we've done a lot with the parks we've got, and we've modeled them, done a lot of upgrades through a lot of, bless you, through a lot of our funding.

[03:39:50] So I think if this is a priority for you, you'll find a way to get it done. And Seth and his team has been extra good in the outskill for the priorities that I put on him, that my office put on him, and we've gotten them done. So I love it. I think you need more. I'll definitely be supporting that.

[03:40:06] Supervisor Bailey. Yeah, I'll be supporting it also because, Seth, with the ARPA funding and with the proffers that we have, wouldn't you say that most of the projects across the county, this would help tremendously? Yes, ma'am. And this would almost double the, if it's in the operating budget year after year, the reoccurring maintenance funding in our operating account.

[03:40:30] Right now it stands at our 1.4, so this would be a tremendous help, and we appreciate your support. All right, thank you so much. Let's take a vote. Supervisor Gordy? Supervisor Franklin? Aye. Supervisor Angry? Heck yeah. Supervisor Bailey?

[03:40:46] Aye. Supervisor Bode? Aye. Supervisor Vega? I'm going to abstain. Oh, sure. Okay. Can you please send that list to us of the parks, and then by the time next Tuesday, I'll know where I'm at.

[03:41:02] Supervisor Weir? No to 1.2. Madam Chair, move. Chair Jefferson? I need to vote. I'm for it. Don't distract. Madam Chair. All right, yeah, we're going to move things because it's getting late. Before we move things, I have one quick clarification.

[03:41:19] Okay. On the Commonwealth's attorney, did we approve 8 FTE or 16? 8. So it's not 1.1. It's just what's in the budget, correct? No, there's no additional. No additional funding. So we included eight positions in the original proposed budget on February 20th.

[03:41:42] What I thought was approved by way of a straw poll this evening was an additional eight FTEs. No, we're good. I'm trying to keep track of the money. Okay. So there is no need to take a straw poll on what has already been presented.

[03:42:03] So we're just reaffirming what was already done, not the 16th. Yeah, so it's 8, 8. We're at 8. Correct. All right, awesome. Did the team understand? Okay. All right, so we are going to move this forward again. Litter control crew.

[03:42:20] Second. So I just want to, okay, so make sure I understand. So everything that's up here is budget recap. We don't, do we need to take a strong poll?

[03:42:37] Because now we're all, yes. Okay, okay. So we're going to move through these quickly, y'all, because it's getting late litter mitigation there we go margaret let's let's we're going to move through these ones i'm asking you again folks if you're going to vote for something just go ahead and vote for it you know rather than let's use the discussion for clarification points questions all right litter control crew can i get a motion second i had weir and bailey on that one all

[03:43:10] right so i think we're good vote uh supervisor weir supervisor bailey supervisor angry supervisor bodie aye supervisor franklin supervisor gordy supervisor vega chair jefferson aye vote unanimous so i feel like this is going to be lightning um auctioneer round so i just want to be very clear on the next one the community sponsored community special events this is not stuff that the super i'm going to put in a new line for supervisors but this is for things that the county's already doing such as the napsco boardwalk um and other special events that the county is already holding

[03:43:48] and there this is just a line item for those events this is not stuff that the board members want to do or that we want to support so are we all clear on that so then let's get a motion in a second second all right discussion let's vote supervisor franklin supervisor bailey supervisor angry supervisor bode aye supervisor gordy supervisor vega supervisor weir chair jefferson

[03:44:20] Aye. So the next thing, sorry. So the next one is, this is actually a line item. This is not on here. This is something different. This is for board members, $32,000 per supervisor. It's a new line item for our BOS-sponsored community events. That would be $256,000. So $32,000 per supervisor. Yeah, because the one up there, the one on the spreadsheet that you have, that's for

[03:44:51] us all right you know you love it so movement I'm sure all right second all right so there's confusion so what we voted on is something and Mr. Short if you can help me out that is for things that the county is doing that's like the Neabsco board like lights correct what is intended with this item is two

county sponsored special events that is the holiday boardwalk that is the holiday lights at the boardwalk and the Fridays at 5 event that Parks and Recreation sponsors in the spring

[03:45:28] and summer. And so now this next one is if somebody wants to do a walk. I know that, you know, we have a supervisor. It is for other events, perhaps like, are you getting, she's getting nervous. Yes. All right. Okay. All right. So the past one was unanimous now. Now this one will not be unanimous from what i'm hearing that's okay and madam chair yes supervisor franklin um quick question so for

[03:46:05] uh the item that we're going to vote on now is that additional money in our budgets or additional money in the general fund that and how should what is the best way mr shorter of handle is should this be in the bos administration fund or should this be if if we are voting if i understand what we're voting on we're voting to add 32 additional thousand for special events that are specific to the magisterial district yes each office has up to 32 000 i would say that it should probably go

[03:46:39] in the board office budgets and be managed by the supervisor thank you and the money can only be used for special events this is what it is tagged for and i can withdraw this because we are going to get into our own budgets that's separate so i will i will remove this one i would like to rescind this one because we're going to talk about our own budgets later so i think to keep that easy we'll move this along then um the next one on the list is sustainability environmental analysis

[03:47:13] analyst so moved second discussion all right madam chair real quick so when this was created we were told that it was going to cost x amount of dollars in order for it to function properly this is now an additional expense to this office yes yes i believe this is a another full-time i correct mr shorter yeah this is another person for the can i get um a total now of where we're

[03:47:44] at then with the um office of sustainability do we have that we could we could pull it up i'm sorry supervisor vega did you mean positions i just want to know budget budget wise like how much now where

[03:48:05] are we at and i assume it doesn't include the 145 ask right now it does not with this addition the Environmental and Energy Sustainability Program in the Office of Executive Management would increase from $401,000 plus $145,000, $546,000.

[03:48:41] Thank you. All right, let's do a roll call. Supervisor Bode? Aye. Supervisor Bailey? Aye. Supervisor Angry? Aye.

[03:48:56] Supervisor Franklin? Aye. Supervisor Gordy? Supervisor Vega? No. Supervisor Weir? Chair Jefferson? Aye. Motion passes. So the next one is public defender interpreter services.

[03:49:14] So moved. Discussion. Madam Chair. I'm very familiar with the courts. We have interpreters at the courts. I'm just curious. Is this going to be an interpreter exclusively working out of the office of the public defender?

[03:49:34] I believe so, yes. It will be specifically for her office. When I had met with her, she expressed a need. This is the only thing she had a request for. And it was because she felt they have a large caseload of people who are Spanish-speaking, and it would make sense for her office to have someone, when they're having confidential client discussions or when they're meeting, that they have a dedicated person to helping them with interpretation.

[03:50:05] - I don't really see the need. I mean, it's not gonna be a hill that I'm gonna die on. I just don't understand why we have to treat this office any different when there are interpreters available for their use if they just-- - I got the feeling there are not enough, And I respect your, you know, your view, but it was conveyed to me that they're not enough.

[03:50:22] There were not enough interpreters. Yes. They wanted someone dedicated. So when they're, you know, they're meeting with clients, they're having confidential discussions. And so that this would help facilitate that. So if there's nothing else, then let's go ahead and do a roll call.

[03:50:38] Supervisor Bailey. Aye. Supervisor Bode. Aye. Supervisor Angry. Supervisor Franklin. Aye. Supervisor Gordy. Supervisor Vega. Aye. Supervisor Weir. Chair Jefferson.

[03:50:55] Aye. Motion passes unanimously. All right, next one, Child Protective Services discussion. So, I'm sorry, I have a question on this one. All right. I don't mean to be nitpicky about $28,000, but if we're giving the schools additional monies with raising the C&P tax, why do we then need to give them $28,000 extra for this position?

[03:51:21] That's a good question. We haven't gotten there. We're giving them additional money. Madam Chair, I believe that's the way it's set up with the state, that we have to pay that portion of it. If I'm not mistaken. The question asks Supervisor Vega, if we're going to give schools additional money, why are we going to specifically call it this position?

[03:51:41] Supervisor, we're saying it's a state issue. A state. Okay, here we go. Run, Courtney, run. Mike. Hey.

[03:51:57] Good evening. Courtney Tierney, Director of Social Services. The position is a DSS employee. So this is the portion from our budget. The schools portion comes to us, and the state portion comes to us. They must be a DSS employee in order to do investigations and to have access to the state system.

[03:52:21] Thank you for that clarity. All right, let's vote. Supervisor Weir is out. Supervisor Bailey? Aye. Supervisor Angry? Aye. Supervisor Bode? Aye. Supervisor Franklin? Aye. Supervisor Gordy? Aye. Supervisor Vega?

[03:52:38] Aye. Chair Jefferson? Aye. motion passes unanimously all right so for the maritime community master plan we don't have a dollar amount set to this i know someone has suggested maybe half a million dollars i know mr shorter um had mentioned too that you know finding someone to assign to this i don't know was this something supervisor bode that you yeah thank you madam chair i because i believe that we're spending half a million on the agribusiness agritourism master plan study right so i'm sorry

[03:53:12] Yeah, so that being said, does staff feel like $500,000 is appropriate or feasible for this? It is very difficult to say. Obviously, we will do our best with whatever the board decides.

[03:53:30] I will say that there are some capacity challenges. When this was originally proposed during the last budget presentation, we have heard that we would need to work internally to find out who would be able to deliver on this master plan, economic development has expressed some challenges with capacity.

[03:53:50] So in terms of funding, this would be a guess, and I would say if $500,000 for whatever reason was not enough, we would come back to the board for additional support. So then I would say let's start at a lower number, $250,000, and then if there's, because in my mind, if we're getting a consultant to do this,

I'm confused on how they're be capacity issues but understanding that there might still be some liaisoning issues and what have you i would say let's start at a lower number and if we do need more funding to get done later

[03:54:26] we can always revisit that all right uh i'm hearing 125 000 would be sufficient and not necessarily 200 125 just as a point of clarification the county executive is absolutely correct the agribusiness agritourism strategic plan is 125 000 that is being funded by transient occupancy tax revenue is the board's intent to also fund this from transient occupancy tax revenue

[03:54:58] that would mean no local tax support necessary yes is there any tot left yes okay all right and so then do we need a so then let's do 125 000 no yeah sorry i'm just yeah 125 000 supervisor franklin sure yeah um just wanted to highlight that i would like to be part of these discussions as I got a call from a marina owner who was very confused by this and wanted to make sure that the Woodbridge District, which has a large portion of the Potomac, was part of these discussions.

[03:55:38] So to staff, let's make sure that my office and myself are part of whatever discussion is moving forward. Thank you. All right, Supervisor, did you have anything else because you're still in there? You're good? All right. Madam Chair, I just want to add, I like this idea.

[03:55:53] As someone who uses the Potomac River, it is a tremendous asset that's very difficult for anyone in this county to utilize. We have one access point, and that's Lee Sylvania State Park, which gets shut down on most weekends because it gets too crowded and you can't get to the river.

[03:56:14] The one restaurant that we had on the river that you could take your boat to is now shut down and not going to be reopened. it is the river is a tremendous asset that could be leveraged for economic development and i believe no pun intended we're missing the boat so thank you all right thank you so let's take a roll call supervisor bodey aye supervisor angry aye supervisor bailey aye supervisor franklin aye supervisor gordy aye supervisor vega yes supervisor weir chair jefferson aye vote unanimous madam

[03:56:52] chair? Yes. With respect to the next one, I had initially thought that perhaps sticking two million dollars in this as seed money would be appropriate. But now that I think about it some more, I think we are so far away from having a viable officer program set up that I would only seed it with a million this year and then revisit it next year. That way you've got money in place if we do get it started, but I'm just thinking time-wise, I think there's going to be a significant lead time

[03:57:28] before we'll be in a position to actually engage in a PDR program. So I would stick it at a million right now. That would be my motion. All right. Madam Chair. Yes. I would just want to ask because, one, I remember we had a discussion about TDRs, too, the transfer of development rights, And the way I understand that is I'm going to use the Neap School District as a prime example.

[03:57:56] The few green spaces I have left are literally being turned into residential because it's by right use. Well, one of the things I was looking at is that these shopping centers we have, why couldn't we transfer that development and keep the green space and move that into these shopping centers and get those redeveloped residential?

[03:58:14] I don't know how that program works, but I know that program, at one point we were discussing PDRs and TDRs, So I'm just curious, while PDRs are up there, I think TDRs are more associated in opportunity for districts such as Woodbridge, Potomac, Neasco, even Occoquan, and so I don't know how that works or if that should be back up there, but I want to put that out there because I'm literally

trying to find a way to save the few green spaces that we have left and try to transfer that into shopping centers so we can move that development into those.

[03:58:51] Supervisor Angry, would you prefer to speak about this offline? We can get together and I can write. It works a little different than that. It's real complicated, but, well, it's not that complicated. But why don't we just get together with perhaps Ms. Roble and bang it out, so to speak.

[03:59:10] It works a little differently than that, but I think we can get to where you want to go. All right, if there's no one else, let's do a roll call. $1 million. Supervisor Weir, Supervisor Gordy, Supervisor Angry. Aye. Supervisor Bailey. Aye.

[03:59:26] Supervisor Bodie. Aye. Supervisor Franklin. Aye. Supervisor Vega. Yes. Chair Jefferson. Aye. Vote unanimous. So now, and thank you, Sheriff Hill. He's been sitting here. We're going to get to the Sheriff's Office. And I don't know if there's anything in the budget recap that we can, if there's anything we can pull.

[03:59:49] Yeah, the compensation study is already funded. I'm just looking. If it's not in here, that's fine.

[04:00:05] Because, you know, I know one of the. Madam Chair. With respect to the compensation study already being funded, I would suggest that be funded not out of this year's general fund, but out of any surplus at the end of the fiscal year.

[04:00:21] I don't know if there's any problems, Mr. Short, if there's any objection. We typically wouldn't ask the board to commit to surplus dollars as they do not exist yet. Now, I will say, and I know I said this when we were presenting the budget recap slides, that there is some fund balance associated with ADC that could certainly be used for a compensation study if the board does not want to take it out of general funds.

[04:00:56] All right, I have Supervisor Franklin in queue. Sure, yeah. I mean, I was just going to make the point that the county exec just made about, obviously we don't know what the surplus will be for, I guess, FY25, but could be open if it is a recommendation to take it out of the ADC fund balance.

[04:01:19] But I think generally, I think it's fine for it to come from our budget. Anyone else? I'm fine with it coming from our budget, honestly, because we don't know. We will have a surplus. We just don't know to what extent, how much.

[04:01:37] I hear that deep sigh over there. You're going to live with it? All right. Not a hell you're going to die. And so that's not something. So, yeah. I'm sorry. That was something that you had already put in the recap.

[04:01:54] Yeah. So we're fine on that then, right? we don't need to do any action all right so then what we're going to do here with respect to the sheriff's office he did have two asks that i'm willing to move yes one is 25 000 for the pay parity for the communications office only and the other would be a hundred thousand dollars for the on-call pay second who's going to second that all right any discussion or can we do a roll call right supervisor weir supervisor vega supervisor angry supervisor bailey supervisor bodey i Supervisor Franklin.

[04:02:29] Aye. Supervisor Gordy. Aye. Chair Jefferson. Aye. Vote unanimous. All right, so we're going to move on to Affordable Housing Trust Fund. That's a big one. Madam Chair, sorry, I have a question before we go there. I'm going to ask staff how much capacity we have left.

[04:02:48] I know. $10.5 million on our side. All right, so one of the things before we keep going down the list, I know we need to get to Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Well, actually, let's get to that one next. And we have to be mindful because we do want to make sure that we're putting money for our school.

[04:03:07] So Affordable Housing Trust Fund, we have, I know, Mr. Shorter. Yes. Five, six.

[04:03:23] Okay. So I am clear that $2.5 million represents, because I know you had talked about putting in $5 million. So in addition to the $5 million, that would be an extra $2.5 million, correct?

[04:03:40] Okay. So Madam Chair, members of the board, We included as part of the surplus from 24, 5 million, and the board decided in December to approve. What we are contemplating here is 2.5 million for this budget, a commitment pending the board's approval for next year, and then a commitment for the following years at the $5 million rate for FY27 through 29.

[04:04:10] And I know, I believe that there was interest from some supervisors in going even higher than the 2.5? if I'm not mistaken sure thank you um um madam chair um so to be clear just so everyone understands numbers there's five million plus the additional two and a half to get to seven um I know that the ask has been for an additional amount to get to 10 for this year my recommendation was to for 25 26 to add an additional three million uh to those amounts and then obviously when we get into the out years we already have being funded at five million to get to the total of 25 million obviously

[04:04:48] that would be increased if we did three million for 25 and 26 so you want to go to um so 5.5 million yes just three million so oh just three million no okay just three yeah 5.5 right hold on hold on because i have people talking in my all right um supervisor gordy yeah so um you You know, last week when we met, I requested what's in the current affordable, in the Housing Preservation Trust Fund that was dedicated by developers as proffers for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

[04:05:27] And it's running about a half a million dollars, as I understand it. If we applied that amount, which we already have, that would get us to $3 million right there. And so, you know, the money's there. We just, and I appreciate Ms. Robles' email earlier on that, but like I said, we have the $500,000 there already to get us to the $3 million.

[04:05:54] Sure, and Madam Chair, for clarification, so the half a million, I know we had discussions, and I'm going to ask county staff to just jump in, about if that could be used towards some type of housing assistance program, but can we in fact put it towards, have we already put it towards the affordable housing trust fund madam chair members of the board with regards to the affordable housing trust fund you need to adopt your ordinance first and then you will work on your trust fund with all the policies in place with

[04:06:29] legal authority to do such on how much money you're giving to whom and how etc so this would just be money set aside for that fund when the ordinance is in place and when all the policies are in place. So the decisions of how the money is going to be spent has yet to be made depending upon the legal authority. Sure. And Madam Chair, just one last comment. And the reason why I even bring that up is because the way in which we're currently discussing, and I know staff has met

[04:07:00] with everyone for the trust fund is towards more so towards incentivizing the development of affordable housing as opposed to a housing assistance program which would go towards immediate addressing immediate housing needs and so I want to be careful with the half a million in the in the in the proffer fund because that may be what we can use towards the housing assistance program that I've issued

a directive on, whereas this amount of money can go towards the incentivization program towards the trust fund.

[04:07:39] So I guess I want to be careful to commit the half a million because that may be able to go towards solving and addressing immediate housing needs, which we haven't talked about that enough with regards to this affordable housing discussion.

[04:07:56] I just I want to be clear okay so so you're talking about three million dollars to the affordable housing trust fund correct okay okay per year yeah per year okay so then six million for those two years all right so supervisor weird and supervisor angry so we're talking a total of three for this year or a total of six for this year three three so all we're doing is

[04:08:35] adding, huh, $500,000. No, we're adding, we're adding two. I said three. Okay, okay. Wait, wait, wait. That's what I thought. That's what I thought.

[04:08:51] Madam Chair. So, wait. Yeah. Madam Chair. Okay, yes. Much like the PDR program, this is in its infancy. In fact, it's not even, it's not even born yet.

[04:09:07] Because we have to adopt the ordinance. We then have to set up the trust. We have to set up the rules and everything else for the trust. I'm willing to split the baby, and I would move a substitute motion of $2 million additional this year, plus moving the $500K from the proffers to supplement it for a total of $5 million in FY25.

[04:09:28] Because the whole point I was making about the half a million in the proffers is that, ideally, I would like for that to go towards housing assistance. I don't believe we can use proffer funds for that purpose. County attorneys are shaking her head. Madam Chair, members of the board, I don't think you'll be able to use the proffer funds for that intent.

[04:09:47] We can work with county staff on other ways to possibly get that, but I don't think the profit funds would be utilized for that. So I'll second that from Supervisor Warehouse. Wait, hold on, because we are in confusion land. Wait, hold on, Supervisor Franklin.

[04:10:05] Yeah, so when I issued the, so I talked about this earlier, the $3 million for FY25 and 26, you know, appreciate the compromise, but, I mean, voices come out and ask for a lot more than that, So I'm trying to get as close as possible to addressing, you know, what our constituents have called and asked us to do.

[04:10:25] I would just argue that until we have the ordinance in place that we haven't even had a public hearing on yet and then set up the fund and then set up the rules for the fund, it's going to be a rather significant amount of time prior to any monies being expended or even considered.

[04:10:46] Let's go to, I'm sorry, because Supervisor Angry, let's go to Supervisor Angry, but again, wait, hold on, to be clear, to be clear, you want to, for FY25, are you saying you want $3 million or you want $5.5 million?

[04:11:04] $3 million for a total of $5.5 million. $5.5, I just want to make sure, okay, all right, Supervisor Angry. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for that, because I was confused on that, and I thought it was $5.5 million. But Supervisor Franklin, to your point of the immediate housing needs that could be out there, you know, we were talking about, I think you said we got 10 million left.

[04:11:28] Could we allocate something to that portion right here, right now, make a new line item of whatever that need is? No? Okay, so then I don't see that. So I'm, you know, yeah, you did, okay. So before we go to go, I just want to say this, because if we do the 5.5 million here, I just want people to know that that's going to cut significantly on how much left we have to work with.

[04:11:52] And we have to think about schools. So, you know, I'm sorry. Don't we have, we have to think about schools if we want to give it. So, I mean, we're down to last count. How much are we down to before this? We're down to what, 10.5 million?

[04:12:10] On our side, this is based on the current revenue sharing agreement with the schools. Yes, 10.5 million on the county government balance. On the county side. Yes. That's a discussion we need to have. All right, so then, Supervisor Gorda, did you want to speak or yes?

[04:12:26] Most of everything was already taken care of, but I did just want to add, I met with voice today, and I think the total ask for this year was $5 million, not an additional $5 million. Their total request was $5 million for this year, $5 million for next year.

[04:12:45] I think they were asking, I thought voice was asking for a total of $10 million, you know, for this year. that yeah they they want to okay so all right this is that's what i that's what i thought all right so so all right hold on okay supervisor bailey and then i'm going to get clarification and we're going to vote okay so it was i my understanding was five and supervisor franklin

[04:13:23] i i support your recommendation uh for the three because we are we've got to get on with this affordable housing trust contribution it's it's it's critical we're we are behind with our housing and so we need to i would support us not pushing it back but to move forward and that we've made an effort uh to do so initially when we talked about increasing the cmp tax so i think it's very important that we've heard from the community that we support it that's just my two cents

[04:13:55] so so wait a five point i mean what supervisor franklin was saying so 5.5 for fiscal year 25 yes um and five yeah so 5.5 for fiscal year 2025 i think the easiest way to do that we have you know is there anyone else who you know i don't know if they're anyone wants to go with a lower amount because we can just do a quick roll call on 5.5 million. Madam Chair, I would support the

[04:14:32] 2 million and then with the additional 500 from the housing trust fund as being transferred a total of five for FY25. So it would take it to an even 5 million. We can't do anything really without the ordinance. Just a point of clarity, please. County attorney, I just needed, if you don't mind just clarity please did you just not say we can't move the 500 until we have established ordinance did i misunderstand that madam chair members of the board i apologize if

[04:15:11] i wasn't clear with the 500 000 that is in the proper fund my statement was that could not be used for the immediate assistance for housing that supervisor franklin was looking for that money could be transferred over into the account that you are going to be putting on hold once you get an ordinance in place and then get some policies in place for the trust fund.

[04:15:34] Okay, that's what I'm saying. Thank you, ma'am. Thank you. So my motion, I think we're at $7.5 million for, I believe Chris is talking, but my motion is for an additional $3 million for $25, and then another $3 million for $26, so that it could be up to whatever will get it to equal the, I guess $2.5 will be the $5.

[04:16:07] Well, no. Now, Supervisor Frank, I think the easiest thing, let's just look at fiscal year 2025. You want to do a total of $5.5 million.

[04:16:24] So in addition to the $2.5 million that is up there, you want to put it on an additional $3 million, which would bring it to $5.5 million. Am I correct? Any other clarification? Because let's vote on this. Can I have Tom repeat his, because he offered something.

[04:16:42] Sorry, Supervisor Gordy. So right now we have $2.5 million. What I'm suggesting is that we budget an additional $2 million for $4.5 million and then transfer a half million from the Housing Trust Fund, Housing Preservation Fund that was the proffers, and that takes it to a total of $5 million for FY25.

[04:17:10] But the budget is only $4.5 million. The budget impact is only $4.5 million, but it gets the fund to $5 million. so that's slightly that's half a million short than what supervisor franklin is looking are you comfortable with that supervisor franklin i mean i would like for what i so then we'll do the vote on the original what supervisor franklin had said and then we can vote on supervisor gordy if that

[04:17:44] fails can i just be clear on what i have i have that we are adding an additional three million to fy25 for a total of 5.5 million yes in fy25 thank you okay are we good supervisor franklin aye supervisor angry aye supervisor bailey supervisor bode aye supervisor gordy no supervisor vega supervisor weir chair jefferson aye motion passes five to three all right we are spending

[04:18:21] lots of money um you know how much do we have left 7.5 based on the revenue sharing agreement madam chair are we basing this argument are we basing this discussion on a straight revenue sharing agreement, or are we going to give them what's left? It sounds like, okay, so again, clarification. The money, when we raise, the school's already taken care of. When we raise the C&P tax rate, it is, is it subject to how to, with the revenue sharing, is it refunding what

[04:18:59] they requested, or does anything that we're bringing in subject to the revenue sharing agreement? For example, the additional revenue generated by the C&P rate going to $3.70, That is general revenue, subject to the current revenue sharing agreement.

[04:19:15] The school share in that increase of about, well, from the net with the combination of the reduced real estate tax rate down to 92 cents. The school shares, by my calculations, they would gain $19.2 million.

[04:19:34] So, again, everything that we've done, you know, with raising the, again, we lowered the residential property tax rate. We raised the C&P tax. that's automatically subject to revenue sharing agreement? Yes, ma'am. Both of those are general revenue sources.

[04:19:51] Okay. All right. Madam Chair, can we have the county attorney opine on the relevance of the revenue sharing agreement and whether it applies? Madam Chair, members of the board, this board has dictated a policy that is guidance to county staff, and it has shared that policy through a resolution which has said to the schools and to the public that the revenue sharing agreement will be...

[04:20:18] x which is what is before the board the board has provided additional money for it the board in its discretion can change that if you would like and if you're going to change that i would recommend you do so by resolution all right um i don't know how much of an appetite but i mean we can explore that since we're on this discussion you know how much of this Do we want, you know, are we going to do a resolution?

[04:20:53] Madam Chair? Yes. If I might address this briefly. Bless you. Last year, we got a less than complete budget presentation from the school board. They repeated that this year.

[04:21:11] They did not give us the nine mandatory buckets. And then they come to us after their budget presentation with markups that they should have had the night before. They present us for the budget with no detail. is I understand that they are fully funded, and we have met our requirement to them.

[04:21:30] And I don't believe there is any legal requirement that we give them any particular share out of this new revenue that we have created. I am more than willing to give them a significant amount of it, but I think we've got a lot of things that we need to get done that we have particular numbers for.

[04:21:51] And unless the school board had some other project, which they have not presented to us, I'm not willing to just give them $19 million willy-nilly for them to spend how they please. I would suggest if we're going to do that, that it be put into one of the buckets with some sort of string, for instance, targeting it towards CIP projects.

[04:22:16] But giving them a $19 million windfall to spend however they so desire with no budget exercise as we are going through right now does not seem responsible to me. Supervisor Bailey.

[04:22:33] Thank you, Madam Chair. Three things for me. 57% is 57%. That's the process and the policy that we live by right now. And so if we want to change that, I think with all due respect to our colleagues and our peers, the school board, with the superintendent, we probably need to have, as we always do, a meeting with them to discuss that.

[04:22:59] I'm not comfortable with changing the rules right now as we are in budget season. I understand my colleagues' concern. I think everyone needs to be accountable to how we spend money. So I would like to, at a future date, once we get past budget season, have that meeting with our colleagues to assure that we understand what they're spending money on and for full transparency to us and to the community.

[04:23:28] They are professionals like us, and they deserve the respect to know if we're unhappy, But we don't need to change the rules in the middle of our budget season. All right.

[04:23:44] Madam Chair. Supervisor Veyo. A quick question for Dave. What is the percentage the schools would get from the total if we took away the extra 19 million? I think we would need time to calculate that.

[04:24:01] Okay. Could we, I guess, have that, I guess, as soon as possible? We would need five minutes to try to wrap our brains around that.

[04:24:17] I will, listen, things are getting late. I will give you guys, if you guys can calculate that in five minutes, is there anyone else who can speak or who wants to speak or say anything? Otherwise, we can take a quick break. Supervisor Bode. Thank you, Madam Chair. I did want to remind folks that we did have an ask from folks near the beginning of the budget cycle about dedicated funding for trails.

[04:24:43] And to my knowledge, unless I missed it, I don't think we've discussed that yet. We have a lot of other stuff that we have got to discuss. I mean, so this is the other thing. We're coming close. It's 1130. You know, we are getting close to midnight. And I know we did have that. And I was going to discreetly send a text to Mr. Shorter.

[04:25:00] But we, you know, have that. We had voted on ending at midnight unless we decide to waive the rules. Is that something immediate? Are we going to need to vote to? Madam Chair, members of the board,

I believe your rules of procedure that you voted on was that you would finish the item that you're working on.

[04:25:16] Yes. And you're on the item that you're working on. So it's not, the rule of procedure was not a hard, fast, stop whatever you're doing at midnight. It was at midnight you will finish what you're working on or unless the board then wants to vote to continue on for other items after that.

[04:25:37] Gotcha. So the item that you're on under your current new rules, you would continue on past midnight. All right. So I just want to make that clear so that everyone realizes where we're at and also kill a little time so that they can do some calculations. Madam Chair, while we're still on topic, if I may, just to be clear, we're fully funding the schools.

[04:25:59] So it's not like we're taking anything away from them. It's not like they're counting on that money. They would like it, it would be nice, but we're not taking anything away. They're being fully funded. So I just want to make sure we're clear on that. Yes, yes. Thank you. All right, yes. So that's an important point of clarification for us in our calculation here tonight.

[04:26:19] We're fully funding the schools based on what they presented to the board on April 2nd, because at budget recap, the schools would have received an additional $4.6 million over what they presented to the board, and tonight would be an additional $19 million for a combination of $23.7 million.

[04:26:45] So just as a point of clarification, you're asking if the schools did not get $23.7 million, the combination from recap and this evening, what would the new split be?

[04:27:06] But I also want to throw out there that they're also getting $801 million from the state and $46 million in federal funding on top of this. Right, but then again, we're fully funding, so I just want to make sure that we're clear they're being fully funded.

[04:27:27] So then I just want to make this point. The schools will be getting, because they're already in budget recovery, they already have $4.6 million again, $19 million. So they're going to be getting, you know, let's just say, you know, $23.6.7 million.

[04:27:48] Supervisor Bailey, how do you, no, because you had brought up the revenue sharing. You know, are you comfortable with them giving this amount? Are you comfortable with giving them, I mean, you want to stick with the revenue sharing agreement? that's what you're saying 100 absolutely madam chair why would we change that tonight no i'm asking because we have a lot and that's fair because this is a discussion that we need to have because like i said education funding is is critical but i also want to be clear because we still have a lot of asks a lot of things that we're not going to be able to fund um we have

[04:28:23] right now hold on we have right now roughly 7.5 million dollars we have other stuff that i know people wanted to cut that we're not going to be able to do so i just want everyone to board and think about i you know i'm not saying with them you know think about that and i want to make sure that everyone before we before everyone in the board is comfortable with maintaining the revenue sharing agreement for the additional monies um hold on i'm not gonna i just want to go around quickly ask people where they stand rather than having you know everyone jump into a queue just

[04:28:59] so we know how we're moving forward so you want to stick with it yeah supervisor weir madam chair respectfully nobody on this board voted for the revenue sharing policy we have not readopted it as far as i'm concerned it does not exist otherwise we would be bound by the financial policies

of a previous board which i didn't think could be done if we haven't readopted it it doesn't exist all right we're gonna okay so you are a no all right yes madam chair i'm a no

[04:29:32] voting yeah i try i'm going to try to not to talk too long about this because yes or no we're not we're not going to we're going to quickly yes to stick with the revenue share or yes is that what yes yes yes sure yes all right angry give me the question i mean what do we are you for the money that we are additional money we're bringing in do you want to stick with revenue sharing the 23.7 that he just mentioned so what if so what we're going to do because we raised it um to with the C&P tax, it would generate an additional, again, $19 million to the schools.

[04:30:09] No, wait, hold on. It will generate another $19 million to the schools. Already in the budget recap, there's $4.6 million. So it would be a total of $23.6 million. So I just want to check, again, just doing a quick pulse check. You're okay with the revenue share. But when you ask them, am I okay, are you saying, am I okay with giving them?

[04:30:28] An additional $19 million. Yes, because it's a part of the revenue share. Okay, okay, okay. I just need a yes. Vega. No. Franklin. Gordy. No. All right. You know what? I do want to give them the money, but I would like to, if we are able.

[04:30:44] Are we able, Madam Attorney, to put stipulations? Because I would like to see it go to CIP. That's still, no. Madam Chair, members of the board, you are legally required to fund the standards of quality, and you provide that money to the schools either in lump sum or by category.

[04:31:06] Once it is provided to the schools, you cannot take it back. You cannot dictate how it is used unless you budget it and appropriate to them by category. So once it's given to them, you cannot put strings on it unless you do it through the categories. We cannot do categories.

[04:31:21] Okay. Madam Chair, can I just offer this also for consideration? We don't have to give them the full amount. We can give them a different amount of the extra portion, which gives us more flexibility to then fund other things. Again, they're being fully funded.

[04:31:37] This is extra funding that can be utilized to fund our needs while still giving them something. So what would you, hold on, hold on, because I do need to go. I have a weirder than Bodie. But what would you recommend possibly giving them?

[04:31:55] Or do you have recommendations? I mean, we got to look at the needs that we have right now and I think prioritize, right, what still is outstanding and needs to be funded, and then say, okay, we funded this, then they can have that. So this is extra. This is something they're not expecting.

[04:32:12] They're going to love us regardless. Madam County Attorney, if I understand correctly, in order to fund the standards of quality, if we fund to the nine required budget categories that they are required under statute to report to us, which we've never done before, but we should do, is fill those buckets that they gave us during the meeting, not before, then anything above and beyond that we could restrict if we budgeted it in nine categories?

[04:32:52] If you budget it in the nine categories, if they overspend in one or want to overspend in one category, they have to come back to the board and ask you to change it. It's not if you budget what they ask for for the nine categories and then give them extra to put strings on it.

[04:33:11] No, you would be budgeting either total or into the nine categories, whatever amount of money you're putting in there. My understanding was we could not enforce the nine categories. That was up to them to come up in the following year. You either fund total or into the nine categories.

[04:33:32] But if we do the nine categories, then we could restrict any additional funding, correct? You restrict the funding into those nine categories. No, I mean, if we wanted to give them, say, a grant or give them additional monies for a particular project, we could put that type of string on it. The board has gotten creative with policy, the class size, reduction size grant, which is a donation to them.

[04:33:57] And once you give it to them, they do what they want. If they want to come back in the future, they would comply with what you were asking for. But it was not a legally enforceable grant. Close enough. Supervisor Bailey.

[04:34:14] Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't want to prolong this because it is getting late. But I think what we need is obvious there's people, my colleagues on the board, that are not happy with the revenue share agreement and how we distribute it. But I think we should have a future discussion.

[04:34:34] Yes, that is a future discussion. As it relates to that. But tonight we've got to finish the budget. And so I don't think this is the time where we do that. Well, here's – no, so hold on. We're not going to get into an argument.

[04:34:50] So what I'm going to say is this. We can have a discussion on the revenue sharing agreement at a different time. But right now we have to determine how much the schools are going to get. And it sounds like, you know, a lot of people are, you know, the majority is comfortable with giving them the 19 million.

[04:35:14] I personally, you know, would have liked to put it in a particular category or given it in a certain wood strings, which it sounds like that will be quite cumbersome to do. One of the big things I feel, and again, I'm not the superintendent, you know, I'm not making their spending decisions necessarily.

[04:35:36] I would love to see them get more money for their CIP process because we have a lot of older schools that need repair and rehabilitation. That's what I'd like to see the money used for. But if we're giving it to the schools, it sounds like this is their money to use. um for how they see fit and i know that there are a number of needs but i also do want to caution people that we have a lot of things we haven't gotten through we're going to have to make some cuts to the same things and people may not get everything that they want and we have to be comfortable with that we have to be comfortable for those of us who want the schools to get the 19 million

[04:36:14] you know our budget is a statement of our priorities so i just want to be clear i'm sure you can have my 175 for my forest green you can keep that because i want my babies to be educated and i i so all right hold on hold on supervisor vega i know i did you have something did you want to i don't know how many times i can i have to repeat it we're fully funding the schools right tonight is the night where if we wanted to make a modification to it and let's just say we give them 56 of the extra

[04:36:48] funding we could do that if we so wanted to sorry dave we did complete that calculation okay and so just want to be sure that it's not that we're not prioritizing education or that our babies are not being funded both of my kids go to Prince William County Public Schools just again trying to address the extra funding that we have the additional items that we have to fund on our side and how that extra funding would help us get there while still achieving all of the goals from the school division or asks of the school

division just want to be clear Supervisor Angry I just have to say this because listen I agree with everything Supervisor Vegas is saying on this all I'm saying

[04:37:26] is honestly, the school board doesn't even have to come in here and present a budget to us because if this revenue sharing agreement says that they get 57.23% of the dollar, literally, we just have to give them whatever that number is. So while they come in here and present a budget and they have a number that says, and we say we met it, then honestly, I just want clarification.

[04:37:49] The purpose of that revenue shared agreement says 57.23% of our end budget that we have goes to the school. So now that we've just increased and we have all this money, literally 57.23% of that new number goes to the school, thus the whole $23 million that you're speaking of now that they should get.

[04:38:08] Now we're saying we shouldn't give it to them because we've met their budget obligations. No, we've met what they've requested based on their budget. But I'm even saying it's like why do we even have to hear their budget because at the end of the day we're going to give them 57.23%. I think at this point we're going in circles.

[04:38:26] Yeah, and I'll say this is the last thing, though. If we want to talk about a revenue-shared agreement, then we need to talk about that. I'm sorry. Wait, hold on. Yeah, I'm sorry. I still had it right, so I was all talking around me. But if we were going to have a discussion about that revenue-shared agreement, then that is another discussion because right now in this budget cycle, the money that we are bringing in that we are now just set as our general funds, 57.23% of that goes to the school.

[04:38:52] Yes, we voted. I'm sorry. Did you guys have something else to say to add? I was just going to say we completed the calculations that the board, Supervisor Vega, asked earlier. If the schools did not receive the additional $23.8 million from budget markup and the board's decisions this evening, their share of general revenue would decrease from 57.23% to 55.73%.

[04:39:23] That is precisely one and a half percentage points. And the county would gain one and a half percentage points of general revenue from 42.77% to 44.27%.

[04:39:39] And what is that in real numbers? Hold on, what is that in real numbers? Like, what is the dollar amount? $23.8 million. No, if we did the $50, all right. I'm getting exhausted.

[04:39:58] I know, Supervisor, did you still want to, Supervisor, we are quickly. Madam Chair, I would move to amend the percentage for the revenue sharing agreement from 57.23 to 55.73. Second. We're going to do a quick vote, but we already had taken a vote on this, but all right.

[04:40:18] We had already taken a vote, but let's do a quick roll call. Supervisor Weir? Supervisor Vega? Yes. Supervisor Angry? No. Supervisor Bailey? No. Supervisor Bode? No.

[04:40:34] Supervisor Franklin? No. Supervisor Gordy? No. Chair Jefferson? No. All right, so we're going to schools get their money. I know I would like to have a greater say, but this is, it is, we voted.

[04:40:55] But, I mean, in terms of how they're going to actually spend their money. All right, all right. So let's go through some of the other things we've talked about. So that leaves, again, still we have $7.7 million. I'm sorry, $7.5 million. We have a couple other things.

[04:41:13] Let me go through. We talked about mobility. That's one of the things I know we looked at in sustainability. um we have a spreadsheet we're thinking about a million dollars for mobility two million for

sustainability in light of the money that we have left i don't know if that's something that we can really fund to those amounts but i don't know supervisor but it were those things that you were looking at sure so like i said before i i think that we did have an ask from our um our

[04:41:46] trails advocates for a million dollars for dedicated funding i had last week proposed more than that understand that mobility should also include bike pad safety and some other things knowing that rick and his team can probably use a lot more than just one million dollars however with how little money we have left um i'm willing to just go along with the one million for mobility yes um but that's already i thought you wanted that at a million and sustainability sustainability that's something that's another line all right um oh yeah that was the one but i thought you

[04:42:24] wanted a separate pot of money for sustainability. For sustainability? Yes, I did. And Supervisor Weir, I think you mentioned before that sustainability you were looking at when you talked to folks you said a million instead of two million. I didn't talk. I did want to see a million dollars for sustainability as well. I'm sorry, what? One million for sustainability. All right, I'm just writing some of these things down. We are going to do a vote on mobility, a vote on sustainability.

[04:43:02] Other things we also need to talk about, and I think there's some things we can pull off. I know we're talking about a boundary study, which I don't think we, since we're transferring money to schools, we don't need that million dollar for that. You know, that's fair.

[04:43:21] I'm just going to read off a couple things that, you know, that have been for further, yes. But I just want to read off a few other things so that people can think about these things as we wrote. We're talking about mobility, you know, for a million dollars for that. We're talking about a million dollars for sustainability.

[04:43:37] We're talking about, you know, money, $2 million for a data center stabilization fund. We're also, there are people who want to reduce the meals tax, which doesn't seem likely with what we're spending. So I just want to name a few of those things for us to think about as we kind of move forward.

[04:43:55] And we're almost done. You know, I know people have other things that they want to throw in there, and we could talk about that as well. But mobility, there was a proposal to put, you know, a million dollars towards. Is it towards just, you know, can you give me some additional clarification and background on that?

[04:44:12] Sure. Like I said, well, you know, we have various funding sources that come from state and regional funding for traffic congestion, relief, throughput, all those things. But we have very few funding streams that go towards either safety for traffic safety or, frankly, for our trail system.

[04:44:34] because right now we don't have a dedicated funding source in the general revenues for trails. And I know that we've heard at the outset from folks that they would like to see us begin to fund trails specifically, so that's what that million dollars would be for. All right, any discussion or any questions about this?

[04:44:57] All right, let's do a—I'm sorry, yes. My apologies, Chair Jefferson. Just a point of clarification for staff. Is this Trails for Parks and Recreation, or is this Department of Transportation Trails?

[04:45:20] It matters in terms of our ability to sustain our maintenance of effort requirements as it relates to NVTA funding. That's why I ask. I apologize. I see Rick is there. I want to see if he wants to add to that.

[04:45:36] While Rick's coming up, can you go into that NVTA, explain that a little bit better? Or, I'm sorry, deeper? In order for us to receive approximately $21 million a year in local NVTA 30% funding, Prince William County has to annually certify that we are devoting enough local dollars for our local mobility network.

[04:46:03] Mr. Canizales and his staff and our friends in the Department of Finance spend a great deal of time to make sure that we meet that annual maintenance of effort precisely because we don't want to leave 21 million dollars on the table and what I'm trying to say is every little bit of local funding for mobility helps. I'm Madam Chair, members of the board, Rick Hanson. Supervisor Bodie, that's a great question. In my aspect, I mean I'm pointing

[04:46:40] at myself and saying to give them to transportation but as you know and as we have a clear record of We work with parks and doing projects. We're currently working with them and doing Long Park. We're currently working with them and doing the Ellicott Trail. So there's things that we can use this money for that we can work together on or we can look to actually even, like we have done in the future or in the past, we can leverage some dollars with this money as well to work together with the parks and making sure we have an enhanced full trail system around the county.

[04:47:13] So, Madam Chair, in light of that, thank you, Rick, for that. in light of that i'm inclined to say transportation transportation and you still are looking for a million dollars correct all right any further discussion all right let's do a roll call vote supervisor bodey aye supervisor angry aye supervisor bailey supervisor franklin aye supervisor gordy aye supervisor vega supervisor weir is absent chair jefferson aye vote unanimous

[04:47:48] all right another thing we um and i'm sorry can we have something on the screen can we have like kind of a running tally or something so that we can all see in real time how much we have left and how much like a blank screen i don't know if i'm asking for yeah because right now we're at 6.5 but madam chair yes i'd just uh like to uh make a point um earlier in the evening i talked about and you know the opportunity to reduce the meals tax to two percent um i'd like to ask the county

[04:48:25] attorney to give us direction on on why that is not the uniqueness of that and why we cannot do that this evening. Madam Chair, members of the board, the meals tax that this board put in place was done by an ordinance and to change and amend an ordinance you have to have a public hearing which has to be advertised once a week for two weeks. That meals tax ordinance is different from the various taxes that you impose or require to impose annually. The General Assembly says

[04:49:00] annually you have to impose a real estate tax. The other taxes are set by ordinance. If the board is interested in amending the meals tax, the board would give a directive to county staff to come back with the amendment and authorizing the public hearing to amend the ordinance. You would not be able to amend the ordinance tonight all right so i am i guess you're filling him in so that is something then that is off the table that is something um and we can have the discussion next

[04:49:34] year all right we are going to keep kind of going down um i know kenny so i'm sorry supervisor bode you were talking about sustainability um and what would that look like so in previous um Before we adopted the CSMP, we had earmarked $5 million in previous years towards sustainability.

[04:50:00] Now that we have the CSMP, I think that we still need to put more money towards its implementation, knowing that we have very aggressive goals and we're going to achieve anything close to

our goals by the year 2030. And so that's why I think that we should earmark another $1 million for sustainability.

[04:50:19] All right. Motion, second, and discussion? because I have, no, Norris, thank you. - That was a motion for $1 million for sustainability. - A second, who seconded it?

[04:50:37] No one? - Go. - Supervisor Bodie? - Aye. - Supervisor Angry? - I'm sorry, who seconded? - It's a struggle. - I guess we don't need a second? - Technically we don't, but I mean-- - We've been doing it all night.

[04:50:54] - Yeah, all right. Any questions, have any discussion or any questions? - Real quick, Dave, is this an addition? So this $1 million would be an addition to the 400 and something that you gave me for sustainability? So now we're what, at $1.4 million?

[04:51:11] So those before were FTEs. Now we're talking about actual funding to program actual sustainability efforts as opposed to just people. I guess the main issue also that I have is that this is not a request from Julia.

[04:51:26] So how do we know it's like a need? The sustainability commission members I've talked to have requested it. But I haven't, and I don't know who else has. So it just, again, it keeps growing. We present things, and we say it's going to cost this, and it's going to be a one-time thing.

[04:51:42] and then it just keeps ballooning and that's the issue that i have with it at what point do we draw the line we talk about things not being sustainable all right super i'm sorry mr uh yet another point of clarification so my understanding mr bode would this be part of the operating budget or is this part of one million dollars of annual funding in the cip to start implementing some of those

[04:52:13] capital things the latter so it would not be in the annual operating budget it would be cash to capital funding by the general fund in the cip one million dollars per year i hold on this is a one-time cost and i guess again you know you're saying commission members were saying that they

[04:52:44] was needed but have you spoken with miss mono about this i talked to miss mono more about her her ftes versus the assistant versus the one million itself so will she be prepared does she have a plan for this probably not i'm willing to withdraw it since it seems like there's a lot of resistance right all right i appreciate that thank you all right um let's look at data center stabilization fund we just withdraw it um and i know the point of this was you know looking at

[04:53:23] loudon county looking at other places you know we may not get the same amount of funding that we would like every year and this is seed money um to start programs to in case this is something that We're going to need years down the line. I mostly want to get to the discussion.

[04:53:40] I don't know if there is any around this. Can I get a motion? Second. A million? Okay. Second. Gordy, second. Any discussion? All right. Let's do it. I'm sorry.

[04:53:56] Supervisor Bailey? So the C program is for what bond? It's a data center stabilization fund to put in a reserve in case, or not in case, when data center revenues dip unexpectedly, as they did in Loudoun County two years in a row, and it gives us some cushion to offset a point in time where depreciation creates a lower than

[04:54:31] projected return on C&P tax from the equipment depreciation. Madam Chair. Yes, Supervisor Shorter. I'm sorry, Mr. Shorter. Or demoted, if you know. This would need to be a separate one,

[04:55:03] correct separate one tied tied to data center shortfalls in the future all right any other discussion yes i'm just curious so what's the difference in just putting that million in our stabilization fund that we currently have so why signal out a different fund that's a stabilization

[04:55:29] fund basically so your revenue capabilities around when you might use that would be argument to have it in its own data center stabilization fund if you just want it to be part of general it's all general revenue, the taxes generated, you know, it could stay right where it is and dips in any one of the revenue stores is a reason to go into the revenue stabilization fund. Now, I will mind the board that we have never dipped into it. We have not ever had to do that. Another important

[04:56:07] distinction is this $1 million would not be budgeted in fiscal 25. It would go into a reserve unbudgeted. Only the board of county supervisors can budget and appropriate those funds through board action it's a fun balance yeah all right so anyone else if not we'll do it I would have gone to two million but I will I'm happy with a million we'll do a million and then just do a roll call supervisor we're supervisor Gordy supervisor angry supervisor Bailey supervisor

[04:56:46] Bodie aye supervisor Franklin supervisor Vega chair Jefferson aye vote unanimous so for a million All right, so we have, I know other people have things that they want to add or cut.

[04:57:03] I think what might also be a little easier right now, because, again, we're getting late, I am going to start going down the line, you know, with things people would want to, again, perhaps it would make this easier, you know.

[04:57:19] We do have cuts, bless you, that we're going to get into agency adjustments. I'm just trying to think if I want to go through this. No, what I'm going to do is I'm going to let, oh, if anyone has any cuts, I'm going to start with Supervisor Bailey.

[04:57:38] If you have anything that you want to see cut or any, we'll go down and we'll do cuts and then we'll take it back around if anyone has anything else that they want to add. We can have that discussion. So, Supervisor Bailey. I don't have anything that I.

[04:57:58] To cut? To cut. All right, Supervisor, where? I got a lot. Okay, go on. Office of Elections, I want to remove the FTE from Senior IT Analyst. I don't believe that it is required at this point in time. All right. Anyone have any questions or discussion around that?

[04:58:18] This was something in Mr. Olson's presentation, correct? Correct. It was his request. Okay. And we don't have anyone, obviously, here to speak. Can you speak to that, Mr. Shorter? I can. And this was not just related to the fact that this is an elections year.

[04:58:35] Okay. The request, as I understand it, and I'm happy to have Deputy CXO Haynes actually stand up and talk about this as well if needed. This request was about making sure that the Elections Office and, gosh, thank you, that we were prepared generally to deal with equipment associated with the Elections Office, not just for elections year, but please feel free to add.

[04:59:09] Good evening, Quentin Haynes, FECXL, Government Operations. You're correct. So the request is for an IT support. So as you know, our general IT department handles network and infrastructure. This is specific for compliance with voting machines and other electronics that actually the elections office handles directly.

[04:59:27] So this is separate from the general IT support that we provide elections as a county agency. This is specific to their equipment that they train on that they utilize for elections office. Madam Chair, I withdraw the motion. All right. Next. Sorry, Mr. Shorter, I would like to take one of your three proposed FTE for procurement analysts away. I believe you can make do with two for the year and see how we stand at a savings of $118,972. Mr. Shorter, do you have anything? I would say, and if Shana Terry is still here,

[05:00:05] would it certainly ask her to come in, but we are asking our procurement staff to do quite a lot. They are under, at this point, they are in a process of transforming the office with a good deal of, thank you for coming in, with a good deal of on their plate in terms of procurement action.

[05:00:29] I would not suggest decreasing the amount of FTEs. This is already a decrease from the initial ask by this office. I don't know if you want to add to Ms. Terry. Yes, Madam Chair, members of the board, Shana Terry, Director of the Office of Procurement Services, Chief Procurement Officer.

[05:00:51] The Office of Procurement Services is understaffed. We operate, based on last year's report, we have about 23% full-time procurement staff to support 100 county employees.

[05:01:08] We also, we not only support operations, we support capital, unlike our counterpart in Fairfax, where they have a 57% full-time procurement staff to support 100 county employees, and they don't manage any of the capital projects.

[05:01:27] So all of the capital infrastructure projects, our procurement staff supports those. So we not only support contract actions in terms of awarding contracts, we then have to do all of the monitoring and oversight for those contracts, ensuring that invoices are paid on time, ensuring that contractors are performing in accordance with the contracts.

[05:01:50] And we also are mandated to comply with the Virginia Public Procurement Act. So we do need the support to be able to keep up with the compliance requirements. All right, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Madam Chair. Yes. I do just want to comment about the process that we're about to go within.

[05:02:11] in terms of agency adjustments and even some of the agency additions that have not been made by the department head i'm just concerned that we've never micromanaged each department before and i'm very concerned about us starting setting that precedence moving forward if the county exec has recommendations on adjustments that should be made obviously we should take that into consideration but to get down into uh full-time employees for you know i mean i just

[05:02:48] i'm very concerned with us getting into the details of each and every department all right so i i'm going to say this is also obviously it's my first budget season and thank you everyone for working with me on this i do appreciate your concerns and i understand them and i agree it's hard to you know i'm not in these departments but i do think that i am going to allow these questions just so we understand you know all the board members are comfortable with what the requests are because it's now our budget and that we're comfortable with what is being presented to us and we don't have to agree on all

[05:03:27] this you know we don't have to agree to make any transfers or to remove anyone but this is a markup unfortunately this is what a markup looks like so and each of us are going to have a chance to go around if there are things that we want to cut or things that we want to add. And so I'm doing this out of transparency. And I'm going to hate myself in the next hour, but that's okay. Proceed. Thank you, Madam Chair. You're exactly right. This is what budget markup is all about. If you have issues with what staff has presented,

[05:04:03] this is the time to take it up. It is our budget now. It is not the county exec's budget any longer. Anybody familiar with budget markup in any jurisdiction, at any level, local, state, federal will understand this is how it's done. And sometimes it makes for difficult decisions or painful ones. But if we were not going to look at the budget as presented, critique it, potentially cut it, or as we have done, add things, then we're not doing our job. And we might as well just take CXO's budget, rubber stamp it, and be done with it. This is our job.

[05:04:37] And you don't have to agree with them. In fact, most of these will probably, most if not all of them will get voted down. But I feel it's my responsibility to bring them forward because I've spent a lot of time reviewing this budget i'm very familiar with how government works and i don't see adding multiple ftes year over year over year as being sustainable especially when i question whether they are actually required all right so let's continue to move forward and let's do so at a good clip all right did you have anything else supervisor that's it all right supervisor oh

[05:05:12] all right so i'm sorry i thought you were with oh so can we office elections where yet Executive management removed one of the three FTEs. All right. So in addition to what Ms. Terry, Shana Terry mentioned, I'll just say to the board we have increased significantly the amount of procurement action happening in this county government.

[05:05:39] The idea that we would pull back an additional position when we are not meeting the original request of this office would be a lot. And so I would, again, ask the board's consideration for my entire ask, and that is three positions for the procurement office.

[05:06:01] Mr. Shorter. Yes. What was the original request? I believe it was eight positions. Supervisor Gordy? Eight. Eight for procurement? I believe so. Yes, ma'am. That did not make the proposed budget, and so that's the point that I'm making, that all our agencies pulled together, And many of their requests were not fully met, which is why we presented the budget as proposed

[05:06:31] and why I am as strong in terms of my message to the board about the need for all three of the FTEs that were presented as part of the proposed budget. All right. So I think in the interest, we'll look at this.

[05:06:47] I don't know if anyone has any more comments, but we can do a quick roll call on this one and keep moving forward with everything else, okay? So let's do a roll call. Supervisor Weir. I'm sorry, give me the motion. What is he asking? To remove one of the three full-time.

[05:07:04] Supervisor Angry? No. Supervisor Bailey? Supervisor Bode? No. Supervisor Franklin? No. Supervisor Gordy? No. Supervisor Vega? Chair Jefferson?

[05:07:19] No. All right. Parks and Rec has asked for a new FTE for a principal planner and a new FTE for a construction inspector.

[05:07:38] I would suggest that we accept the new FTEs, but they not go to the Parks Department, the planner going to the Planning Department, and the construction inspector going to Development Services where they belong so that they can serve everybody and not just the limited needs of the Parks Department.

[05:07:54] All right. Mr. Shorter? Yes, Madam Chair. I'm sure Seth has a bit to say about this as well. These are positions that are being recommended in planning for very specific reasons.

[05:08:09] A senior planner in planning does not do the same thing as a senior planner in parks and recreation. So I misspoke for parks and recreation. So I want to be clear that each agency, when we started this process and as we worked our way through the process, developed their own budget based on their own needs and based on the scope that this board envisioned that this board has provided.

[05:08:35] And so each agency is unique. While the titles are the same, the responsibilities are not. Planning has a role in permitting. Planning has a portfolio of work. Parks and Recreation has a role in permitting, and Parks and Recreation has a portfolio of work.

[05:08:53] So these positions are not interchangeable, and I would not give planning the responsibility of doing Parks and Recreation work. I don't know, Seth, if you wanted to add.

[05:09:16] All right, let's vote. Supervisor Weir? Aye. Supervisor Angry? No. Supervisor Bailey? No. Supervisor Bode? Nay. Supervisor Franklin? No. Supervisor Gordy? I'm going to extend on this one.

[05:09:33] Supervisor Vega? Chair Jefferson? No. Let's try something different. All right. Going to community partners. I want to remove the subsidy for Virginia soccer. I don't believe we should fund just one sports group to the exclusion of all others.

[05:09:53] It's only $36,855. All right. Discussion or questions? Or should we just... There's a question. I don't know who would answer this, Seth or CXO. Just give us a 500-foot view, five-second pitch on why we started doing this to begin with.

[05:10:14] Good evening. Good morning. Excuse me, Madam Chair, members of the board. Seth Handler-Voss, Director of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism. Supervisor, we're assistant reference to PWSI. So this decision, this community partner decision, allocation, appropriation, whatever you would call it, It was made before my arrival here, and I believe it was done to support the production of sports tourism events.

[05:10:40] As all the other leagues do? That is correct, sir. My point exactly. Mr. Seclair. The original request was made a long time ago, 15 years or so ago, if I recall correctly.

[05:10:59] At the time, PWSI made a proposal to the county as it relates specifically, I believe, to their icebreaker tournament. As a matter of fact, that icebreaker tournament is held over two weekends in March. They made the claim that they helped put heads in the beds.

[05:11:18] And this funding has continued over the years from transient occupancy tax revenue. So I saw... It is a regional tournament. It attracts states from North Carolina, the whole mid-Atlantic region.

[05:11:39] Supervisor Vega? Thank you, Madam Chair. So does Northern Virginia Soccer Club. So does VDA, right? And so if this was made 15 years ago, what stops us from changing this tonight? Well, have we engaged?

[05:11:55] I'm sorry. Has anyone engaged with this group? I mean, they're in my district. And yes, at one point, one of my kids played for this club, but I get where Supervisor Weir is going with this. It's not just this one club.

[05:12:10] We have so many, and what if all of the others then come and want something similar? There's nothing special that this one club is doing that the others aren't doing and are offering the county. So this seems more like a legacy. Supervisor Angry. Yeah, and that's exactly right, that legacy question.

[05:12:26] So here's my question. So you said community partners, but we have a program for that. and I do think at some point that program should be scrubbed. If this has been 15 years in the making, I just don't know if this board, and I get where you're going with this supervisor, but if it's 15 years and we have all these other clubs that really are relevant, and we do, then my question is even have we communicated with that club or with the community partners, overseers, whoever manages that, to really go and scrub that?

[05:13:00] Do you need us to really remove that, or is that something I think in 15 years, we probably should seriously look at more than what's in there and see if we really need to revamp that program and who we have inside these partnerships. I think we even mentioned this before at one point. We have, and I will say, if I can, I will say this quickly. The board last year during this budget process really encouraged staff, pushed staff to commit to transforming the community partners program as it has been run and we are in the process of doing that and so we have

[05:13:37] communicated with community partners we have named a selection committee that selection committee is at work i would like to use this year to make sure that all of our community partners are on notice that the program will be a competitive program moving forward without having provided any notice to these organizations, I certainly wouldn't want to be in the business of pulling back funding in this kind of way without providing any notice.

[05:14:07] I just don't know how the funding is being used and who is sort of pulling down on this funding in terms of that specific organization. I feel like this, again, is part of a longer discussion, you know, and it is worth, I know, you know, Supervisor Rear has brought up, you know, examining community partners and who's on the list, and I definitely think that that is a discussion that we need to be had.

[05:14:32] I will be willing to withdraw a motion, however, I want to note that we had this very same discussion last year, and nothing has changed. And I do not want to come back here next year to the very same circumstance where it still hasn't been addressed.

[05:14:50] Let's have a running list, which I kind of feel we already have, of post-budget things, because we're going to have, you know, talk to our partners in Manassas City, Manassas Park about our shared services agreement. Let's look at the community partners. I know there was something else that we're supposed to do. You know, PRTC, we have a running list, and it keeps getting longer.

[05:15:07] But let's add this. Let's make sure, and let's give this a date, you know, if we can. Let's give this, because I know you said we're already looking into us. Let's make sure that, I mean, we don't have meetings in August, but let's address this no later than September, you know, if possible.

[05:15:23] Okay, I'm running out of things because I'm pairing this as we go. The next one would be economic development. They want $35,000 for a workshop for small business owners. Why are we doing that when George Mason provides it for free? I would suggest striking it. All right, and do we have anyone?

[05:15:40] Mr. Shorty, can you speak to that? I believe Christina is here to speak to it.

[05:15:54] You should have stayed in from before. I was wondering, why did she leave again? Good evening, Chair, members of the board. Christina Wynn, Economic Development and Tourism.

[05:16:11] The $35,000 that you talked about, that is specifically a sponsorship for Leadership Prince William to hold four small business leadership cohorts through the year.

[05:16:31] So different than what we do through George Mason with the counseling and the free services, Those are free, but this would be something very specific because our small businesses can't participate in the leadership, Prince William.

[05:16:49] They can, right? But as small business owners, they don't have the time to make that commitment. And so the idea and the concept was to actually have these four kind of cohorts every quarter that gives these small businesses an opportunity to participate and really kind of build up their leadership skills, but in a much more manageable way that doesn't affect their day-to-day operations with the business.

[05:17:20] Madam Chair, I'll withdraw that because it's not that much money. And I'm going to do one more, but I just want to note that while we've done a real good job spending tonight, we haven't made a single cut. All right. Go on. I've got one more. Okay. Under debt service.

[05:17:37] Okay. $339,465 for the indoor track land purchase. I don't see that going through in two weeks, so why are we funding it? That's a good question, and I think that we need to play out the process.

[05:17:55] But we're budgeting for it now. And if we don't need that money, then that's money that is unspent, and that is savings, Bob. That is savings. If you're willing to address an amendment at a later date, I will accept that. I will. Yes, sir.

[05:18:11] Supervisor Bob. And I'll leave the other ones for the time being. All righty. Supervisor Bodie, anything you want to cut? I'll go back to the one that he just withdrew, which is the economic development one, the $35,000 for LPW. Do you want to cut that?

[05:18:28] All right. I'm not even going to take motions. We're just going to do the roll call. Man, we're in the early wee hours. I'm going to tell my staff next year, don't put anything on my schedule the day after.

[05:18:44] So this is $35,000 for economic development? So, economic development, $35,000 for workshops for small business owners. Roll call. Madam Chair, I just have a quick question. Is this going to be just for this year, or is this going to be an ongoing thing where we view them again as a...

[05:19:03] So, I appreciate that. So, the reason why I want to cut this year is, again, under the conversation we just had about redoing community partners program, I think this is a prime example of something that should be looked at for the new community partners program versus us just funding it as a line item this year at $35,000.

[05:19:25] So I'm suggesting we cut it this year. I understand that. I just wanted to know, as somebody that has gone and seen the work that they do, it's impressive. I think it's very beneficial to our community, to our county.

[05:19:41] And so I just want to know if this, like, I doubt that it's a one-time thing. I think that if we open that door, it's going to be a continuous, continual ask. So I just wanted clarification. Sure. All right. Are we, did you want clarification from Christina Wynn, or did you, here she comes.

[05:20:01] I think you just hang out in here with us. Sorry. Chair, members of the board, Supervisor Vega, right now it is a pilot program.

[05:20:21] So at this point, it is a one-time request to develop these cohorts and do it as a pilot. All right, thank you.

[05:20:36] Do you still want to move forward with that, Supervisor Bode? All right, so we're going to do a roll call. Supervisor Bode? Aye. Supervisor Angry? No. Supervisor Bailey? Supervisor Franklin? No. Supervisor Gordy? No. Supervisor Vega?

[05:20:53] No. Supervisor Weir? Aye. Chair Jefferson? No. Motion fails. And that's the only one I wanted to cut, so I'm all good. All right, Supervisor Angry? Madam Chair, I don't have a cut, but I'm recommending that we move all of our board employees under the general fund for compensations because we pay for that out of our budget, which would then free up our budget to do more things with.

[05:21:21] We did this in 2012, I just want to say, and right now the proposal for the expenditure additions on page 7 is going to give a $15,000 increase, which, you know, basically... Cuts, cuts, cuts, cuts. Well, actually, I'm not a cut, but I'm just wanting to move, so I'm not cutting anything. We'll do that later.

[05:21:37] I want to go through cuts real quick. I don't have a cut. All right. Vega. Thank you, Madam Chair. If it were up to me, I would get rid of the Office of Equity and Inclusion altogether, but I know that that's not going to happen. However, I will say that I had several questions for a county executive that I didn't get answers to.

[05:21:57] I think I got a vague response in general. But we're seeing a 25% increase here, and I believe, Mr. Shorter, that the increase that we're seeing for this office is because of a position that was filled, that we are paying more now than what we anticipated?

[05:22:16] If I understood the response that I got back. Thank you for the question, Supervisor. The increase is due to the market and merit adjustments that we are making for all employees within the organization. We are assuming that the office is also receiving those increases.

[05:22:36] And yes, there was a reclassification of a position within the office last year. That position was, we recruited for the position at its lowest range twice and did not receive, I understand, any candidates.

[05:22:53] We reclassified the position, recruited again for a third time, and yes, the position was filled at the higher, at the higher range. And so, yes, that was the answer, and the position is currently filled, and all remaining funds were for the increased market and merit adjustments.

[05:23:13] And the position title is Business Services Administrator? Correct. That is correct. For the Office of Equity and Inclusion? Yeah, that is correct. Okay, just want to be clear. Along the line of questioning that I also asked was in terms of, you know, the reason to keep this office open or functioning, if you will.

[05:23:32] Its current budget is $478,164. This year, with this increase, we're getting up to $599,270. And again, with the phenomenal work that we have in regards to the Human Rights Commission and the Citizen Advisory Board, I find it redundant to have this office.

[05:23:48] There's really nothing that has been proven to me or shown to this board data-wise in regards to what these folks who manage this office actually do to earn their paycheck. The only thing that we've actually seen are surveys that have come out of this office. I mean, to include some community events or county events, Mr. Schurter, I'm not really sure how to classify that, as most of these events are taking actual place during work hours.

[05:24:15] So I'm going to be pressing for the additional questions that I asked to be answered. I will say that you did state that it's not that you couldn't provide an answer. It's just that it was going to take longer

than expected in terms to fulfill my request to have those responses before today's meeting. So I want to be very clear.

[05:24:32] I'm still going to be on the lookout for the response to the additional questions that I did ask. And we'll continue to make the argument as to the reason for this office to be in place. um again it's redundant we have a human rights commission and we have a citizen's advisory board and also i'm just want to highlight that under hr we have um equity and inclusion employee resource groups that is costing the taxpayers of this county sixty thousand four hundred dollars and again the same line of questioning what what's the purpose of this and is the sixty thousand

[05:25:08] dollars um it says expenditure at sixty thousand is this current county employees that have additional duties now to be a part of this resource group? So like many organizations that encourage employees to come together, certainly employees who have an affinity, employees who might all want to share, encourage, and support each other, this is what this is encouraging.

[05:25:36] These groups have not yet been formed, obviously, until the budget is approved. Ultimately, workshops, training, professional development all is yes sometimes during working hours but we are with this office and others trying to do our best to encourage the best possible work environment for our employees. This is not required. It is a voluntary opportunity for our employees to come together to support each other and so any budget that is set aside for

[05:26:10] that purpose is it's for professional development it is for encouraging employees and again employees are not required to participate. And how do we arrive at that $60,400 total? I believe it was an estimate of the number of workshops trainings and professional development opportunities along with any other special events that the employee groups would be interested in sponsoring. And again this is under HR's budget, but I assume that this is somehow connected with the Office of OEI?

[05:26:45] It is. And so HR would be partnering with Equity and Inclusion. We have a training office within Human Resources that currently provides for training and professional development. So any work that comes from the individual employee groups related to training and professional development should be consistent with what we currently do. So yes, HR would be supporting and assisting. Which again, I think we are where we need to be. We create these things in the hope

[05:27:20] of finding things or verifying or not allegations. And again, there is no proof that has been presented to this board, to this governing body to continue to entertain this. I will go on the record and say that at the time it was put forth and yes it was politically motivated I don't think there's a need for it I understand that you already filled the position somebody's already employed and whatnot and that that took a lot of time so I'm not gonna die on that hill but I will madam chair ask that we cut sixty thousand four hundred dollars because I don't think that that's a proper use of tax dollars and I think that we could be using those

[05:27:55] funds in a different regard it's sixty thousand four hundred it's not I don't i don't have a line i don't have a line item for you the number and what do you want to cut it from so we can so it's under hr and it's again equity and inclusion employee resource group and it's estimated um based on what mr shorter just said that it's going to cost 60 400 for events

[05:28:30] trainings you you heard his reasoning all right so we're just going to take a quick vote um and you want to cut so we'll just take a quick vote roll call supervisor vega yes supervisor angry no supervisor

Bailey supervisor Bodie nay supervisor Franklin supervisor Gordy supervisor we're chair Jefferson no motion fails all right do you have

[05:29:04] anything else supervisor Vega no all right supervisor Franklin all right supervisor Gordy nothing okay all right so yay we're going to I know there are a couple other big global things that we wanted to or the global so in terms of maybe individual projects we want to see I do kind of want to keep things at a high level countywide you know because we haven't had a chance to discuss

[05:29:41] everything that people may want to see in their districts I do appreciate Supervisor Bailey handing out something I know you really want it for a screen maybe we can look at that because we did give additional money to we gave 1.2 million to parks is that that's is that a part you want that to be a part of it are you looking for something separate because I think that the issue is we were talking earlier when we did the 1.2 was that that was going to be for everybody to be split so you're good with that all right so you're good with that I just want to verify all right so I know supervisor angry you want to talk about something regarding the you know office budgets okay BLCS all right

[05:30:21] yes yes okay yeah as i was i was saying so we have on page seven the expenditures edition blcs office budgets so my proposal is that we take our office staff employees for blcs's roll their benefits and compensations under the general fund which will then free up that funding in our budgets because we're currently paying that out of our budgets right now to do whatever you need to do within your districts i know there was a discussion about some possibly wanting an extra FTE, some want extra money.

[05:30:55] I think that $15,000 was that increase. But a lot of that still had tied to the FY 24 and 25 compensation adjustment for board days. I'm simply saying that in the compensations area we rolled out under the general fund, really I would say permanently because apparently we've done this in 2012 one time, and now you've got this increase that we've got for two years.

[05:31:20] So I'm asking that we pull them out and put them under the general fund and whatever that cost was that we were paying goes back into your bottom line for whatever you want to do inside your district with the funding. So before we jump in, I will support that, but also we have to think about, again, because we had money in there for staff increases.

[05:31:43] You know, there's a program, $15,000 for each of the supervisors, $25,000 for my office because I have a higher pay. and there's a disparity, so would this be in addition to or supplant that? Right, and that's the big question because I'm simply talking about employees moving them, but this line item is already in there for that 15K increase.

[05:32:07] So if it stays, I'm saying in addition to, or if it doesn't, I'm saying this is what we do, we move these employees. So I would even recommend both because it's already there and you've already kind of allocated for it, And you're not really making any additions or subtraction.

[05:32:24] I'm just simply talking about moving, which would benefit each district office for additional funding, again, for you to use how you see fit. All right. I have Supervisor Weir. Just a point of clarification. Where are we moving them to?

[05:32:40] So we're going to, I think, not general fund, but we have a BOCS administrative fund, right? Administration. I think that's a better place to move it. That's fine, but the question is, if you're moving $200,000 of staff salaries to that fund, you're not getting that $200,000 back in your...

[05:33:00] So, okay, go ahead. I think, and I'm stealing your sheet. So, if we're moving our salaries, and correct me if I'm wrong, because on the hill with our MRAs, I don't know if the member's salary is actually in that or if that's just the pot of money that they get.

[05:33:18] It's what? So that's what this was kind of the thinking is modeled on, is that our salaries as a board come out of our office budget. And instead of it coming out of our office budget, put it in the BLCS administrative department.

[05:33:34] So we're talking simply about our budget, our salaries, not the staff. No, no, no, not staff. That's what I was going to do about. Just the people on the day. That's fine. Okay, we're good. That's fine, yeah. But that means you're giving every office budget, in our case, $77,000 additional money.

[05:33:51] It's a slight bump. So I just want to say, so that's not what I was saying. I was saying the compensations benefits from, I'm not saying our employees' salaries. I'm saying what we pay them currently in compensation, which is adjustments every year that we move those compensations into the same compensation that's paid out for all the rest of our 5,000 employees in that general fund.

[05:34:16] Because we're currently paying that out of our district office funds. Am I correct? Yeah, but that appears on everybody's balance sheet the same way. But the point is that those funds are coming out of your office funds now. Are we talking about two different things?

[05:34:32] Because if you're talking about moving our supervisor's pay. I'm going to streamline this. I would like for us to take our pay out of our office budgets and move it into the BOCS administration fund.

[05:34:49] So that's one thing I would like to do. And then secondly, what is already in here concerning the increase in our supervisor office funds, I would like to do that because that is the money that our staff would get.

[05:35:04] If I'm not mistaken, Mr. Shorter, that's the money our staff would get for raises because right now they don't get a raise. Like when county employees get a raise, our staff does not get a raise. They are set at that amount.

[05:35:21] And so that's the second part, is if we have this additional funding, we could possibly, you know, we can give them a regular raise like, you know, everyone else gets. So if we could do this, if we could go through, because, you know, my proposal was just a compensation of our employees, I would like to hold to that.

[05:35:44] And we just go through and do a straw poll, but it sounds like there's this flavor for moving the Board of County Supervisors' salaries. let's do both and you know let's do both so first let's do a straw poll oh i'm sorry we have a couple people we have bodie we have vega uh we have franklin yeah so i just wanted clarity so currently when the county staff when we authorize a raise for county staff that does not automatically also get applied to our office budget to give to our staff as well correct so that doesn't if we

[05:36:20] decide but it doesn't expand our pool of money so if that kept happening we eventually would hit our our budget caps and we wouldn't be able to do anything okay so i wanted that i just wanted that clarity there all right super wait hold on supervisor vega then supervisor franklin and then supervisor gordy vega there was a lot there was a lot going on between victor and you okay so i i will clarify okay we are going to do two things we're going to look at two things

[05:36:50] The first one is taking our salary, our benefits, our salary, out of our office budget and putting it into the BOCS administrative fund. So we'll come out of that fund. That will actually free up money in our budget, but it also gives parity because, you know, in all fairness, I do make a slightly little bit more, and so I'm also dinged on that in my budget.

[05:37:16] But that's the first thing. We will take, like they do in Congress, congressional members, they're not paid out of their office budget. So we will not be paid on our office budget. It will be in the BOCS Administrative Fund. So that's what I'm saying. Okay, but I guess my question is, do our office budgets remain the same, or are you asking for what you're moving to the box administrative fund to still remain in our office budgets?

[05:37:41] It will still remain. So our offer, what is it, what are we at right now, 410? About $670,000 total. You're a no? Well, I'm a no, but for the reasons that not every employee, one, uses benefits, okay?

[05:37:57] Two, it comes down to how we manage our offices, right? And I don't know about you all, but I've taken care of my employees, whether it's through bonuses or whatever the case may be, hear me out. But at the same time, I can't justify increasing our office budgets because I don't have the justification for it.

[05:38:21] And so if you're saying we're going to move our pays into this other fund, but our office budgets, you know, remain the same. And hold on, hold on, because I know different offices have different needs. And, I mean, if it's something, you know, we don't have to spend to the max.

[05:38:42] I just want to mention that. Different people have different needs. Some people have a need for more constituent services within their offices. Some people may have less. But I'm going to move on to Gordy and then Franklin. And then, I don't know, Victor, if you, I'm sorry, Supervisor, if you had anything else.

[05:39:00] Supervisor Gordy. Yeah, so, you know, I'm pretty blessed with my staff. Most of them are, receive benefits due to military service. And so they don't take the benefits, which allows me to utilize that money in support of, give them a better salary and or use it for other purposes within my office.

[05:39:27] I don't want to lose that flexibility, and so, you know, the opportunity to me would be lost if we transfer this over into an account where it's either use it or lose it, but I don't have any flexibility in how I'm able to manage that, so I just want to.

[05:39:49] I think that we're getting confused. Hold on, hold on, hold on, hold on, hold on. We're getting confused. You still have flexibility to use your office budget. We are just taking out our salary and moving it to a different, all right, I'm sorry. Manager.

[05:40:04] We have two things. All right, go on. Let me be very clear in what I'm saying. I'm not talking about what you do with bonuses. I am talking about your BRS, your health benefits, your retiree health, those market adjustments. I'm saying those things are already what your employees are getting.

[05:40:23] I'm not talking about your bonuses that you've given folks. I'm saying that because those things are already things that are compensated to the rest of the $5,000 out of the general fund, that when we start talking about the fact that some of the officers want more money and want another staff, whatever, that bottom line of those benefits package that you are paying for your staff, if you move that into the general fund, it frees up that money in your budget to do more with.

[05:40:50] So to your point, if you're saying you want to give your staff another pay boost or whatever, you can do whatever you want with your money. I'm simply saying that those benefits packages are moved over. I just want to, for a point of clarity, Michelle, you want to make the...

[05:41:05] Sure. I just want to clarify some terminology. So you each have a magisterial district budget. It is in the general fund. Yes. You have board administration. It is in the general fund. So you're moving between cost accounts, not necessarily moving it to the general fund. Your salaries are already in the general fund.

[05:41:21] Now, what I think the question at hand is, is when you're, if you want to move those benefits fringes to board administration, are you suggesting that get funded with a new budget out of this, or are you moving your budgets that exist today, which doesn't create capacity?

[05:41:38] I'm saying the first of what you said. Because then, what I'm saying is those bottom line dollars inside of your district funds, To the discussion of everything else that we've been having frees up money for you to do whatever you want to do with those funds. Now, the second part of that was right now it says $15,000 increase and a $25,000 increase.

[05:41:57] That's there. So to the point, I was simply substituting that initially with what I'm saying about the health benefits. But if you want to still leave that, then that's a discussion to have. So does that clear what I'm saying?

[05:42:12] Yeah, like I said, a lot of my staff does not take the benefits because it's cheaper or they're getting it already due to military service. However, I don't have any military service on my staff. I get that. But because I have that situation, that gives me a lot more flexibility to do things for my staff that I don't want to lose.

[05:42:35] And so if it goes to a fund that I don't have control over anymore, I can't manage my staff and their benefits in a way that gives me the flexibility to ensure that I don't want to lose that flexibility.

[05:42:54] That's just what I'm saying. I think we still have some confusion. I'm sorry. And I just want to say this last thing. So that's the whole point of whatever that money is that you currently have in there that you aren't giving to your staff right now because they have military benefits, that's still there. Now, nothing changes in your office.

[05:43:09] Nothing changes in anyone's office other than there's now a plus still that you have because now those benefits that you don't even give your office, I'm sure everybody else gives their employees that benefit, is going to be out of this other line that we can now use some of this money to put in.

[05:43:27] And all I'm getting to is that it gives more money back to the bottom line of your offices. So that was my recommendation. But we can just vote on it and move on. Wait, wait, hold on. So what's the net budget impact? Yeah, and actually there isn't one. Well, no, no, hold on. No, no, no, there is.

[05:43:42] There is. There is. Hold on. Let Mr. Sinclair speak, then we wrap this. I will be impressed if you know the answer. Clarify my understanding of what I am hearing. If we move the board members' salary, benefits, and employer taxes, FICA, and Medicare, from your office budgets, all eight of you, to board admin, the board admin program, And we keep the office budgets intact.

[05:44:15] Yes. That is a net additional cost of $724,148 board-wide. Now, so we have how much left in this, you know, $5 million.

[05:44:33] So if we're moving all this money around, my simple request is that you allocate that to that, and then you give this money back to these offices of what it is. Now, it's a simple request. We can move on. We don't have to stay here until 3 in the morning to do this.

[05:44:49] It's a recommendation I had. That's separate from talking about moving supervisor's salary. So if you want to have that discussion, we can have that discussion. I'm confused. Okay. Now I am officially confused. Yes, Supervisor Franklin. Hold on. And, Dave, I think you answered this, but just so that I'm clear.

[05:45:07] So if we were to do this, we would need to fund it for that $725 to make sure that that account that Supervisor Angry is referencing has the money to pay for those benefits and salaries that we're moving over.

[05:45:27] And to, I guess, to his point. And you want to keep the office budgets intact as they are in the recommended budget recap. So will we, I guess my question is, and I don't know how much that is, I guess, is it 725 divided by 8?

[05:45:45] Maybe it's not that simple. But I guess my question is, how will we guarantee that our office budgets will, that we will have a surplus? That would depend on your individual management of your office budgets.

[05:46:03] But I, yeah, so I guess, yeah, I guess. But you'll have more capacity by virtue of the fact that your specific positions will be moved to the board admin program. Sure. And then I guess to Supervisor Gordy's question, just so that I'm clear, you know, because to Supervisor Vega's point, you know, my employees are, I think, taken care of with regards to, you know, the bonuses and the increase in salaries that I give.

[05:46:32] Will I still have the ability to do that if I wanted to give a raise, if I wanted to give a bonus? That depends on what each board member would do with their added capacity in their office budget. But my question was, moving it to this other account doesn't lose, it doesn't get rid of the flexibility I have to give additional money.

[05:46:52] Yeah, you do not lose spending power. You actually gain additional money in your budget. You're growing your office budget. Yes. So, and we, honestly with this, depending on how people feel, I mean, I think things should be separate votes.

[05:47:07] We may not even need to, you know, if people are not comfortable with also having what's already in the CXO's budget, we don't, you know, this is why I'm looking at this two separate things. Supervisor Weir, and then, you know, unless there's any questions, we can move on this.

[05:47:23] Madam Chair, I'm not going to support this for no other reason than it will expand the dialogue we hear from that microphone, which is, you gave yourself a 70% raise, Mr. Shorter makes far too much money, and now you've given yourselves three quarters of a million dollars to spend in your offices.

[05:47:45] No. All right. So if everyone is clear on what we're going to vote on, we're just going to do a straw, you know, roll call, and then. So, no, I'm not clear, because we proposed two different things. You, yes, we, so, yes.

[05:48:00] I had the mic, it was mine. So, I was saying, we could, I think we should vote on yours first, and then Madam Chair's. All right, that's fine. Or I would vote on mine first, and then his, because mine would

take into account, if you guys want to limit how much we're putting into our own budget. So, I'm sorry, I hate, are you okay?

[05:48:18] So, how about this? We're going to do one first, and then we'll do the other, because we may not need both. Yeah, that's what I'm about to clarify. That is what I'm about to clarify. So what I would like to see is we move our board, people on the dais, supervisor and chair, our salary, our benefits, our payroll taxes, to the board administration fund.

[05:48:47] And in that, we also put additional money in that fund, the $720, whatever, to compensate for that. That will leave our budget, that gives us additional wiggle room in our budget for whatever we want to use it on.

[05:49:08] We do not have to spend to the full amount. But again, I've heard from different offices about having maybe additional needs because everyone's office has different needs. Some people need somebody for constituent services 'cause they have a greater need within their district.

[05:49:25] If it is something that, I'm just saying to, aside from that from the board members, if you don't need the additional funding, you don't have to spend it. No one's going to make you spend money. But for the people who have expressed to my office that they want the additional flexibility, that is why I'm carrying this.

[05:49:42] So if there's no other questions about what I'm saying, then let's go ahead and do a roll call, okay? Supervisor Angry. Yes. No for that.

[05:50:03] All right. No lobbying the voter. All right. All right. Vic know that her proposal is better than his, to be quiet. Yes.

[05:50:19] Thank you. Supervisor Bailey? What do you think? You want to -- I don't have a -- okay. I'm sorry. All right. I pick. I don't know.

[05:50:34] She's a no. No, she said yes. You're a no? You're a no? I thought you said yeah. Okay. I thought you said you were for it. You're not for it, okay? All right. Supervisor Bodie? Aye. Supervisor Franklin?

[05:50:51] Aye. Supervisor Gordie? Supervisor Vega? Absolutely not. Supervisor Weir? Uh-uh. Chair Jefferson. I support this. Motion passes. All right. And so then we're going to take his off the table.

[05:51:10] Okay. So we're going to take his off the table. And I think that we have exhausted this. We're exhausted. I'm actually, now I'm starting to get my second win because earlier I was just dead tired. No, you're not.

[05:51:26] So, all right. So I'm sure I will. So it sounds like, you know, we are past, we're at 1 o'clock. We have finished this item. I just want to take a pulse on the board if you guys want to continue or if we are going to um because all we have left is closed meeting so how do we feel good i want to move on attorney is that necessary to do tonight or can we carry it over to the next meeting county executive what do you feel closed session i i want to move forward but i don't

[05:52:00] think no if i want to move but hold on quickly do you want to move forward you do supervisor weird do you want to move forward supervisor bode yes supervisor angry supervisor vega supervisor franklin yes supervisor gordy that you want to continue want to go to closed session all right I am so sorry, but yes, I do want to move this.

[05:52:27] I mean, we're so close to the end, guys. First of all, and I do want to congratulate everyone. I know this is painful, but we made it through markup. This was a real markup, you know. Oh, wait, real quick, we have to mention we didn't do this yesterday, and I apologize, but this is really important. Yeah, and honestly, we'll just say we saved the best for last.

[05:52:44] So yesterday, the 16th was also the anniversary of one of our own, Kyle Wilson, a line of duty death and gave his life on a fire over at 15474 March Overlook.

[05:52:59] The thing is this, this Saturday we always have an annual Cal Wilson walk over at Cal Wilson Elementary School. So that's going to be this Saturday at 9.30 a.m., Cal Wilson Elementary School. And that's off of, what is that, Spriggs or what is that?

[05:53:16] Yes, Spriggs. Spriggs Road. So hopefully you can make that and come on out. His family is always there. It's a great event. It's always packed. So hopefully you can make that. And, again, it's to celebrate the life of Kyle Wilson, one of our own firefighters. Thank you, ma'am. I will be there. Thank you. Now we are going to move into our closed session.

[05:53:36] All right.

[05:54:00] So we are back from closed session. I just need a motion to vote so we can certify a closed meeting. So move. Second. All right. Let's vote.

[05:54:19] Is it up working? Okay. 1.21 in the morning. Vote unanimous. All right. Thank you, everyone. I had my second wind, but we are going to be closing out this meeting. I'd like to entertain a motion to adjourn. So moved.

[05:54:34] Second. All right, let's take a quick vote. And while we are doing that, our next meeting will be on Tuesday, April 23rd at 730. And that's when we are going to have a resolution to adopt the budget. Thank you, everyone, and have a good morning.

[05:54:53] Thank you.