



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Prince William Board of County Supervisors Meeting, Tuesday, April 14, 2026

Date Tuesday, April 14, 2026
Place Prince William County Board of County Supervisors, Virginia
Length 7h 46m (video)

- Official meeting video (Prince William County, Granicus): <https://pwcgov.granicus.com/player/clip/3817>
- Official Board of County Supervisors page (Prince William County): <https://www.pwcva.gov/departments/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 2026-10-27. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:00] All right, everyone. Thank you for coming out. Today is Tuesday, April 14th. I'm going to go ahead and get us started. It is 2-0-1. We are going to begin with a moment of silence.

[00:00:22] Thank you so very much. Please rise if you are able for the Pledge of Allegiance. The United States, to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

[00:00:42] All right. Thank you, everyone. We are going to move into public comment time. If you would like to sign up, the sign-up sheets are in the back. I am going to begin by calling people in groups of five. You will go to the back.

[00:00:58] You will line up. You will speak. Please begin by stating your name in the magisterial district where you reside. If you're outside the country, I'm sorry, the county, you could just say, if you're outside of the country, hopefully you're not here in person. That'd be weird. You could just say where the area where you reside. Your timer is up there.

[00:01:15] Everyone has three minutes. I'm going to start with Marianne Gadban, Tommy Rush, or Rauch, Nina Dow, Jim Rafferty, and Steve Amato. Hello.

[00:01:34] Good afternoon, Chair Jefferson and members of the board. My name is Marianne Gadban. I live in the Gainesville District on Pageland Lane. I'm a lifelong resident of Prince William County. I've been on Pageland Lane for 45 years, and I've been a commercial broker bringing economic development to Prince William County for about that same period of time.

[00:01:56] I'm here today on behalf of approximately 400 Pageland residents, your constituents, who came together in good faith to change and request a change to the comprehensive plan and a rezoning on Pageland Lane.

[00:02:12] We made that decision because our reality had changed. Our community is no longer rural. We are surrounded by existing massive Dominion transmission corridor, and we now have a new 100-foot transmission corridor coming through new areas on our property.

[00:02:31] Last but not least, we have the Gainesville Crossing, which is a 3 million square foot data center that was approved in December of 2019 on Page and Lane, next door to the Manassas Battlefield. That was approved within about 90 minutes, start to finish.

[00:02:49] There was no outcries from Heritage Hunt, no outcries from the Manassas Battlefield Park or Oak Valley. What's happened to the Digital Gateway is different. It has been driven by individuals and organizations who do not live on Pageland Lane, who do not bear the impacts that we do, and who have not always represented our community truthfully.

[00:03:12] That has created a narrative that is overriding the voices of the actual property owners. We've seen this before. The Manassas Battlefield tried to take our properties when they created the Bi-County Parkway. We fought them then to protect our property rights, and we'll have to do that here again.

[00:03:31] The digital gateway was overturned, not on merit, but due to our county procedural error. That impact has been absolutely catastrophic to our community. And yet the people most affected say the very least. Please remember we're your constituents.

[00:03:48] Please remember we are not other people's open space. And please remember we are not the rural crescent. We are families. We are taxpayers. We want to be treated the same way as you treated the people on Ventile Road when they decided they needed to change their properties. We will be back before you because nothing about our situation has changed.

[00:04:08] We're committed to bringing forward a plan that is as good and better than what you have seen before. Thank you for your time. Next speaker, please. Good afternoon. My name is Tommy Rush.

[00:04:23] I live in Haymarket. I'm the chief operator. Please adjust the microphone so we can hear you. Thank you. Is that better? Yes. I'm sorry. My name is Tommy Rush. I live in Haymarket. I'm the chief operating officer of Great American Restaurants, and I've been with the company for the past 31 years.

[00:04:41] I'm also a resident out there. I've been out there with my family and live in Prince William County for over 23 years. Spent the last five to ten years trying to convince my company to come out to Prince William County for the first time. Trying to convince the Norton family, who are the owners of Great American Restaurants, to take our first step into Prince William County.

[00:05:03] I'm very excited that we are opening up our first restaurant in Gainesville, Tommy's American, later this year. As our company continues to look to grow, we've been based out of Fairfax County since 1974.

[00:05:22] The Meals Tax in Fairfax County recently implemented has made it a less desirable county to look for continued growth. I'm simply here today to ask that we repeal the Meals Tax.

[00:05:38] If repealed, Great American Restaurants will continue to identify more locations in Prince William County and we will open up more restaurants. Thank you for your time. Thank you. Next speaker, please.

[00:05:56] Hi, my name is Jim Rafferty. I've been a resident of Prince William County for close to 40 years. I am currently a 30-year-long employee of Glory Days Grill. I am here to speak about the meals tax.

[00:06:12] It seems very unfair that we tax the one industry, you know, that they have to take the burden on that. We have two current locations in Prince William County. We have multiple locations in Fairfax County. We are looking to grow coming out of COVID.

[00:06:29] We're looking to grow again. And coming to Prince William County with this meals tax, it really makes it a hard sell to try to open where there's a meals tax. We're already fighting increased labor costs, increased food costs. All of our cost of goods are going through the roof.

[00:06:47] And we have to keep raising our prices just to be able to match those. And then when you add a meals tax on top of that, that's an additional burden to the guests who want to come into our restaurants. And we get our traffic patterns are down. We've seen it in Fairfax County, and we'll start seeing it in Prince William County, too.

[00:07:05] So I'm here to ask for a repeal of the meals tax, or at minimum, lowering it a percent or two or whatever the board can do would be greatly appreciated and lean towards Glory Days wanting to be involved more in Prince William County.

[00:07:20] Thank you for your time. Thank you. Next speaker, please. I'm short, so this is covered down a little bit. My name is Nina Dow and I'm a resident of Gainesville District and I've been a taxpayer of this county for 24 years.

[00:07:41] I'm here today because local government should serve its people and not take them to court. You've been spending our money, taxpayer money, used to fund appeals against the very homeowners you were elected to serve. That's not good governance. That's a betrayal of the public trust.

[00:08:01] But this can stop today. I'm simply asking three things of this board. Cut off the legal spending. Not one more dollar of public money goes to this needless fight. Drop the appeal now.

[00:08:17] Stop digging a deeper hole. Two, commit to a more transparent governing process. No more shortcuts, no backroom deals, and no NDAs. Three, any new application starts over from zero with proper public notice.

[00:08:38] Done right, no exceptions. Rarely in life does one get to do a do-over, but here you are, and this is your chance. The citizens of this county worked hard to lead you to this moment. We showed up, we voiced our opinions, and we did not go away.

[00:08:57] Do not squander this opportunity. Do not spend one more dime defending this lawsuit. Choose to lead. Choose to listen. Start healing this community today. the people who elected you are here right now and we're ready to trust you again and with all the respect don't let us down thank you all right before we get to the next speaker i want to call the last two people i have timmy norton and gary cohen if you can go to the back we greatly

[00:09:28] appreciate it thank you mr amato you may come forward see overhead working thank you good

[00:10:10] afternoon madam chair board of county supervisors i'm steve amato from the occoquan district and today i'm just re-emphasizing about our real estate taxes particularly in the 2027 budget build i like to bring to the board facts so you can have the facts from what a taxpayer a county resident has obtained through various freedom of information and privacy act requests to the county i appreciate The individuals have helped me with developing this.

[00:10:43] I don't agree with the proposed 0.906 per \$100 real estate base rate for our taxes. It needs to be lower. Personally, over \$1,700 is what my family's taxes have raised over personal property taxes within 10 years in this county has really shot up.

[00:11:08] The two things that I emphasize with this chart, first of all, is the surplus. surplus after six plus fiscal years to include the projected 65 million for 2026. Over a third of a billion dollars we've generated in this county. So there's only two ways that I could foresee revenue that would generate so much surplus. You sell a lot of products or you tax high. Well, the county does not sell products. It's taxing high. Second are the full-time

[00:11:43] equivalents. Nearly 20 percent over these past eight fiscal years, the county has grown in employees. Now, I have nothing personally against hiring more FTEs. In fact, I believe our first responders and safety should be the first ones to get new full-time equivalents funded fully.

[00:12:08] Everybody else, we've got to take a harder scrub. Over 920 new FTEs authorized over this time frame. Government growth is where a great amount of cost, it's a must-pay bill.

[00:12:24] Just think about it. You have your retirement pay. You have all these other benefits. That's a must-pay bill. So instead of distributing our equity through all these different social service programs, we need to tighten our budget.

[00:12:42] More people are leaving this county because of our high taxes. Please consider that real estate-based tax rate to be 0.84 per hundred. That will provide some tax relief. And thank you for you all from the board who responded to my emails.

[00:12:59] I appreciate it, especially providing this data to you and these facts. Because I think it's more facts-based than emotional-based, which helps in the decision-making for you all. Have a great afternoon. Thank you. Next speaker, please. Thank you, Chair Jefferson and the Board of Supervisors for taking the time to listen.

[00:13:24] My name is Timmy Norton, and I'm from Fairfax, Virginia. I'm a partner with Great American Restaurants. My father, in 1974, with two of his friends, started the company Great American Restaurants. Flash forward 52 years, and as of two days ago, we broke ground at Tommy's American, which will be just off of 29 and 66.

[00:13:43] We're very excited to come to the county, And we're very grateful that you all chose to reduce the meals tax from 4% to 3% in January. Our ask is if, again, you could repeal the meals tax. It would be very advantageous for any restaurateurs as well as the county in general.

[00:14:02] I live in Fairfax County, as I stated, and meals tax is a real thing. It costs me, just in tax alone, over \$1,500 a year out of pocket for my family of six to go out. if I go out and spend \$300 a week on just

meals tax alone.

[00:14:18] And it absolutely will affect your constituents, and we greatly appreciate it if you would vote to a full repeal of meals tax. Thank you for your time. Thank you. Next speaker, please. Good afternoon, Madam Chair and the Board.

[00:14:37] My name is Gary Cohen. I'm with Glory Day's Grill Restaurants. And if you want to know why you have so many restaurant folks up here today, you know, we live and breathe, our business lives and breathes with customers, as you well know. Our industry seems to be under attack.

[00:14:54] I won't list them all, but everything from food costs and labor costs and tariffs and everything that you could think of seems to be hitting the restaurant industry, especially labor. And we're kind of in survival mode. I'm not talking about glory days.

[00:15:09] I'm talking about the industry in general. I attended a National Restaurant Association meeting two weeks ago, and they gave us the staggering statistic that 42% of all restaurants in America are not profitable. And the ones remaining, the other 58%, where they used to make an average of 5% to 10% profit are now making 2% to 3% profit.

[00:15:34] So that's the state of the industry. So the reason I bring those facts up are because restaurants, there's a very clear pattern that when prices go up, customer counts go down. Or people eat out less frequently or people spend less when they're in the restaurants.

[00:15:51] So sometimes you see busy restaurants and you say they must be making Boku bucks. But the reality is you can't confuse sales with profit. And the reality is a lot of restaurants are really hurting these days. The reason I bring up all the industry statistics are the fact that Virginia is unique.

[00:16:12] In 2022, that law got passed in Richmond that allowed counties to implement meals taxes. I don't know of any other state in the union. I think maybe Maine might be the only exception that allows meals taxes. We look at it as an unfair tax on a single industry.

[00:16:28] And I realize that Richmond gave you the power to do that. And four years ago, we should have been here telling you not to do it. But the fact is, our numbers show the results. Every time we put a meals tax in, our sales go down. And by the way, there are a lot of legislators that think there's no impact to the restaurant.

[00:16:47] It's just a pass-through to the consumer. We don't want it passed through to consumers. We don't even like raising our prices because we know that we'll lose customers. But the reality is there is an impact on restaurants. The average Glory Days will spend \$3,800 a year in paying credit card fees to collect the meal tax for you.

[00:17:06] And we have 35 restaurants, so you can kind of do the math on that. So we ask very politely, anything you can do to repeal this tax that has a negative impact on consumers and a negative impact on the business, we would appreciate. Thank you for your time.

[00:17:23] All right. Thank you so very much. I'm going to turn it over now to Supervisor Ingrid for virtual comments. Thank you, Madam Chair. Looks like we have two speakers, correct? Good afternoon, Vice Chair and the Board. We do not have any speakers online. Thank you.

[00:17:41] All right. Thanks a lot. Thanks. All right. So that now concludes our public comment time. I am going to go on to agenda item number four, and that is County Executive Time. Mr. Shorter, the floor is

now yours. Thank you very much, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Good afternoon. A few quick updates. In terms of directives issued, there were three directives issued during our last meeting.

[00:18:03] As a reminder, staff was directed to look at the inventory of boards, committees, and commissions and identify any that are not legally required and have been inactive for over a year as of the date of the directive and to prepare a draft resolution or resolutions that dissolve any such boards, committees, or commissions for board consideration. This directive was assigned to the clerk's office, and we will follow up as soon as possible. Staff was also directed to review and propose a possible

[00:18:39] countywide maternal health action plan focused on prevention, screening, referrals, and coordinated review of serious maternal and infant health outcomes. Staff will bring recommendations back to the board for consideration. This directive was assigned to the Office of Executive Management and the Prince William Health District. Finally, staff was directed to review and establish a comprehensive human trafficking education program for community members and bring back recommendations for the board's consideration. This directive was assigned to our Office of Community Safety. There were no directives closed since our last meeting. In terms of communications

[00:19:19] to the board earlier today i sent the board a message that we will be publishing the county's first environmental sustainability annual report and that report will be published this month the report highlights key accomplishments catalyzed by the board's vision and strategic actions and the measurable progress made towards the county's climate goals really want to give a big thank you and shout out to Julia Mano and her entire team just for the phenomenal work and coordination. Many partners, many agencies are involved, and this is an absolutely phenomenal

[00:19:56] step forward really for the county. I also sent the board a message about the official launch of the Foundation and Soil Management Fund program. The customer outreach campaign began yesterday. The application period will begin on May 1st through June 15th.

[00:20:16] Staff will spend the summer reviewing and scoring applications, and we plan to bring applications back and recommendations for the board in the fall of 2026. And with that, Madam Chair, that is all for me.

[00:20:34] All right. Thank you so very much for the update. We don't see any speakers in queue, so we're going to go ahead and move on to agenda item number five. That's county attorney time. Ms. Strobel, the floor is yours. Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the board. This afternoon in closed session, we will have consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members pertaining to the discussions concerning an economic development items regarding a prospective businesses or industries where no previous announcement has been made of the businesses or industries interest in locating or expanding their facilities in the county, along with the discussion or consideration of the disposition of publicly held real property.

[00:21:09] All where discussions in an open meeting would adversely affect the litigating posture, bargaining position, or negotiating strategy of the public body. We will have consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members pertaining to the discussions concerning economic development items regarding an expansion of an existing businesses or industries where no previous announcement has been made of the businesses or industries interest in locating or expanding their facilities in the county, along with related discussions or considerations of the investment of public funds for economic

development matters, where competition or bargaining is involved, where if made public initially, the financial interest of the county would be adversely affected,

[00:21:46] along with the discussions or considerations of the disposition of publicly held real property, all where discussions in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position, litigating posture, and negotiating strategy of the public body. We will have consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members regarding the following actual litigation. Katie Burke et al. versus Board of County Supervisors et al.

[00:22:08] Circuit Court Case Number CL24-334. Court of Appeals Record Number 2025-24-4. Oak Valley Homeowners Association, Inc. et al. versus Prince William County Board of Supervisors et al. Circuit Court Case Number CL24-375. GW Acquisition Co. LLC et al. versus Oak Valley Homeowners Association, Inc. et al.

[00:22:30] Court of Appeals Record No. 1584-25-4 Board of County Supervisors of Prince William County et al. v. Oak Valley Homeowners Association, Inc. et al. Court of Appeals Record No. 1590-25-4 H&H Capital Acquisitions, LLC et al.

[00:22:46] v. Oak Valley Homeowners Association, Inc. Court of Appeals Record No. 1592-25-4 Underwood Family Farm, LLC v. Prince William County Circuit Court Case No. CL 24005849 Pageland Farm Associates v. Prince William County, circuit court case number CL24005849-01.

[00:23:11] Thomas D. Ackerley Jr. v. Prince William County, Prince William circuit court case number CL24005849-02. Hishamna Abolasim as trustees for Aja Abolasim Trust and Prince William County circuit court case number CL24005849-02.

[00:23:32] 849-03. Syed L. Ali versus Prince William County, circuit court case number CL 24005849-04. David Mitchell is trustee for the Kimberly and David Mitchell 2021 Irrevocable Trust versus Prince William County, circuit court case number CL 24005849-05.

[00:23:51] Pageland Limited Liability Company v. Prince William County, circuit court case number CL24005849-06, Barbara Brower v. Prince William County, circuit court case number CL24005849-07, Gary D. Lawson and Mary E. Lawson v. Prince William County, circuit court case number CL24005849-08, Frank E. Surface and Sandra H. Surface v. Prince William County, circuit court case number CL 24005849-09.

[00:24:26] Garland Williams and Melanie Williams v. Prince William County, circuit court case number CL 24005849-10. Kenneth S. Bland and Nicole S. Bland v. Prince William County, circuit court case number CL 24005849-11.

[00:24:42] Paige S. Snyder as trustee of the Paige S. Snyder Revocable Trust v. Prince William County. Circuit Court case number CL 24005849-12. Phyllis W. Thompson as trustee of the Thomas F. Thompson and Phyllis W. Thompson Joint Trust Agreement dated August 26, 2015 v. Prince William County.

[00:25:02] Circuit Court case number CL 24005849-13. Marianne Gadban as trustee for the Marianne Gadban Revocable Living Trust of November 7, 2001 versus Prince William County, circuit court case number CL24005849-14.

[00:25:19] Fay M. Howard as trustee of the Fay M. Howard Trust Agreement dated May 31, 2017 versus Prince William County, circuit court case number CL24005849-15. William A. Becker, trustee et al. v. Prince William County, circuit court case number CL25-2434.

[00:25:39] Along with the accompanying consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel pertaining to land use law and litigation and real estate assessment law and litigation, where such consultation, discussion, or briefing in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position, negotiating strategy, or litigating posture of the public body.

[00:26:01] We will have consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel pertaining to the Freedom of Information Act and the attorney-client privilege and the attorney-work product doctrine, where such consultation, discussion, or briefing in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position, negotiating strategy, or litigating posture of the public body.

[00:26:23] And finally, we will have a personnel matter regarding the appointments to the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission. All these items are appropriate for closed session pursuant to 2.2-3711A13567 and 8 of the Virginia Code.

[00:26:39] So moved. Second. It's been moving to second it. Let's go ahead and take our votes. Vote unanimous.

[00:26:55] All right. Thank you so much. We are going to take a short break to go into closed session, and then we will be back to resubmit budget markup. Thank you. Closed meeting.

[00:27:11] So moved. Second. It has been properly moved and seconded. Let's go ahead and take our votes. Vote unanimous.

[00:27:34] All right, thank you very much. We have, I believe, four things to report. I'm sorry, Supervisor Vega, were you on cue? Okay, you were. Okay, now you're gone. So, Supervisor Gordy. Thank you, Madam Chair. I move that we authorize a public hearing to consider approving the sale agreement with Patriot Properties, LLC, for approximately 1.25 acres of county-owned property located at 9349 Hornbaker Road, Manassas, Virginia, 20109 in the Brentsville Magisterial District.

[00:28:04] Second. It's been probably moved and seconded. Any discussion? All right, let's go ahead and take our vote. Vote unanimous. All right, we have another item.

[00:28:20] Mr. Gordy? I also move that we authorize a public hearing to consider approving the sale agreement with Hales Castle LLC for approximately 1.25 acres of county-owned property located at 9349 Hornbaker Road, Manassas, Virginia, 20109 of Brentsville Magisterial District.

[00:28:37] Second. We're only moving to second it. Let's go ahead and take our vote. Vote unanimous. All right. We have our third one, Supervisor Angry.

[00:28:54] Thank you, Madam Chair. I motion that we appoint Supervisor Yesley Vega to serve as a regular member of the Potomac and Rapidhandic Transportation Commission. Second. You beat me to that one. All right. Congratulations, Supervisor Vega.

[00:29:10] Let's take our votes. Motion passes unanimously. Supervisor Vega abstaining from vote. All right, and then our next motion.

[00:29:28] Thank you, Madam Chair. I motion that we direct the county attorney to and outside legal counsel not to file a petition for a writ of appeal to the Virginia Supreme Court on the Virginia Circuit of Appeals decision issued on March 31st, 2026, regarding the two digital gateway rezoning lawsuits.

[00:29:49] Katie Burke, et al., versus Board of County Supervisors of Prince William County, et al., and Board of County Supervisors of Prince William County, et al., v. Oak Valley Homeowners Association, et al., Courts of Appeals Records, numbers 1590-25-4, 1584-25-4, 1592-25-4, and 2025-24-4 Gainesville Magisterial District.

[00:30:20] Whereas on March 31, 2026, the Virginia Court of Appeals issued its decision regarding the two digital gateway rezoning lawsuits, Katie Burke, et al., versus Board of County Supervisors of Prince William County, et al., and Board of County Supervisors of Prince William County, et al., v. Oak Valley Homeowners Association, et al., Court of Appeals record numbers 1590-25-4, 1584-25-4, 1592-25-4, and 2025-24-4.

[00:30:54] Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Prince William Board of County Supervisors that the county attorney and outside legal counsel are directed not to file a petition for a writ of appeals to the Virginia Supreme Court or the Virginia Circuit Court of Appeals decision issued on march 31st 2026 regarding the two digital gateway rezoning lawsuits katie burke et al v board of county supervisors versus prince william county et al and board of county supervisors versus prince william county et al v oak valley homeowners association et al

[00:31:28] court of appeals records numbers 1590-25-4 1584-25-4 1592-25-4 and 2025-24-4. Be it further resolved that the board acknowledges and understands that if the board of county is ordered or directed by the Virginia Supreme Court, Virginia Court of Appeals, or Circuit Court to file a pleading brief or other document with the court, appear before the court, or take some action related to any further litigation, even though the board did not file a petition

[00:32:05] for a writ of appeal of the court of appeals decisions the county attorney and outside legal counsel will do will to do so in compliance with the court's order or decision thank you madam chair motion seconded let's go ahead and take our vote unanimous all right thank you very much we are going to move into supervisor's time i'm going to get this kind of an outline first

[00:32:41] we have taken action at our last board meeting on april 7th on the three action items action items a action item b and action item c before we move into markup i do have some coia statements um victor i'll give you a moment to let you recover from that supervisor bode if you would like to read your statement sure thank you madam chair before the board budget markup i need to declare a personal interest in this matter 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 this matter because i am able to do so fairly objectively in the public interest. Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, before budget markup, I need to declare a personal

[00:33:20] interest in this matter. 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 this matter because I am able to do so fairly, objectively, and in the public interest. Thank you, Madam Chair. All right. Thank you so very much. I just want to go over a couple ground rules before we get into markup. We are going to be doing straw polls. So when I come, and I will explain the order which y'all will go through things but we are going to have to state our preferences and there will be a roll call vote there may be times where we need to take breaks for staff to do calculations and

[00:33:55] the staff will be budgeting making sure that everything balances out five years that is something that is required for our annual budget we also may take breaks depending on how long things

go if we're going to need it as a board collectively need to eat or just rest what we're going to do is we're going to begin with supervisor statements. Everyone can state what it is that their goals are that they want to achieve. That would be three months each. Then we are going to go ahead and set the C&P tax rate. After that, we're going to go into the real estate tax rate.

[00:34:28] Third will be the meals and beverage tax, which is an ordinance. It is not something that we had to advertise. And we will get into that when we discuss that. And then we will have to talk about all other taxes or go ahead and approve all other taxes as advertised once we are finished with that b poll that was something we brought up and we need to land the plane um so we will talk about that another thing i have added i would also like to revisit the bond referendum that was a discussion we had last week i know that i emailed several people on the board with some considerations that have come up about that we will then talk about potential cost savings are there things that we

[00:35:06] may want to um take out of the budget again that will be a collective discussion and finally we'll get into recap and items of board interest if there is something that we feel should be in the budget uh we will do that last so with that madam chair sorry i apologize i don't think i heard you clearly with regards to the the food and beverage tax that would require a public hearing is that what you said i said it's an ordinance and we'll get into that latest right yes i thought you said it didn't require and so i apologize i misheard you thank you you know what it's nice to have the

[00:35:39] attorney at the end to keep you in check so with that i am going to actually start um at the far end i will start with supervisor gordy you're ready for a minute i didn't see you i was like did he leave all right supervisor gordy if you would start with um your statement yeah madam chair i'm just going to keep this real fast um you know we we have collected over uh 550 million dollars from the data centers and we've been telling our communities and our citizens that this is going to help provide tax relief for them and diversify our tax base. It's time for us to

[00:36:15] honor that commitment and so I'm hopeful that through this today and next week we can honor that commitment with meaningful tax relief to our residents through their real estate taxes and potentially other tax relief measures. I also have interest in revisiting and discussing our salaries and our FTEs as it relates to our Sheriff's Department and ADC.

[00:36:43] Other than that, I'll keep it there and let my other colleagues share their priorities. Thank you. Senator LaCroix. Once again, I'm wearing my citizen's hat, And I think I've talked to everybody here about what the citizens want from us. And they want to know that we are doing and making good decisions on behalf of them.

[00:37:04] And many years ago when we started getting the data centers year after year, we were saying that they were going to mean a tax break for our citizens. And that just hasn't happened. Every year it's maybe tomorrow or maybe another year. And I know that the county has worked really hard on the budget and they got a certain amount of money and they want to place it all together and it's spent.

[00:37:29] But really what I would like for us to do, and I'm just going to be consistent with it, is every department buckle up a little bit more and allow us to give some money back to our citizens because they are paying more.

[00:37:48] And I'm a real estate agent and we talk about affordable housing, but now really we need to talk about affordable living because as long as we're going to continue to be taxing our citizens more and more

and more, they're not going to be able to afford to live here.

[00:38:06] And like I said, even with the children, I love the schools, I love giving money to the schools, but if the kids can no longer afford to live here, what is the point? And so that's what I'm going to discuss every time. I'm going to be wearing a citizen's hat and thinking, what would I want me to do for my children and for myself?

[00:38:29] And I'm going to replace that for you. Thank you. Supervisor Vega. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to start off by thanking the county executive, Mr. Shorter, for putting together the budget that he presented to this board. I want to thank Dave and the team. Dave, I know that at least my office has pestered you with questions and you've responded in a timely matter.

[00:38:51] And I know that running numbers isn't always easy, but thank you for, again, your commitment, not just to this board, but to the taxpayers of this county. With that, I also want to thank everybody throughout the county who took the time to fill out our survey. We had over 500 folks partake in that survey throughout the entire county.

[00:39:08] And the message has been very clear. I shared the results of those surveys, of the survey, sorry, on social media through mass email. And I just want to thank you all for letting this board know what this budget should look like. And it should be a budget that reflects your priorities, that of your families, but most importantly, that addresses the issues that not just folks in this county are facing, but throughout our country.

[00:39:32] But I want to make the emphasis that this board governs here in Prince William County and that what transpires today will be our responsibility in ensuring that we actually provide relief to the taxpayers of this county, that we actually start helping improve the affordability issues that we've been having here for a very long time.

[00:39:51] As Supervisor Gordy stated, the obvious is that the data center industry has injected our coffers with \$550 million in new revenue. That is one industry alone. This budget cycle is the one where we are able, capable, and in a position to provide meaningful tax relief to you, the taxpayers of this county.

[00:40:16] I look forward to the open dialogue. I hope that we all come with an open mind to ensure that we put forth a budget that reflects the interests of the people that have elected us to be their voice and their representatives on this dais. I think, Madam Chair, that talking about the \$550 million in new revenue is important because that's the biggest portion of the revenue generated, but it's not the only one.

[00:40:38] I put forth a budget that addresses the real estate rate, providing meaningful real relief that ends the meals tax while transferring a historic \$1 billion transfer to our schools. Anybody that refers to that as a cut, I don't know what to tell you.

[00:40:57] But, again, I'm thankful for the data. The data has guided at least my budget proposal, and I look forward to the further conversations that we're going to have. Thank you, Madam Chair. Supervisor Angry. Thank you, Madam Chair. And, Supervisor Vega, thank you for the thank yous to the crew. That's a lot to go through.

[00:41:14] I'll simply say, Mr. Schroeder, thanks for giving us this budget. You do it every year. I'm going to start by saying what I always say, how did we get here? So, in 2019, when I got on this board, under the

leadership of Corey Stewart at that time, There was a resolution that was put forth to hold the data center tax at its current rate as it was, and he wanted to max it out in that first year.

[00:41:38] So I was that outlying vote that kept it down to where it was. A couple of years later, we were able to slowly start growing that growth of the data center revenue from the C&P tax. I have been saying since 2020, not now, not now, not now, on lowering the residential tax.

[00:41:56] But I will also say since 2020, that tax was \$1.20, and it has gone down every year since. So it has shown decrease, just not the amount that we know our citizens want to see. I'm proud to say, and I will say this right now, that this year my focus is on the citizens.

[00:42:16] And I believe we have the revenue generated to really show the impact of what significant changes or decrease looks like for our citizens. So I'm all in on lowering the tax for our residential taxes for our citizens. Same time, I'm also not interested at the time, because I understand that's going to be a significant cut out of the proposed budget that has been presented.

[00:42:38] So I'm not interested right now at this time to lower or get rid of the mails tax. I'll save that discussion for another time. I also will say simply that, well, I'm kind of losing my train of thought, But what I'll do, I'll get back to it as we get into the discussion of all of these incentives and tax cuts.

[00:43:00] But I'm excited that this year my sole focus completely is to look at our residential taxes. I want to start there, and then we'll work down the line to the rest of the issues. Thanks, Madam Chair. Thank you. Supervisor Bode. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll just ditto a lot of what was said in terms of thank yous. Thank you to the staff.

[00:43:16] Thank you to County Exec Shorter for his leadership, as always. Thank you for all the folks that go as hidden figures that help work through the budget process, Not just from February to April, but throughout the entire year because we know that this sausage gets made behind the scenes almost throughout the entire year. So I wanted to say that.

[00:43:32] Also wanted to thank all the citizens that have come to us either through emails, through surveys, but also just out in the ecosystem. I know all of us have the distinct pleasure of we go to the supermarket. Someone might recognize us. We're in the line somewhere at the grocery store and people say, hey, aren't you so-and-so?

[00:43:52] Can I have asked you a question? I always, once a local one's, hey, can I ask you a question because we don't know where that's going to go, but especially during budget season, it's a great opportunity to engage and ask folks, not only anecdotally, but just from their lived experience, what they feel like our budget should do as it's a statement of our values as a county.

[00:44:08] To that end, I'm going to agree with a lot of what my colleagues have already said. You know, we have talked about the ability for us to diversify our tax base, for us to bring in economic developments, not just the data centers, but other business ventures that we've been able to bring this county over the last five or six years have been able to do that.

[00:44:26] We're in a place we're able to not only look at right now, providing some relief for our residents, but also really invest in places this county has been unable to for a long time under the county execs leadership and other folks who have been with the county for quite some time.

[00:44:42] we may be able to lean in on the people that help deliver services in this county. Are they public safety, social workers, planners, clerks, all the rank and file folks that just are under the hood of this county every single day? We may be able to make those investments and do so in a meaningful way without overburdening the taxpayers.

[00:45:01] But as some of my colleagues have said, we have an opportunity this year to really lean into one source of concern and strain for families across this county. You know, last year we tried to do sort of an all-of-the-above approach. Folks felt a little bit here and there, but I don't think that folks really felt that in a meaningful way.

[00:45:18] So I think that this year, and I'll piggyback my colleagues, we should focus on one area that no one has control over, which is having a place to live in, that's your rent, your mortgage, and also for businesses, if you rent or you own your space, having to pay real estate on those areas as well.

[00:45:34] So I'm very interested in having a conversation with this board today on really leaning in and lowering the real estate tax rate, because that will really help all folks of all stripes, again, on a fundamental thing of whether it's your business or especially your home, you'll be able to see real relief there. So really looking forward to that conversation. Thank you, Madam Chair. Supervisor Stewart. Thank you, Madam Chair. So my number one priority is, and just to kind of echo the rest of the board, is real property tax relief. I think it's important. I think with the macro point of view of the

[00:46:13] economic headwinds that we're currently dealing with today and those yet to come, we need to provide our neighbors with the best financial footing possible that we can provide.

[00:46:30] There have been promises made around this ever since the first red carpet was rolled out for data centers to come to Prince William County. And now it's time for promises kept. A half a billion dollars is, as we say, not no money, right? And I think that that needs to really go back to our neighbors as a form of real relief in and around property taxes. Also, I think it's

[00:47:03] important that the data centers continue to pay to play. They are here. We can't lift up one side of the building, neither can they, to move somewhere else. You know, as a guy in jail said, you're locked in here with me. I'm locked in here with you. We're in this together. You know, let's dance. So I'm fully in support of the \$4.50 C&P tax. And I think that's a good start.

[00:47:34] When you look at the fact that this is the single wealthiest industry on the planet, they can more than afford it. That's the other part. I think we need to keep our schools fully funded uh we we you know there was some there was some hiccups in and around you know the way that i think their their budget was initially uh uh presented but you know we we have to we have to do certain things in order to as well maintain our triple a uh credit rating

[00:48:09] we can't kick a bill off to um our neighbors because we lose our investment grade status well the highest grade of investment grade status as as as a county and you know again looking at the macro economic point of view and and the and the uh financial headwinds that we're about to face or or and are currently facing you know i i think while you know trimming the meal tax a little bit is a good idea i i think it's a it should take a back seat to other priorities first and i agree

[00:48:46] with Supervisor Angry with really attacking the property tax issue first. Thank you. All right, Supervisor Bailey. Thank you, Madam Chair. Let me start off again, as my colleagues have said, thanking our CXO and his staff for the brilliant job that you continually do to keep us abreast of how we're supposed

to go through this process. Each year you make it a little bit easier for us to digest and to make these decisions for our public, for our community.

[00:49:19] And so we're very much appreciative of that. Let me also say that I agree with my colleagues when we talk about providing for our communities. Now's the time that we really need to focus on providing for our residents, and it is a good time.

[00:49:38] We are very fortunate that it's a good time that we could talk about the fact that we do have enough money in the coffers to do that and to partner with our community in doing that. So I'm very much interested in reducing the real estate tax. I'm also interested in maintaining and making sure that it is a partnership between the said industry of data centers and the board and the community.

[00:50:03] I think not just to pay to play, but the data center industry lives here also. And so I think it's very important that they take responsibility for living here as well and partnering with us to make sure that the provisions that we need for our citizens are provided.

[00:50:21] That is very interesting for me along with my colleagues, but I think we bode well when we build partnerships for everyone. So also I think our schools should be fully funded. We are raising and crafting the next generation to take over these seats and your houses as we move forward.

[00:50:41] And that's real important in how we pour into them to make sure that we make them whole. The other thing that I'm interested in is the AAA bond rating. Michelle Atreid, thank you for your service if you're watching. Thank you for the team, the new CFO. One of the things that I always ask Michelle Atreid, how's our AAA bond rating?

[00:50:59] So we have to protect that to show that we're good stewards of the monies that we have. Also, we need to focus on making sure and protecting that AAA bond rating that we have enough reserves in our coffers as we go through this trying time of what's going to come from the state and what's going to come from the feds.

[00:51:16] We don't know. So that is the crux of where I'm going. I also want to make sure that we really focus on reducing, if we can, and working with the CXO, the FTEs that we are providing for.

[00:51:32] And in closing, I'll say, in doing so, we have been really focused on making sure that we take care of our county, recruiting and retaining. Now I think it's time for us to stabilize and retain and focus on the individuals, protecting them as we always do, But making sure as we go forward that we are using those marketing studies, the classification and compensation studies that we've done, that we are really working that to the nth degree and making sure we're retaining what we have.

[00:52:03] Thank you, Madam Chair. So I'm just going to offer a few words. A lot of what I want to say has already been said. And, again, I do have to start with thanking staff. Mr. Fun, I appreciate all your guidance. You know, Mr. Fun, he has another nickname. Mr. Fun and everyone else, Mr. Shorter, your team, everyone who is working, you know, Leslie, this is your first time, you know, going through this with us. Thank you. So affordability is really the issue that we are trying to tackle with the rising cost of living. How do we best do that? How do we best ensure that Prince William County continues to be an affordable

[00:52:41] place to live? Over the nearly 11 years that I've been here, it has changed so much. A single mom like me was able to purchase property in Prince William County. And I was working in the public

sector at that time. I was working as an aide on Capitol Hill. I don't know if that opportunity really exists for people who would have been in my position. That's something I think about a lot.

[00:53:07] So obviously attacking the real estate tax rate, what can we do for homeowners? But affordability isn't just limited to homeowners. We have a lot of people who are renters who are not feeling that actual decrease and that's a concern. One of the things I have mentioned and I have been very vocal in wanting to phase out or eliminate completely the meals tax. It's hurting our restaurant industry and they already operate under razor thin margins. Let's not make it harder and that's also a quality

[00:53:40] of life issue. It's a quality of life. People want to have places to go to have special celebrations, a birthday, an anniversary, hanging out with friends and I've surveyed the board. I know that that might be a tougher lift but that is something I think that is really important and when we want to talk about jobs Glory Days employs more people in their restaurants than a data center. I just wanted to point that out. I had a great conversation with some restaurateurs last week to understand their challenges and their struggles. Another priority is also mentioned is the financial health

[00:54:17] of our county. We're going to have to put more reserves and we are going to have to talk about our debt. We had a conversation last week and I mentioned it again that we are going to have to talking about the bond referendum and possibly deferring that till next year but i want to get into that at a later time if we are going to do all the things that we want to do we're going to have to say no to a lot of things and we're going to have to be intentional we're all going to have to think about what is the county what is the county going to look like but we are going to have to say no to a lot of things because we can't be all things to all people so i'm excited for

[00:54:54] this discussion to begin mr seclair if you could step forward i would like to go i'm going to be working off again as I have in years past the budget recap document because it's easier for us to visualize everything so if you can go to page 20 and that is the business tangible personal

[00:55:11] property tax computer equipment and peripherals if you can start there and so if anyone has any discussion or any questions that they you know go ahead I see supervisor Bodie in there but again And we are going to be doing straw votes.

[00:55:47] And it's going to be a recall, sorry, roll call with Andrea Banton. So, Supervisor Bode. Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't really have any questions for staff. I think we've tread on this pretty well. So, I sort of had sort of a two-part sort of proposal for folks for this.

[00:56:05] The first is just to say that I would like us to have it set at 450. Supervisor LaCroix. I appreciate that position. However, like I said before, I represent Woodbridge, and representing Woodbridge means that I am representing the people that are hurting and are the least fortunate within the county.

[00:56:34] And a lot of my people have small businesses, and even though this will gather some of the data center people, and I get it, but it will hurt some of my smaller businesses, so I would like to keep it where it is at 415.

[00:56:50] supervisor um stewart simply put 450 gordy um so um to kind of piggyback off um supervisor la croix so if we raise the cmp tax we also have to raise the the tax on trailers and other is that number inclusive of the tax the increase on uh that uh personal property tax yeah the cmp But if we raise the C&P tax, we also have to raise the general.

[00:57:29] And so the question I'm trying to get to is, are these numbers reflective of just C&P or all taxes that would be affected by increasing this rate? You see on this slide is just C&P.

[00:57:45] Okay. And do we have the number for what will happen to, and that gets to, you know, the other businesses that get impacted potentially and even residents on trailers and other equipment? Can you speak to what that impact is? Let me try to research that.

[00:58:02] Okay. Okay. Thank you. I just want to know why you're reaching. I think that we talked about that in finance and budget. So I'm also going to be looking for that. Supervisor Vega. Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to make a recommendation. I know that we have the order, but I think that if we started first by tackling the rate, the real estate rate, it gives us a better idea of which direction to go with in terms of what monies we're playing with.

[00:58:26] And so maybe we go down the line and say what our proposed rate is, and I think that that would better guide the conversation. I think with, and so we've started the past couple years with C&P because that has also helped us go back and, you know, how much money we could be capturing overall.

[00:58:43] well I will also say that I mean last year we got stuck in it and we had to have additional discussions so if you know you want to go back or if it is the will of this board if we make a decision but we're saying hey we might need to play around a little bit we can go back I mean keep in mind that this is an open discussion that unfortunately we're not really able other than on the day is to have these conversations in person so and that's fair I just saw some of my colleagues nodding yes in terms of wanting to do the um real estate tax first so i'm not sure if you want to get additional feedback if there's consensus i i don't know if anyone i'm happy with cnp tax cmp

[00:59:22] cmp cmp what i'm sorry real estate real estate you want to do real estate yes yes all right so we have one real estate real estate real estate so we hit we're four four unless anyone else you want to do real estate okay so then let's go to let's go over to slide 18 so i guess what we're

[00:59:56] doing is we might be looking backwards i'm sorry mr sinclair i'm sorry i had developed a new uh summary matrix um that includes other rates do you want me to call that up yes all right thank you and so this shows where we would be with each of the rate cuts and how deep we can get

[01:00:29] um with some of our cuts so supervisor angry i see that you're in the queue so okay then And Supervisor Stewart, did you want to talk about residential? Yes.

[01:00:45] Where I'm at is at, you know, and I've got a little bit of flexibility, but, you know, I'm at 870. So, okay, you are at? 0.87, no.

[01:01:02] 0.87, so. And I'm just going to note this so that I can keep track. You're 870. Anyone else want to discuss or volunteer? Supervisor Bode Vega. Yeah, thank you, Madam Chairman.

[01:01:19] I'm also at 870. 7-0, Vega. Oh, wait. Ooh, Gordy, how did you jump in like that? I'm going to go Vega than Gordy. Madam Chair, I'm at 8-5. 8-5, Gordy? Yeah, I'm also at 8-5 because I think that gives more people.

[01:01:40] Because, I mean, that number we're looking at is on the average tax bill. So that means if you're above the tax bill, above the average, you're probably still seeing an increase in your taxes. And so the more people that we can get as a tax reduction is what I'm looking for, and that's why I support 0.85.

[01:01:59] Supervisor LaCroix. I am so thankful, Dave, that you put the 8-4 on there because that's where I am, at 8-4. And the reason I'm there is because I'm hearing from a lot of my constituents that are telling me that they've lived in their house all their lives, they retired and they're on fixed incomes, and now they can't afford to stay there.

[01:02:21] and so I think we need to make a meaningful tax cut all right um angry or are you in the queue yeah I've spoken to everybody about this so I think that middle ground is 865 I mean I will sit at 85 and we'll see where it goes but I think that middle ground is 865 where we'll end up so all right Bailey um I I have flexibility but I'm at 0.870 but I do have flexibility in the

[01:02:55] discussion supervisor stewart thank you madam chair um after looking at one other thing in and around the budget i also can come in at 85 so i can do 87 but i will be honest with you i'm really concerned about doing a cut to the meals tax and this makes it a little harder so you know i want to have the discussion supervisor la croix you're there um even though it pains me to go up um if

[01:03:29] everybody else is okay with 0.85 i think that that will make a significant difference in their tax bill and i think it will look like we're supporting the citizens so i will go up to 8.5 all right so we have hold on right here a couple people who can swing you know steward is can do a couple things you're looking at me do you have anything you want to say i have five for 8.5 i have LaCroix, Vega, Gordy, Angry, and Stewart. All right, so then if we do 8-5, hold on, one,

[01:04:04] two, three, oh yeah, oh wait, I'm sorry, you're at 8-5, Angry? 8-5, I'm sorry, I thought you had said 8-6-5. One, two, three, four, five. So then we are at, hold on, I am so blind, 8-5. I don't know if there's any way to make that bigger, so that would be the one, that would be \$145 or a 2.80 reduction manager i'm sorry supervisor bailey and then la croix i could go 85 oh well i mean

[01:04:42] we're already there so super okay and um supervisor la croix so 85 carries the day so that if you guys just looking at that um that will be a 48.6 reduction in real in our revenue okay and so then with that we're gonna i guess people mr sinclair no just to summarize what what that means for the

[01:05:15] decisions made thus far at at 85 cent real estate tax rate uh compared to budget recap last week you're right it's a 48.6 million dollar reduction compared to the proposed budget at budget recap of that based on the current revenue sharing agreement the reduction to the county is 20.8 million dollars and the reduction in revenue compared to budget recap for the schools is 27.8 million okay so i'm just gonna write this so it looks like we are kind of reverse engineering this

[01:05:53] so are people ready for c and p tax discussion all right i'm sorry oh yes okay all right then let's go back to page or slide 20 all right then it has a table of where we you know how much

[01:06:29] additional revenue we would generate with each increase and the cnp tax rate and it looks like um obviously the higher we go the more revenue that we can generate for ourselves and for our schools so i have supervisor bode up first yeah i'll just reaffirm and say 450 all right bode's at 450 anyone else um vega bailey stewart thank you madam chair um when we uh went up to 415 it was under the promise that I would be supportive of it if we in fact provided real meaningful tax

[01:07:04] relief to the taxpayers of this county. With a consensus of us being at 8-5, we achieved that. However, you know, I want to be mindful of how we do this because we cannot continue to do this to one single industry. One of the things that we argued with the data center industry or one of the points that we try to make for a time there was that we did not want to put all of our eggs in one basket, yet here we are.

All of our eggs are, in fact, in one basket when you're talking about one industry and how much they're bringing into the county. And so while I do support the

[01:07:41] idea, you know, I want to see where everybody else is at. You know, we're going to have to give and take a little bit in other areas. I know that some of my colleagues are very sensitive when it comes to the revenue share agreement you know even if it's half a percent i'll put that out there i know that i started very aggressively initially with 50 50 i've spoken to the chairman of the school board and i know that 50 50 was do a for for him um but i do think that it's important that we have these conversations and just so that you guys you know can just think about it for a little um you know even if we did just one percent of the revenue share agreement that frees up

[01:08:18] an additional 20.4 million dollars just one percent if we do half a percent you can do the math you can split 20.3 uh four million dollars and a half and so i'm i'm supportive it's just that if we're going to do it here we have to be willing to do it there and i can compromise it could be a little bit but it shows good faith that we're sort of kind of moving in the right direction which is what i think the majority of us want for for next budget cycle supervisor bailey

[01:08:52] Thank you, Madam Chair. I would absolutely support the 450, but not go, depending on my colleagues, not go any lower than 430, but I'm for the 450. I think that we have another opportunity if we, in just throwing out ideas of where we can pick up more revenue, we have another opportunity as it relates to the FTEs of having an additional \$15 million in the budget.

[01:09:26] And I would recommend and suggest if we could stabilize, and that's what I meant earlier in my statement, And if we could stabilize and really not focus on the compensation market adjustment right now, postpone that until maybe next year, the adjustment and classification compensation study, that's \$15 million that we could put back in the budget.

[01:09:52] So for the – sorry, Madam Chair. Supervisor Bay. So the first piece that you said about the FTEs, what's that price tag? Savings? That's savings. What would it be, \$15? \$15 million. Okay, and then – and then do the \$450,000. That's my preference. So I want to actually go into that later when we talk about cuts because one of the things I'm going to propose is for some of our new hires to wait until January 1st because that will be additional savings.

[01:10:19] I agree with you, Madam Chair. But with the time that I have, if I may. Yes, go on. I really want to make sure that we consider that, you know, because I think what we need to do with our staff, We need to stabilize and make sure that they're whole, but stabilize and make sure that the county exec has what he needs to manage the future of what we're doing.

[01:10:46] But we've done a lot of studies on compensation and classification, and we've done very well with those. So I just want to put that out there. But going back to the C&P, to the peripheral tax, the \$450, I think, as I said earlier, as we maintain with this industry and make them a part of the community and the decisions that we're making, \$4.50 is where I would like for us to stay.

[01:11:16] All right, Supervisor Stewart. So I agree with Supervisor Bailey about this. You know, just doing a little bit of back of the napkin math with the market adjustment. you know, freeing up \$15 million and the CMP giving us \$21.47 million that pays for that more than repairs the \$27 million loss, um, of a 0.85, you know, that naturally nets us out about \$9 million. So that we didn't have by the beginning of this conversation. Madam chair, if I could just

[01:11:54] at that point. Oh, wait, hold on. I'm sorry, because I do, I will call on you. I do want to go to download Q, Supervisor Angry. Yeah, thank you, Madam Chair, because I can see now this is going to start getting all over the place because everybody's on the piece of it. But I want to stick at the C&P first because that's where we started, and folks are saying 450.

[01:12:13] And I just want to remind this board, like, let's address the elephant in the room, and the fact of the matter is everyone wants to take, take, take from the industry, and we get it because the data center industry has bought this revenue. They're having challenges all over the place now because people are seeing this revenue.

[01:12:30] I just want to be mindful about how you bring industries into the county. Leadership is about trust and honesty. And if we say we're going to do something, we should stick to that. So we're moving numbers around, and I don't even know how many of us has actually talked to the industry about it, just trying to get more and more and more.

[01:12:47] I think those are still discussions you have to have within the industry because they still have to do things on their end, and it's probably going to end up with the end user on getting this increase of what we're doing. And who is the end user? probably are saying taxpayers that we're saving funding on right now to lower the taxes.

[01:13:02] So I think this is a whole circle that we should really have real conversations about before we just elevate these numbers. Now, I will say this because I literally just talked about trying to get our residents down to a great tax savings. And if, in fact, it means that we have to raise this revenue to make these balances because there's other areas that I'm not willing to budge on, I would be interested in a conversation of it.

[01:13:23] But I don't think we need to be at that 450 mark out the gate. We're at 415 now, whether you add a nickel or a dime, still makes a significant change on both of these industries, our side and their side. But I'm willing to have that conversation as we finish out this conversation about what these numbers look like based on, you know, staff cuts, you know, other revenues coming through.

[01:13:46] So when we have that, I'll come back and look at that piece. So I want to come back to that on what you said. You know, I definitely I want to go down the line, make sure I'm hearing everyone. Supervisor Gordy. Um, so, you know, look, I'm all for getting out data centers, what we can get out of them within reason. Um, but I also don't want unintended consequences. And so I'd like to go back to Mr. Sinclair to see if how this affects the, the other taxes that would have to be raised on our citizens. So based on some analysis that staff did, um, I believe it was

[01:14:24] you supervisor gordy that asked for the average trailer bill and how that would change um the revenue pickup from the the trailer and the general classification i'm coming up with 228 000 increase if the rate was changed from 415 to 450 so total across the board all everyone across the board about 228 000 that's the net effect of that that's my understanding based on what i'm looking at right now okay all right thank you um madam chair may i colloquy with uh supervisor

[01:15:00] bode have a have a conversation between since no one else is in queue i will go ahead and allow my time like that fast all right so go ahead no one else is in queue just go this is a boardy time so so um uh when you first brought this up and you and i first had a conversation and you said earlier there's a

second part to this um which included some level of commitment of funding to certain things that would be exempt from the revenue sharing agreement yes

[01:15:36] sir is that still your intent it is okay all right uh that's all i have thank you all right i want to go back i mean there are a few people you know who haven't um given numbers but i do want to go back to something Supervisor Angry said, because we do keep going to data centers and raising the tax, raising the tax. And it was really important for me to make sure that we are on par with neighboring jurisdictions. I do think that the C&P tax for too long was too low. And I think that we have reached parity. The question is, are we going to keep raising that rate every year and out of

[01:16:12] the blue? And that's, for me, a discussion point that we're going to need to have. I'm comfortable people with let's see the 450 so that's one two three four five people right there but I do want to continue this conversation and hear where people are at because I'm going to go to Stuart first because he jumped but then then I'm going to go to you because that I don't want to just keep coming out every year and just with big increases we are going to need to have more conversations around this a better place may be finance and budget committee like when we start talking about the next budget and maybe start signaling to people with the increases that we are looking

[01:16:49] to do if we're doing any because we do keep raising their rate and you're right we do people need to see what they're getting out of it what's happening with them but we also have to make sure that there are unintended consequences because they may be on a different fiscal year or a calendar year and they're putting a squeeze wait a minute we've got to charge you know either some of them again who are co-located facilities may have to eat the cost and it's not easy to um pass on to consumer i mean and you know to their to their clients so i do want to continue that conversation i'm going to go to well stewart you should have put yourself in i'll go stewart angry bailey

[01:17:29] so just some numbers so according to um fortune business insights so in 2025 this was a 270 \$170 billion a year industry as far as revenue is concerned. They jumped in 2026 to \$300 billion and they're projected by 2034, eight years from now, to be just around \$699 billion. And then the next year hit a trillion dollars. They can't build these buildings fast enough.

[01:18:06] This is a gargantuanly fast revenue generating business that is right now just insatiable when it comes to energy, when it comes to water. And in Gainesville, we are being disproportionately affected by everybody else in the county.

[01:18:30] We live with them. We see them. We hear them. We drive by them. And our families live and learn in the shadow of them. And if they're going to be good neighbors, it's time to have them open their wallet. I'm telling you right now, they can afford it. They can't build these places fast enough. And they can afford it.

[01:19:00] And I'm going to say something, it's a little provocative, but we could go to \$10 and they still wouldn't miss it. It's ashtray and the car money for them. They can afford it.

[01:19:17] And so I don't want to worry about \$4.50 as it's on the record, as everybody heard on this dais. I wanted to go to \$5 because they would laugh at us at \$5. So I think we're good at \$4.50.

[01:19:36] Thanks. supervisor angry let me let me let me just say this and be clear the show is called american greed okay the question is how much of this money do we need if neighboring jurisdictions are at a rate that they're set at do do we need to be there what is their budget what is our budget the question is

how much do we need in our budget to do the work that we need to do in this county for our citizens at that rate we just because we can go there doesn't mean we go there that is not that is not professional that is not what leaders do like we need to figure out what it is we're chasing

[01:20:11] set a number get there and go from there like just because we can doesn't mean we should i'm just let's start there folks this is an industry god they make a lot of money do we need all their money well how much do we need of that to get what we need done done and are we doing too much right now in the first place so let's look at all this i've been saying we need to look at efficiencies even in our government you know how many employees we have in staffing and departments the whole overall system needs an overhaul okay and then we can start there and then figure out

[01:20:45] what we actually need and not just get because we can okay supervisor bailey thank you very much madam chair i uh i agree leaders don't do that uh what leaders do is they do what you said earlier supervisor angry they have conversations with their business partners to uh to talk about the direction that we're all going and that that is in fact what uh i don't think that they are surprised because that is in fact what has happened we've had those conversations uh but i think we

[01:21:21] should make them a part of the solution rather than they were invited into the county in the 90s They just sat here for a minute. Nobody knew they were here. Now they're here. Now we know they're a cash cow. I'll just say it. But we don't want to treat them like that because they live here also.

[01:21:41] So how do we build the partnership? And one of the things, you know, this is off the beaten path, but this is something that I brought forth. What we do in fairness to them, we create, quote unquote, and county attorney keep me safe, a collective, a community business agreement.

[01:22:04] As an example, not saying that's what we do, but that's why I presented that, because we need to make them a part of the solution, not a part of the problem that we've incurred. And so with that, I don't think that they would be surprised, but I think we do, all of us on the dais need to have those conversations and those relationships, so they're not surprised.

[01:22:26] And they do know that we're making them a part of living in this community as they're building in this community, as we do with our small businesses. We do that. And so I don't think, you know, that's why I gave the scale, 430 to 450.

[01:22:42] I'm in favor of 450. And to what you said, Madam Chair, I don't think that we keep raising it year after year after year. I think we project collectively what we're going to project or say and vote on with the straw poll because they're aware that it's coming.

[01:22:59] It's not that they're not aware. They are aware. But what we've not done is built the relationships to make them part of the community and have the accountability both ways. So I just wanted to say that because I agree with what both you and vice chair said, But it's how we've done it that's gotten us in a place where we are debating.

[01:23:24] I'm going to go to Bodie, then LaCroix. Yeah, thank you, Madam Chair. Appreciate the conversation so far. And so I just want to draw on a couple different beads that some of my colleagues have already said. So appreciate you, Supervisor Stewart. Like you said so well, this is an industry that has more money than God, and I've used that term before.

[01:23:40] At the same time, I appreciate some of my colleagues have said we have to provide some certainty to this industry to make sure that they know we're not just keep jacking up every year. I will say at the same time, we are here, at least in my opinion, because we wanted to finally sort of reach a point of equilibrium where folks, at least on the real estate side, whether they residences or businesses, don't see as nearly big shocks because even if there is a slightly bigger assessment, their base rate is already lower, so it's not going to be much of an impact.

[01:24:09] And to go back to something I know Suarez Agordi has talked about before, data centers also benefit from lower real estate tax rates. So I hate to say it this way. I mean, I don't know exactly where this point is, but if we're talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars or a couple million dollars in terms of racks and computers, but they're also then saving hundreds of thousands of dollars, not millions of dollars in the real estate tax bill at that point, us going down on real estate also helps them too.

[01:24:33] So this is not like they're only losing when we raise this if part of what we're doing is lowering the real estate tax rate. So I wanted to make sure people are sort of clear about that. The last thing I'll say about this is I think that, you know, if we go through with these rates as they are, I have no intention of going back to the well.

[01:24:52] I think that, you know, Sue Reservaiga said it well. We can't keep going back the same eggs in one basket. We have to find other ways to raise other revenues or figure out ways to cut to get to where we need to go to keep living affordable for our residences and our businesses. And the very last thing I'll say to go back to something that Supervisor Gordy asked me earlier in terms of exempting some of this from the revenue sharing agreement, I still want to put back forth on the table the idea of doing \$0.30 of this increased rate exempt from the revenue sharing agreement.

[01:25:24] Can we get a figure amount for that? Sure. Where is it? Yeah. So if you just go up from \$4.20 to \$5.50, yeah, that's... So, wait, hold on.

[01:25:40] I want to go back. I do we're going to go back and explore this a little bit more but I have other people in queue so I want to go to LaCroix then you Vega then Gordy so LaCroix well I just want to mention and thank you all for your opinions and I I'm learning while I go but one of the things that is caught up in here is the small businesses and once again I represent Woodbridge we have Bodie and I have a lot of marinas that are going to be hit with their trailers with this this tax too so even though I

[01:26:19] was at let's keep it the same I would go up a little bit but I just know that we're all talking about data centers but the smaller businesses are the unintentional consequences that are going to be hit with yet another tax and they're going to be upset with it and it's just like the meals tax If we keep going up in taxes like this, they're not going to be able to exist.

[01:26:46] And in the Woodbridge District, I have a responsibility to make sure that I'm fighting for them to stay alive. Because so many people in the Woodbridge District, especially the restaurants and the small businesses, are struggling to survive.

[01:27:02] So I know I'm sounding like a bleeding heart, but my job is to represent the people that have put me in this position. And like I said, I wish I could separate out and say, yes, we want more from the data centers, but we cannot do it. And it would be consequential to a lot of the businesses if we raised it a lot.

[01:27:22] So I don't mind coming up because I think that we all have been making decisions here that are supportive of the county and each other, our positions. But I'd like people to consider that I am wearing the Woodbridge hat, and the Woodbridge hat comes with a lot of people that are struggling.

[01:27:45] So what rate are you at right now? I will go up to the 425. All right, and I have a real quick question, Dave, before I get to the next person. What was the average trailer again for the average cost for the average trailer? Sorry, at which rate, 415 or 450?

[01:28:04] 450. The average bill would be around \$63. that would be an increase over the average bill at \$4.15 of \$54. So the increase in the average trailer would be about \$8.74.

[01:28:24] \$8.74 is the average increase. Okay. All right. Supervisor Vega. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm wondering, could we take a straw poll on interest to discuss the revenue share agreement?

[01:28:42] i mean i certainly when we finish this up i think that we can certainly do that i know that there are people who want to make changes so we can certainly i will add that to the list but let me go to supervisor gordy before i open that discussion well i'm still i i'm sorry oh you're still okay yeah and the reason why i say this i mean we could um i'll just approve my proposal and we go home within the next four minutes i'm not exaggerating but it would require that we um you know reclassify renegotiate that revenue share split um in my proposal if we did 2.4

[01:29:19] percent of the split which would put the schools at a new 54.8 percent the board of county supervisors gets 45.2 percent that gives us the 0.85 we completely get rid of the meals tax and everything is funded all right i'm all right sorry you're okay i'm still going i'm still going And so that's why I said we can literally go home in four or five minutes.

[01:29:46] But also, just want to be very clear, because we keep throwing terms out there. The data is the data. The numbers have been provided to us. My friends, my colleagues, it is not a cut. We are funding fully the future, our children, education, whichever term you want to use.

[01:30:03] It is not a cut. And so that's why I think that it's important. And again, that's my proposal. We get rid of the meals tax. Everything is funded with a split of 54.8% to 45.2%. Now, again, if that is not something that the majority is in agreement with, that's fine.

[01:30:21] If I understood correctly, though, I think there might be some interest in actually looking at the revenue share agreement because based on the percent that you want to go up, Supervisor Bodie, \$18 million would not get transferred to the schools, correct? And that is if we did the \$450 million.

[01:30:36] And just, Supervisor Angers, so you know, under my proposal, we leave the rate as it is to \$415 million also. if we did that split so there's room to negotiate again we can meet halfway or not we're sort of halfway i'm just putting that out there madam chair but i think it's important that we maybe do a straw poll because if the revenue share agreement is not in play then we can eliminate that right from a source of getting more funds into our coffers and the last point that i want well i still have two minutes and 38 seconds um you know we you mentioned debt when we look at the

[01:31:08] debt, the bulk of the debt is from the schools, right? And again, it's our budget. It's our process. I don't think that we need to be in a position where we're spending two hours scraping the bottom of the barrel because the funds are here. And while I understand that there's appetite also to add new taxes, we cannot tax our way out of improper spending. We have the revenue.

[01:31:33] If we make adjustments at home, if you, Madam Chair, as a single mother can make it and you do it's because you've tightened your your your pocketbook you've made modifications in your personal budget we can do that here tonight today hopefully we don't go into the night um and we can send a strong message not just for the taxpayers of this county but to the region that when funds are administered properly we can provide relief and we can tackle affordability issues so i appreciate that i am going to get into that after because i know you want to talk about changing the rate supervisor bode wants to exempt certain things so i do want to have a

[01:32:09] fuller discussion i'm sorry you want to go to um 54 yeah you want to change percent he's talking about having exemptions so i just want to if we can i most people have given me their rate but i would like everyone to state something for the record for full transparency reasons so supervisor are gordy and angry you are the last to have and given a rate so for the record okay um so i have a question for dave um so right now when we tax trailers it we have a point zero zero zero out to

[01:32:43] something um and and that is how we've established a very low personal property tax on on that equipment correct we're taxed the the rate of the rate of the amount of value associated with those trailers that we are taxing i'm i'm assuming that because of the general classification rate we have the the value of the trade the trailer right uh we divide that by 100 dollars of valuation

[01:33:17] and then we would apply the rate to that okay is there any because i know like but that but that's not something that we can change under state code or is that something that you know move the decimal point i would i would rely on i'm thinking out loud here dave so work with me i think we would need the county attorney to weigh in i need i need some assistance there all right we can come back

[01:33:51] to you come back to me all right um okay supervisor angry so you needed a rate yeah just what rate are you at yeah i'm gonna get back to him when he gets back to the or where are you at i'm gonna i have support with Supervisors of the Corps at the 415.

[01:34:08] What did you say? 425. 425. So you're 425. So, Gordy, I know you – do you want to wait? Do you want to – we can take a break then. She'll be back. Hold on. Before I see you – before you get your itchy finger, can you kind of give us projection of where we sit?

[01:34:28] If we go to 450 and we're at 85, do you have those numbers for us? Yes. So on the county side – Sorry, \$450 for C&P and \$0.85 for real estate. Where does that leave us right now?

[01:34:43] On the county side, the county would be in the hole \$11.4 million compared to budget recap. And on the school side, they would be \$15.5 million in the hole compared to budget recap.

[01:35:06] All right. Thank you so very much. I hear that my colleague, Supervisor Gordy, is conferring with the county attorney. Do you have any questions or anything you want to say? I will say this, and Supervisor Bode sort of took it from me, but we just gave the data centers, I would assume, based on previous conversations, if about 40% of our revenue, real estate taxes, are coming from industrial and commercial, And I'm estimating, you know, data centers, maybe about half that.

[01:35:42] We just gave them somewhere in the range of about \$10 million tax cut to the data centers in the county on this real estate tax cut. So on one hand, I'm happy to bring them back to level, but at the same time, I still have concerns about those second third order effects.

[01:36:08] And so waiting to see what options we have there. But I may be somewhere in that 425 to 435 range pending future information.

[01:36:24] All right. So we can always go back to things. But right now, it looks like Bodie is at 450. Bailey can do 430 to 450. Vega is 450. Stewart's 450. I'm sorry. You're not 450? I never said 450. I said I was open to the idea.

[01:36:40] Open to the idea. So where are you? Once we figure out where we are with the revenue share agreement, then I'll know. Because if the revenue share agreement is a no-go, then I might want to go higher. So, all right, I'm just going to leave you as an open book. So we are right now, hold on. So we don't have a consensus on this.

[01:37:04] What I'm going to do, because I know some people want to leave it open. I just want, if Ms. Madden, if you can do a roll call. Because I just want to get a sense of where people are. And we can pick this up after revenue sharing. But I just want to, again, in case people change their mind, if you can do a roll call.

[01:37:23] This is at 450. For CNP tax where people are. Okay, just the number. Just the number. Very good. Supervisor Ingrid, can you give me the number you're at? 425. Thank you, sir. Supervisor Bailey?

[01:37:40] Yes, 450. Yes, 450. Thank you. Supervisor Bodie? 450. Supervisor Gordy? 435. Supervisor LaCroix? 425.

[01:37:57] Supervisor Stewart? 450. supervisor vega open chair jefferson 450 so and we just need a simple majority right let's see yeah so we are 450 for that one so hopefully that can help guide um we are going

[01:38:26] to get into so we're 450 for c and p tax we are going to um divert because i know a few people want to get into revenue sharing and that will help us lead into a discussion on the meals and beverage checks. So there are a couple competing proposals. We have Supervisor Bode who wants to raise it to \$4.50 or \$4.45 was his original, but he wanted to split it up into three different buckets. We also have Supervisor Vega who wants to change the actual calculation from \$57.23 to

[01:39:06] 54.8 i can let them duke it out you know but i do want to talk about i do all right we're good all right so i do want to talk about revenue sharing and hear from people we've had this discussion many times you know leave it alone change the formula exempt certain things because you know this is the time and the place to have the discussion so supervisor bode and then angry Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate the openness of the conversation so far. For me, I would be more comfortable exempting this extra revenue as opposed to changing the formula this year, and here's why.

[01:39:47] And I know folks have been frustrated because we say next year, next year, next year, but frankly, there have been things every year, at least for the last two years, that have caused uncertainty in how things are going to go. Last year, it was federal action around the Department of Education. We weren't sure where things were going to go there. This year, it's the LCI.

[01:40:03] We obviously sent a letter about that last week, I think it was. So I just, I don't feel comfortable changing the formula while we have uncertainty around this. However, when we talk about going from \$4.15 to \$4.50 or even just \$0.30 of that, that wasn't revenue that the schools was expecting anyway, right?

[01:40:25] They base their budget off of the proposed tax rates and the proposed revenue projections that was shared with them all the way back at probably the end of 2025. So that's why, at least for this new

revenue, I'm comfortable with exempting it because it wasn't revenues that they were at all anticipating from there.

[01:40:43] So, again, I'm open to having conversation about the revenue sharing in future years. I think that should be a holistic conversation we bring to the Finance and Budget Committee. That's a conversation I think we should have with the schools over the course of the year, probably starting in the summer. But for right now, I'm not comfortable with actually changing the base percentage based on that.

[01:41:01] Thank you, Madam Chair. All right, Supervisor Angry, then Vega. Yeah, thanks, Madam Chair. And Supervisor Vega, I think you got a great proposal. For me, though, and, you know, I've been in this situation before, unfortunately. I have talked to the school administration, certain school board members, and I gave them my word that I wasn't looking at that this year and going to go into it next year.

[01:41:25] So while that may be wishy-washy based on many things, what I want to do is keep that word and really look at this as I mentioned to them next year. So I hope we can find another way to get there. All right. Supervisor Vega.

[01:41:42] Thank you, Madam Chair. They do expect it, Supervisor Bodie. they expect extra and additional revenue every single budget year and they make sure that we know about it and we willingly give it to them and so it doesn't matter how you want to slice it I can turn around and say that you know withholding the percent that you want is a cut to the revenue share agreement because they're not getting that money right and so if we're willing to do it in one regard why don't just do it from the top right which would be less of an impact it gives them a better idea of what's coming instead of doing it on the back end you know I maintain the position um that we can do it this year we keep kicking the can down the road and if we don't do

[01:42:21] it this year the reality is is that we're not going to do it next year especially when we're being asked to go up to 450 yet again and I'm just saying this so that my colleagues you know can think about it meditate on it this is a year that we do it I think that my requests have been very reasonable um you know I again I'm willing to do half a percent half a percent we should not be scraping the bottom of the barrel and I keep saying that half a percent gives us a little over 10 million dollars a full percent gives us 20.4 million dollars we can do a lot with that money

[01:42:58] we have needs that we have to fund on our side and even a small modification of the RSA still gives the schools what they need and I will remind my colleagues they are sitting on a mountain of cash in terms of surplus unencumbered funds while we're over here literally scraping for pennies supervisor Stewart uh so question for uh supervisor Vega would you have that money come out of their

[01:43:31] operating expense or the debt service which so they they have an ask of 998 million 265 thousand 926 dollars for operating expenses and then the rest of that uh covers the debt service which we as the county are actually responsible for. I don't, Dave, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but that's a decision they have to make. Generally speaking, the debt service payments, whether it's the county or the schools, it's the top priority of bill that must be paid.

[01:44:11] It's right up there with employee compensation in general. Okay, so just to kind of move along, does 54.8 fully fund what they need for operations and for debt service?

[01:44:31] We're running the numbers now. Thanks. Madam Chair, members of the board, with regards to what the county funds for the schools, the county can do it either in lump sum, and once it's given to the

schools, you then have no control over where it goes, or it can be by the nine statutory categories.

[01:44:56] This board, to my knowledge, has never done the by the category, has done the lump sum, transferred it to the schools. And while you may express your intent as to where you want it to be paid in what category, once it's given to the schools, they have the authority to put it where they feel it needs to go.

[01:45:15] Mr. Sinclair. Okay, I'm just, we're just trying, as staff, we're just trying to walk down the middle of the street here. So I'm going to answer this a couple ways, okay? at an \$0.85 real estate tax rate, at a computer and peripheral tax rate, keeping that at \$4.50, is that right? \$4.50, at \$4.50, excuse me, and a modification to the split of the schools receiving 54.8% and the county receiving 45.2%. The county would have a positive balance in fiscal

[01:45:54] 27 of \$35.5 million. The school's reduction compared to budget recap would be \$62.3 million reduction. Now let me answer that school transfer another way, please. The resulting school transfer

[01:46:16] for fiscal 27 would be \$1,056,000,000, but it would be a \$62.3 million reduction compared to the county executive's budget recap amount of 1 billion 119 million dollars so that well yeah we

[01:46:56] can't tell them what to do with the money um i don't i i would just i would i would need more data to to to right now where i stand it's it's i i i can't blow a hole that size in the middle of there all right so trigger finger i've got her new name sorry supervisor vega and it doesn't have to be that amount remember that i said that that is 2.4 percent adjustment i said it could be one percent i said it could be half a percent that's on the higher end dave how much more is that than

[01:47:31] last year that we that they're getting this year let me come back to you on that okay so i'm going to continue going down the line and i do think that this is a conversation again i know a lot of people want to have and we also have to weigh the difference between keeping them you know where it is you know with the current calculations and adding so we're going to continue this and i also may give us a little bit of break to let them get some time to do some calculations and us time to have additional conversations um supervisor bailey thank you madam chair uh we can't tell

[01:48:09] them what to do with the money but as the county attorney just said that's i think that's where the opportunity that we've never taken and sitting down and talking with them about partnering with them as we said last week with them after they told us what they do do with the money partnering with them to help them decide, or not help, what we are looking for as how we can partner, like with housing, with health care in the school system, with workforce in the school.

[01:48:38] That's the part that we've been talking about for two years, that we as a board has never approached them in doing. And that's why Dr. Lateef mentioned to Tom and I that the collaboration piece, I think, is the opportunity. It really is an opportunity for us to fully support the schools as well as understand what the typical and total needs are. And that's the part where I think we as a board have more power in doing that. But we've never done that. And that

[01:49:13] breeds community and collaboration rather than, and I don't mean this in a negative sense, we have to look at this when it comes to our children, I think, not politically, but what is it we're trying to do in terms of the growth of the entire community? So I, you know, with the revenue share agreement, I think that there's an opportunity for us to talk about it. But as we said and led them to believe last week, maybe we need to sit down and talk about, talk it over with them, as we had just said with the uh with the um computer and peripheral tax talk to them rather than pull

[01:49:52] the rug from underneath them right now because their expectation is for us to make them whole and then come back next year and that's what we led them to believe when they left here last week and so uh to supervisor vega's point i understand what you're trying to achieve but i think there's other opportunities that we can look at within our budget that will give us what we need as well as we contemplate how we're going to talk to them about reducing the revenue share agreement.

[01:50:21] So I'm not disagreeing with what your proposal is, but what I am disagreeing with is when we do it. That's what I'm disagreeing with. So for this year, you want no change? This year, I want no change, and then we come back and talk to them about what those changes are.

[01:50:39] And if we decide to reduce it, so be it. But I don't think we pull the rug from under them now because they don't know what the state's going to do, nor the grants that they get from the feds. And I think that would be totally unfair to our school children if we did that. And before I jump, I see you shaking your head.

[01:50:55] So you're in great, no change, Mr. Stewart, no change? Okay, so then let me go to Gordy Vega-LaCroix. Yeah, you know, I've been trying to sound the alarm on this for the past couple of years and really even more so this year.

[01:51:12] You know, as our revenues continue to grow, the gap between the funding they get and the funding we get is going to continue to get much wider. Because if our revenue is growing, let's say on a 5% basis, 5% over what they had last year is much greater than the 5% we had over the last year.

[01:51:33] And so each and every year, this is just going to keep getting wider and wider and wider. And what ends up happening, it makes it even more difficult for us to be able to meet our priorities as accounting. Now, I have talked about the idea of revenue sharing on a portion of revenue, up to maybe 85 percent, leaving a 15 percent for negotiation.

[01:51:57] For us both to identify our priorities and become a point of negotiation between what are the priorities that we need to fund between the two of us. But right now, everything's on autopilot. And so because it's on autopilot, it really doesn't allow us to focus on priorities.

[01:52:20] And so I recognize the fact that we probably don't have the votes today to end the revenue sharing agreement, though I would support reviewing it and looking at seeing what we could do. But I also recognize the fact that we've talked about reviewing it, and it hasn't happened for two years.

[01:52:40] and so um if it's going to happen it needs to happen next month and it needs to be settled by june so that uh chris and the the school counterparts can start planning the budget starting when do you start up in september usually yes september so this has got to be resolved by september and i think we owe it to them and to us to get this resolved between now and no later than July because we're not in here in August.

[01:53:11] So I think it's high time that we have to have this conversation because, like I said, we've been on all pilot for way too long, and, again, that delta is getting wider and wider and wider, and it's just making it more difficult for us as the county to be able to meet our priorities.

[01:53:31] And, again, when we're looking at us needing to put more money in reserves, we're needing to carry and pay attention to their debt service and their debt load and maintain our triple a bond rating then those are things that we've got to come to the table and have a collaborative approach on how we're going

to manage that together all right um so for this year i know you've said it before we need to have the discussion for but for this year where are you do you say no change where right now i'm i'm willing to look at you know one percent as as

[01:54:04] what mr vega has proposed so maybe going down a percent okay um who do i have next i have vega i'll get back to you sorry jeannie i know you haven't spoken yet but i'll get to you vega and then i'll get to jeannie thank you madam chair dave do you have the number compared to fiscal year 2026 in this scenario the school transfer would increase 65.1 million dollars over fiscal

[01:54:31] 26. It would go from \$991.6 million in fiscal 26 to \$1,056 million in this scenario. And that's at a rate of 85 CMP at 450. So they would get an additional \$65.1 million over last year, putting them over a billion dollars. It's hard to say, but I think that it's important to be reminded that we are only responsible to fund the standards of quality.

[01:55:09] That does not mean that we are responsible to fund bus drivers, psychologists, administrators, or anything that is outside of the standards of quality. And while I know that they presented that slide when they were here last week, that is not what is required by law. And I only say that because we are quite literally going above and beyond we are looking at the possibility or of the realities of not giving our employees a raise while they're getting a record transfer an

[01:55:43] additional 65.1 million dollars and they still sit on a surplus that should take a little more more consideration I think on our part and we have to be a little more thoughtful when it comes to that we are going above and beyond and so you know again like i said i know that i proposed 54.8 for the schools 45.2 um for for us but that's not where i will that's not the hill i'll die on i'm willing to negotiate because as as we're going to keep going down the the list madam chair where else are we going to come up for the money with the money especially if we want

[01:56:22] to shave a percent off of the meals tax right if we want to get rid of it all together like we have to be really serious right now because the further down the list we go the less money we have to work with I'm going to go to LaCroix then myself and then people for their next round well this whole thing is new to me of course and as I've told you a lot of you people that I was a single mom for a long time and I had to tighten my belt and even though I wanted to give my kids lavish vacations and what have you I still had to take a minute and look at all my bills and I'm responsible and

[01:57:02] so I paid them and I look out in this audience and I see that and I think about some of the people I met with and I know a lot of people here want to give people a little bit more than what is in the budget and I do too but the money has to come from somewhere and I still think giving a billion dollars to the over a billion dollars to the school is is a great amount of money and i was here last year listening to you all promise that you guys would handle it this year and that seems

[01:57:38] to be the song that keeps playing over and over because it's very very hard to say hey we don't want to give you everything because like a parent we want to give every single department and every all the kids all the money that they want but right now i think we need to tighten our belts and i actually thought that what um yesley vega supervisor vega said was really really smart it was amazingly responsible and it also um would support our needs and yet also support

[01:58:13] the county in this dilemma of how do we pay our bills and and move forward with the money that we have all right and so where are you i'm going to support uh yesley vega's proposition all right so i'm

putting down with yesley so where i am this is a tough time for schools you know possibly making changes to the lci their local composite index which is going to be tough but we've also

[01:58:48] already said to schools that we don't want to share a surplus. Does anyone remember that from last week? We don't want to share a surplus. We want to take all of our surplus and put into reserves. I stand 10 toes down on that. I have been the biggest defender, the most vocal defender of revenue sharing agreement. But one of the things I've also identified as a big priority is that we boost our reserves. Our rating day fund is everything. And like you, Supervisor LaCroix, it's nice to have another, someone who understands being a single parent. You have to make really

[01:59:26] tough decisions and saving, making sure that we have money in our reserves is critical. It is absolutely critical. So they're not getting that money. So I just want to make sure that I name that. They are not, there is a little piece of the pot that they will not have this year and possibly next year if we continue that down the line. And I also have had conversations and they understand that because our debt rating benefits them as well now again we can't give them everything but yes yes like we have to pay for the bus drivers okay we have to absolutely pay yeah that's

[02:00:03] their budget but that's something you know that needs to be paid for i you know i am at no change and again i do appreciate the discussion and because i'm at no change doesn't mean i'm not listening or i don't hear people i do take it into consideration i take it very much in consideration I look at education as the way up.

[02:00:25] When people talk about folks pulling themselves by their bootstraps or what have you, education is what really lifts people up. And our schools are being asked to do so much more right now. I went to an opening, a grand opening, at Hilton High School when they had the new food pantry.

[02:00:42] They have food pantries. They're talking about having mobile clinics at their schools because they're providing services. Because they see a need in our schools. And they're able to meet them. Superintendent McDade has done a wonderful job, and I am so proud of the direction that she's leading our schools in.

[02:01:03] But they are meeting a lot of needs that families aren't necessarily able to meet. And even things like the extracurricular activities are things for children to do and to be involved and to become their whole self.

[02:01:22] I don't want to see cuts because I'm worried about what they will have to cut. Willoughby middle school sports, which for a lot of kids, sports are what keeps them anchored to schools. It builds community. It's teamwork. Again, I'm having these conversations and I'm okay having these conversations. You know, I don't want people to feel that I'm not willing to work with them. For me, this is so personal, particularly because I had parents who grew up in Jim Crow, Mississippi and they weren't allowed to get an education and so they had drilled it into myself

[02:02:00] my sister and I drill it into my son that it is actually a privilege to learn and to have the schools that we have may not like the homework may not want to go every day but this is a privilege that your family your ancestors didn't necessarily have and so it's hard for me again I welcome the dialogue and but it is hard for me i mean right now where we're at um hold on one two

[02:02:34] um it looks like there are more people who are in the no change category i want to go ahead um you know just have a cleaner look if andrea mada can call it out we can still have this dialogue and i

know supervisor bode has initiated this in the finance and budget committee meeting

[02:02:55] I do have two people, Q, if you guys want to, Bailey, Gordy, I guess, Votie, you're jumping in, and then after that, unless anyone wants to jump up, you know, in, I want Andrea Madden, okay, Kenny's in, Kenny's out, Kenny's in, I want them to speak, we'll do the roll call, and after that, I'm going to give everyone a short break, so.

[02:03:19] all right supervisor bailey then gordy uh thank you madam chair um i uh i don't want uh anyone to think that i'm not open to discussion because i i am open to discussion it uh i also uh don't want anybody to think that i'm not listening because i am very much listening i'm going to be no change this year because of what supervisor gordy said you're right we keep saying we're and Supervisor LaCroix. But we just haven't had the discussions and we need to have the discussions

[02:03:56] and we don't need to have them just during budget season. We should have them mid-June so that the county exec can have the discussion at his level with different, in a CFO, with their CFO. That's important also. But it shouldn't be just during the budget season because right now, Jeannie, you're right. Excuse me, Supervisor LaCroix, you're right. Everybody's suffering. Everybody's suffering right now. But how we do it is very, very important. And how we protect the momentum

[02:04:30] that we have both in the county and in the school system is really important. When you think about this is not just about, though I agree with you, school buses, this is about what these kids are achieving for the next level in their lives. And we've got to look at that wholeheartedly. It just can't be one perspective and so with the level of expertise that we have higher echelon now in the county the baton has been passed we have an exceptional school superintendent and we need to support that and so we we need to support that and our school boards and the other opportunity

[02:05:09] that we have is building relationships with our school board uh representatives some of us have those and some of us don't and so all of us need to have that when it comes to budget season so i'm just putting those things out because it's all inclusive uh and i i don't believe that we pull the rug from underneath them right now but we do make a really distinct effort to meet and talk about things not just separately but collectively we have these we never had school board joint school board meetings before now we're having those but they're not as productive as they should

[02:05:46] be we're not having these discussions when we should as leaders we should be having these discussions so i you know that i i just want to paint the picture also how it really is along with the exceptional recommendations that are being made supervisor garty thank you madam chair um bless you um um i i just want to reiterate the point nobody's cutting the school's budget they will not they'll be able to fully fund their budget meet every requirement that they presented to us and as my understanding is they have 17 million dollars of unobligated funds as of the

[02:06:25] end of last month so so again we're not talking about you know cutting the schools it's just the extra money that they're getting we could be using this on our side or we could be sending it back to our residents in in terms of tax relief and so it really is about trying to get down to the brass tacks of how do we fund each other's parties, meet each other's needs. And so that is the part that continues to get lost on this, is that their job in statute is to present their

[02:07:03] requirements to us and then tell us what they need to be funded. But because of the way that we have it arranged, they just develop a budget based upon the expected revenues under the revenue

sharing agreement and then that's what they present and so and we've had that conversation but I also will point out that you know as I've pointed out last Tuesday night they've they have school enrollments that are below 50 percent that they are now have to pump more money into and then schools right up the road that are over capacity so that is a highly inefficient model where we're

[02:07:38] wasting money when there's money with if they just change the boundaries they could rebalance enrollments and fix a lot of those problems so those are things that need to be done um but right now there's no impetus to do that so um but i i appreciate you know the dialogue but i also want to make sure that everyone understands we're not talking about cutting their budget cutting their spending it's about helping them meet their requirement and anything above that we have the opportunity for us to recapture and use for the priorities for the county thank you all right

[02:08:12] i'm going to have do a roll call to go through supervisors if you'll give me your no change or your percentage that would be capture that very good all right supervisor angry i'm a no change and and and i'll just say thank you both for that dialogue i fully understand what you're saying i will simply say that that discussion as i said we should be having that now throughout the year so we may not get there in july or august but i think this is a discussion to have with all your rep so i talked to the school board superintendent i've talked to uh dr uh latif i've talked to uh

[02:08:49] my rep mr blake and so they understand that i'm going to be having conversations now about this very uh professional discussion we've had so thank you supervisor bailey supervisor bode no change

[02:09:06] supervisor gordy supervisor la croix change one percent or greater if possible supervisor stewart No change, and yes, you know, we do have to have the tough conversations at these upcoming meetings because the Delta is getting out of hand, and, you know, things about rebalancing enrollment, et cetera, et cetera,

[02:09:45] yeah, the tough conversations have got to be had in this coming year. Supervisor Vega, I'm open to half a percent, one percent, anything, because I think that we need it, But I just want to be very clear.

[02:10:03] We didn't just start talking about the RSA. We've been talking about it. It started last budget cycle with the idea that we were going to really tackle it during our finance and budget committee meetings. And that hasn't happened because there has not been a serious, you know, intent to actually tackle this.

[02:10:22] And so it looks like it's going to go down 5-3. That's fine. But I'm going to hold everybody accountable. If we're all talking this time about actually doing something and working on this, come next year, I hope that the conversation is very different than what's happening here today.

[02:10:40] Thank you, Madam Chair. Chair Jefferson? No change. And I'm going to give people's supervisors time at the end. So if we want to talk about things when we're done, that's great. So, I'm sorry, Ms. Madden, you said no change? Yeah.

[02:10:56] So what I was talking to a few folks, we have a lot to discuss. I did want to give people a break, but I also know that we have other taxes to discuss. I kind of feel like one of our big things that we're going to talk about later is potential cuts and items of board interest. So I'm going to give everyone a 15-minute break.

[02:11:15] We will have another break. I don't want to hold people hostage on this day. So let's do a 15-minute break. Thank you very much.

[02:11:24] Thank you so very much.

[02:13:25] I wanted to begin with Mr. Sinclair. If you can just refresh where we are right now. I know that we are going to be talking about cuts, but I wanted to go through that, where we are right now. Real estate tax rate of \$0.85 and a computer and peripheral tax rate of \$4.50.

[02:13:49] The county is \$11.4 million short in FY27 compared to budget recap. And the school, if I may, that is fairly consistent throughout the five-year plan.

[02:14:05] So as the board considers expenditure reductions, they would need to be recurring in nature at this juncture. And so schools, that's what, \$15.5 million? They're in the hole? Yes, \$15.5 million compared to budget recap.

[02:14:26] All right, compared. Well, you're saying compared to budget recap. The county executive final proposed budget that he presented to the board last week during budget recap, that is considered by staff. be the new baseline okay thank you so very much so right now folks we are operating in a deficit so right now um the county is 11.4 million dollars short from the recap proposal and schools is 15.5

[02:14:57] million dollars short and that is with our real estate rate at 0.85 and going up to 45 four dollars and 50 cents on cmp tax so we are short so um the next thing we are going to talk about in the is this meals and beverage tax i know we're in the hole i do think yes eliminating we just don't

[02:15:24] have it um so i want to open a discussion around that hold on um this was my preference just trying to look at the budget recap. I have papers everywhere. So if you can go to page 19 in the recap, and this shows the impact if we were to reduce it 1% to 2%, if we were to go down to 1%

[02:16:02] tax rate, or if we were to eliminate it. And again, looking several years out, if we even go down 1%, that's going to add a \$6 million hole. This one is a tough one for me because this is the tax that I really wanted to cut. This was my focus. This is why in the straw poll, I went with 0.87 because it would have given us a little bit more flexibility to make a reduction to that tax rate. I want to see if anyone still wants to make a reduction. And we can also come back to this

[02:16:32] again, you know, after we talk about other cuts to make. This is a hard one for me. Again, I would have liked to have had more flexibility um to make a cut even just a very small cut i don't know if anyone has an appetite for this one um i will let people go put your okay super oh yeah refresh

[02:17:00] supervisor stewart and supervisor la croix thank you madam chair um again macroeconomic point of view. I get where you're coming from with your wanting to cut the meals tax. And I get it. I feel

[02:17:37] for the restaurant industry right now at this current point, especially with gas over \$4 a gallon, everything else going on, the tariffs, partial government shutdown, et cetera, et cetera. We're facing a lot of very bad headwinds and choppy economic waters, despite what Wall Street numbers are telling you.

[02:18:06] What's hitting Main Street is not what's hitting Wall Street. And I get where that would help. But, you know, again, macroeconomic view, for what this industry, the restaurant industry, is about to face, cutting the restaurant tax even a little bit is, I don't think it's going to save the day.

[02:18:36] It's certainly not going to carry it. But we also have other things that we need to kind of focus on in and around the county, things that we haven't gotten to yet, especially when it comes to FTEs and other programs.

[02:18:53] So I really think we should circle back to this, actually. But I think at the point that we're currently at, the writing is somewhat on the wall. Supervisor LaCroix. Okay, so at the risk of sounding like a broken record, the restaurant tax has not just hurt, it has closed down a lot of the restaurants in the Woodbridge area.

[02:19:20] They have been begging us for years now to make that go away. And they're struggling, and some of them are struggling just to survive because families are not going out to eat, especially in our underprivileged areas in Woodbridge.

[02:19:41] And we are a county, and we're talking as a county, not just on the West End and what have you. Everybody needs to look at what's happened to all our citizens. And this has been one of the most damaging taxes that we have done. And I want us to remember that when we're talking about a shortage of money, it means that what they proposed in the budget would be down by that amount of money.

[02:20:07] But just tightening our belt in all areas, with the exception of a few that I think we should beef up a little bit, I think that this county can afford to take away the meals tax.

[02:20:25] and I get it. We have money coming in from it. I get it. But we have a lot of money that's here, and it was spent before it got before us. So now it's like kind of bass-ackwards to me because it's like what we're trying to do is we're trying to figure out where we should cut all the county budget when they know what they've asked for and what would be surplus. And now we're trying to figure it out but what I do know is once again my boss is the citizens and the citizens have been

[02:21:01] crying out for this tax to go away and it is hurtful to not just the businesses it's very hurtful to uh the constituents that cannot go out to eat supervisor angry thank you madam chair um Dave I don't know if one of you can you just help explain this meals tax to me again and what I mean is we have a meals tax on a restaurant restaurant industry and saying they're being cost out and it's something about credit cards like if it's a pass-through tax that that we are trying to get

[02:21:40] residents come through our county eat at our restaurants we tax them we get extra money it's not our citizens money it's out of county money the concept where are businesses saying that they're being charged is this and i heard a little about a credit card so can you just explain the process of how the meals tax revenue and what is happening in the industry and with citizens happens i don't know if that's too i don't want to put you on the spot but i think i think we need

[02:22:13] some clarification on this process i'm going to look to leslie here to step in to help me out as necessary. I obviously don't own a restaurant. But whether you're a merchant that accepts credit cards, credit cards charge a fee for the convenience of their service. And a lot of businesses, some businesses pass that on to the consumer, their customers. As a matter of fact, a few weeks ago, I had a vehicle repair bill, and I was counseled to use a check. Otherwise,

[02:22:51] they were going to pass on the credit card fee to me and add that on to the bill, just for perspective. So as I listened to the gentleman at public comment time, I think what I'm inferring here is that restaurants choose to absorb that fee, which is a portion of the bill, rather than passing it on to diners.

[02:23:22] And because, so there lies the issue, because the meals tax is not anything new really across the country. And every city and town here has a meals tax. So we've just, you know, incorporated one into the county for more revenue, and thus this discussion.

[02:23:41] But if it's about a credit card, then maybe there's some other conversation we need to be having as a board about the industry, you know, and the restaurant industry and what they're saying they're actually being outcast on. So I don't know what that sounds like or looks like, but maybe that's a conversation.

[02:23:58] And I'm sorry, but to residents who consistently eat out, the intent was to bring through traffic that comes through this county and really have an anchor of some form of entertainment that folks can actually visit. And even as we talk about our graduations and 13 high schools of all of this going on, like these folks are going to Fairfax to do this now.

[02:24:18] And if there's anything I want, I want these citizens and graduations and grandparents and families to come here to Prince William County and spend their gas in their restaurants and their hotels, and we get all that revenue here, which is the intent of that. So I just want us to ground ourselves at zero of how we got to this meal sacks and what that revenue has done.

[02:24:38] Oh, by the way, the schools get a split of that too. So I just want us to ground to what this is, and then maybe if there's some issues that we need to figure out and work out that we can work our way around that to help the industry restaurant industry on whatever their shortfalls are. Thanks. Supervisor Vega, then Bodie. Thank you, Madam Chair. Again, not a revenue problem, but a spending problem. I will support any measure that assists in either flat out repealing the meals tax altogether or even a percent. It is a regressive tax. It is hurting our small businesses, and it is continuing to add to the affordability

[02:25:14] crises some folks are choosing now not to go out and support these small businesses in our community because you know with with with everything being expensive as it is you add an additional tax it makes things quite literally unaffordable and we we shouldn't have to put this on the residents I understand the idea that the residents of this county understand that the idea the intent behind it was for folks coming outside of the county but the reality is is that this regressive tax is being felt by the taxpayers of this county, and it is damning for the restaurant industry. We've heard

[02:25:49] from them today, and we've heard from them ever since the idea of implementing this tax came to light. So with that being said, I do like your idea, Kenny, Supervisor Bode. We were talking about you had said keeping 30 cents right um dave what if it were 50 50 cents that we kept um yeah when he was talking about the 450 right for yeah you had said we would keep 30 cents my question is

[02:26:23] what if it were 50 cents or a dollar can i get number figures for that to not be part of the revenue share agreement so if we're at 30 cents what does 50 cents and a dollar look like 50 cents on the computer and peripheral tax rate.

[02:26:50] And while Dave and the team come up with that number, I just also want to share, I believe that, you know, yes, other localities have it, but when put on a ballot sheet for folks to decide and vote on, it has overwhelmingly been rejected.

[02:27:18] I mean, we can use Fairfax as an example. I believe that the voters turned it down twice, and even then the board ended up implementing a meals tax. Granted, it's not as high as it is here in Prince William County. It is higher.

[02:27:33] I'm sorry. It is correct, yes. I share this because it's not a popular tax. I don't know that any tax is popular to the voters, but this one in particular is not one of those. And so, again, we're Prince William County. We want to do things as we see fit.

[02:27:50] So \$0.50 is \$30 million? If it's \$3.79 and \$0.50. That is correct, yes. Okay. And then \$1, Math Guru? double yeah all right so just just food for thought we have some wiggle room there if we want to keep a little bit more of the cmp tax and not let it be a part of the rsa all right supervisor boating thank you madam chair i appreciate the comments and the questions so far dave i know that at one point may have been this budget season may have been last um you had a

[02:28:28] chart of all of the neighboring jurisdictional meals taxes do we have that somewhere we can look for it i appreciate that and so there's a big guy i appreciate what you were saying at the same time you know i'm going to go in a slightly different direction um as to my knowledge the cities and all the towns have a meal technically all of them have had it for a number of years the you just mentioned fairfax county like you said they they implement theirs with this past budget so they're now at four percent i understand and we're gone down to three percent um and and go back to what

[02:29:05] Suarez or Angry just said you know a number of years ago when we put this in place we were trying to figure out ways to one as was said find revenue streams that came from outside the county in order to help boost the budget but also frankly find other ways to diversify the tax base that wasn't just going back to the well on the real estate taxpayers. We can have conversations around whether the CMP should have been raised more aggressively. I know Madam Chair you've mentioned to that as well, but we're constantly advised by our financial advisor that we should be having as a diversified tax base as possible, coming from different revenue streams that are

[02:29:42] vulnerable to different shocks in the economy, so it's not just one in one place. Where I'm going with this is that we implemented that tax, we started getting a new revenue stream that we weren't getting revenues from before in quite the same way, and now we're in a slightly a different place where again we lowered it by one percent last year and one percent in the middle of last year but it took effect in january 1 of this year we have not seen the full effects of how that's uh you know uh blown out because it just came into effect three and a half months ago um we had folks that are restaurateurs that came before us as hey hey you know we're in x county

[02:30:21] we're headquarters here we're headquarters there we have concerns i hear those concerns um but again, Fairfax just put theirs in this past year. So we're still not exactly sure how that's going to pan out. What I will say, though, overall, is that at the outset, I said, hey, I want to focus on one tax, one source of concern for our residents. And yes, I've had residents and constituents say, hey, not a huge fan of the meals tax. We've sort of talked through where that money has gone and what have you. And most of them have sort of understood that. But ultimately, I've had

[02:30:57] several conversations with folks that, hey, if we had to focus on one tax, either your real estate tax or your mortgage, what have you, or the meals tax, not a single person has told me that they'd rather their meals tax reduced than their real estate tax or their mortgage. So that's the actual anecdotal and conversations I've had with my constituents around that. Now, that doesn't say that I'm not open to, you know, visiting it next year and subsequent years, at least where I am right now, we did a pretty good job sort of talking through lowering the real estate tax,

[02:31:34] and I think that's where we should stay. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm going to jump in, and then I'm going to go to Gordy, because he hasn't spoken, then LaCroix and Vega. So I'm not a fan, and I know that I'm going to get outvoted on this, but I'm going to say my piece. When people are talking about data centers, that's a very different discussion, and even then, a lot of us are saying we don't want to give them any surprises. We don't want to go too fast, too soon. And we've already given them significant tax increases. Restaurants are very different. They're not

[02:32:06] multi-million dollar corporations, by and large. We've got a few outliers. They cannot handle the same economic shocks. These are businesses that operate on a very small margin, and a lot of them are small businesses. Glory Days employs more people than a data center. They don't have the same revenue as a data center. But I want to talk about this being a regressive tax. The people who eat out the most are at the top. You know, they are the very rich. They're also at the very bottom.

[02:32:36] They're the very poor. When you're somebody who's working two jobs, you don't always have time to go to a grocery store, prepare the healthy meals, and do all of that. You're going to grab something on the way. You're going to get that quick bite. They're paying the meals tax. If you're going to Starbucks on a railing or basis, it adds up. Now, yes, when you ask people to compare, you know, real estate tax versus the meals tax, real estate tax generally wins because it is a larger percentage. But we had to do a very, very, very deep cut in order for people to see some kind

[02:33:10] of relief. We wouldn't have had to cut that deep if we focused on the meals tax. This is one that I personally was prioritizing because of all the stories I've heard of the people I've talked to who not just simply own them, but work them and rely on these jobs. And when someone comes in and they have 50 bucks to spend, they have \$50 to spend. So if that means that they're sharing an entree, they're going to share the entree. If it means they can't get dessert, they're not going to get dessert. I can see where this is going. I knew that I was on the end of a losing fight,

[02:33:47] but I want to make my voice heard. And I really want to speak up for small businesses because we talk about small businesses a lot. A lot of these are small businesses. A lot of these, even if they have multiple, you know, locations, they're still small businesses. They're not raking in a ton of money. I would really like to consider what we can do if we're going to talk about small businesses.

[02:34:11] Let's think of restaurants as a small business. And let's not stereotype people who eat are just the rich. It's not just fine dining. It is fast food. It's fast casual. It's also catering. And I've spoken to wedding venues. When this tax was implemented, you had brides who were freaking out because now they owed \$900 more on their bill because they had weddings and they have to come up with that money or cut guests. So this tax really does have a real implication. I would like to see us be able to do more. If not now, certainly next year. I'm really asking my colleagues to prioritize because we are going into, or not we're going, we're already in a tough economic

[02:34:51] environment. No, this may not make or break our economy, but for the people who open these restaurants, this is a big deal. And I've heard this consistently from people. I also want to say for a lot of people who come to this country and who are new Americans, they may not know much.

[02:35:12] They might not even know the language well, but they know their food. They know their cuisine. They know how to cook. And in Prince William County, we have such a wonderful diversity of restaurants and offerings. And I think that's one of the things that makes us special is that we have such diversity.

[02:35:28] And as for people out of town paying the taxes, yeah, there are certain business models that are built on, I'm being next to a highway and I'm going to get a lot of people traveling up and down 95 or 66. But we also have a lot of businesses that don't see a lot of out of town traffic. They're local community restaurants, and they're not getting the business they used to.

[02:35:48] Their regulars are not coming in like they used to. I respect that people wanted to prioritize the real estate tax this year. I respect that. I just wish we had more flexibility so we could have done something with the meals tax. Supervisor LaCroix. I think we do have the ability to do both.

[02:36:08] I mean, honestly, if you look at the, I mean, I appreciate everything that Dave, the group, Chris has done. They've worked really hard to do a budget. But we do have the money. There are surpluses within that budget where if we just tighten them up, then we could help our citizens out.

[02:36:32] But saying, well, I, you know, maybe next year, hopefully next year comes for some of these businesses. But I know a lot of them in Woodbridge that are just barely hanging on, and they are hoping that we will fight for them, and it shouldn't be either or. We make a lot of money. A lot of money is coming in, and yet we're acting like somehow we just don't have it. We do have it. We just have

[02:37:05] to tighten our belt a little bit, and that could still mean giving, prioritizing some of the other areas that you all want to fund and some of your pet peeve projects but I can't imagine a pet peeve project going over the citizens that are trying to make a living for their families and local restaurants and restaurants that have been here forever I mean honest to goodness I just I feel like I'm a broken record but I'm I'm I'm begging this board to think about what's going on in Woodbridge and some of the people that have been begging me to understand that they're going under

[02:37:44] and they're just barely hanging on. I will go down one point if it means making a concession just so that I can keep some of the businesses open. Supervisor Gordy. Thank you, Madam Chair.

[02:38:04] I appreciate everything that you said, Madam Chair, and also Supervisor LaCroix. Again, This is a regressive tax, and the people who've paid the most are the people who work in the restaurants because they're not getting the tips because of the tax.

[02:38:23] So it means they're working for less, so they've been affected by this. And as someone, I've been fighting the credit card transaction fee battle for over a decade on Capitol Hill. I'm signed on to many, many letters through my trade association to try to get control of this fastest-growing, uncontrollable cost that retail is experiencing.

[02:38:45] that's how it's described so when they say they talk about these these interchange fees these interchange fees are also growing even though that you know the because of inflation it those amounts are going and it's all going to banks and this is now well over a hundred billion dollars that's just flowing into banks coffers coming from our small businesses and retailers um and so So, yeah, it is penalizing our real estate.

[02:39:16] Now, if we want to get after trying to get taxes from folks who are transient, well, we have a transient occupancy tax. Now, a county attorney and I have been trying to look here and see what's the max we could go on that. But if that's the intent, that's where you get almost 100% from the folks who are from out of state, out of town.

[02:39:41] But the majority of people eating in our restaurants are local. And we've had that conversation over the last couple of years. And most of our businesses, restaurants, if I remember the numbers correct, 50% of them are family-owned small businesses.

[02:40:01] So it is not working to the benefit of the people who live, work here, and it is actually making it harder for them to struggle. And then, look, guys, there's going to be a minimum wage increase coming up. They're really going to get hit hard when that happens.

[02:40:19] And so if they're already struggling today, just wait until next year. And then you've got they're going to have to raise their prices, and now that 3% goes up again. So now it means more taxes come out of people's pockets, because it's a tax on the final bill.

[02:40:35] And so if the cost for food goes up, so does that amount. And, again, it keeps eating out of people's pockets. Um, I'm I would support one percent reduction all right supervisor Vega thank you Madam Chair. Uh, Tom, you're you're spot on. Uh, I don't want to offend anybody from county staff but the reality is that Prince William County, um, let's be real is not a tourist destination. It's not we have certain pockets of the county right that I can make the argument are becoming a tourist attraction.

[02:41:12] Right but the reality is that the county as a whole cannot be marketed or classified as a tourist destination and I think that making the distinction is important because that is often time the path that people who propose said tax use right it's going to be for tourists this and that and the other the reality is that it's not just for the rich folks Madam Chair it's a regressive tax because it quite literally impacts at disproportionate levels low-income families and busy families. We have kids, play sports, you're on the road all the time, and sometimes you don't have, you know, the time to cook at home. So what are you going to do? Go through the drive-through.

[02:41:51] It is impacting busy families and low-income families. And I will also suggest a very important data fact that says that industry data suggests that roughly 70 to 80 percent of restaurant revenue comes from local residents. So we're quite literally taxing our people, our residents, and we should end this tax and then the final point that I want to make is that you know we talk about well let's see right what what we're going to get um when we see it operating at full term the truth is that once we see those figures it's going to be like anything we can't let go of that revenue because how are you going to make up for it and that's the conversation that we're going to be having next budget cycle if we don't do anything now what's the shortfall going

[02:42:30] to be then and how do we make up for it we're going to try to increase CMT yet again and keep scrape being the bottom of the barrel so we don't improve anything and so while I do support supervisor Gordy's proposal of one percent Madam Chair I want to hear what your proposal is and for us to take into consideration right that we have some wiggle room whether it's 30 cents 50 cents or a dollar where we can actually um start to bridge the gap on the short fall that we have currently and what that would look like if it's one percent or fully repealing the meals tax what's your preference Madam Chair I'm going to let you keep going or I'm done okay um I have a couple other people in queue, then I'm going to get back to myself. Stuart and Bodie. Thank you,

[02:43:09] Madam Chair. Mr. Fun, what is our current income on the transient occupancy tax right now? And at the same time, Madam County Attorney, what is the maximum that we can go to on that rate?

[02:43:33] Madam Chair, members of the board, Deputy County Attorney, Mr. Grossis and I have been emailing back and forth. Currently, the county code has a 5% transient occupancy tax. And in my quick review, and so I'm just putting a little caveat, it's a quick review. It looks like in the state code that between 2% and 5% of the TOT tax must go to travel, marketing, and tourism. But it looks like we can go above the 5%. But I'd like an opportunity. And it is a trust tax, similar to

[02:44:09] the food and beverage tax in that the hotel and the restaurant are not the ones paying for it they are receiving it from the customer and then passing it forward just like the food and beverage tax it is an ordinance and so the board can't change it you must have a public hearing first before you can change it so if you wanted to that would give us time to do the proper analysis with the county executive as to see how high we can go but um and if that's something that you direct us to look into we can do that but you would have to have a public hearing before you increase the tot tax

[02:44:42] okay thank you and so as the county attorney mentioned the transit occupancy tax is a five percent rate 40 of which is considered general revenue and shared with the schools that estimate of the 40 is two and a half million dollars okay um the the 60 portion that must be used to uh for tourism purposes it is not included in the well it is in the general fund but it's not

[02:45:17] for general purpose use um that estimate is 3.75 million dollars so the portion of that is general revenue and gets shared with the schools is two and a half million dollars that's the fy 27 forecast so we have another nine and a half million to to make up for if i'm looking at fy 27

[02:45:52] numbers for one percent yes i will also point out for the board fiscal 27 assumes an implementation date of january 1 if you look at year two the board yeah for a a one percentage point reduction to go from three percent to two percent need to find another an additional 6.3 million because the total impact in fiscal 28 is 12.3 million dollars okay i'm i'm i'm trying to build a

[02:46:31] bridge of some sort i'm i'm i'm looking i'm looking you know and and look me you know we're we're gonna have to be creative and we're gonna have to um we're gonna have to make some some some choices i mean i'm willing to work with you but we we've got to just find a way to pay for it well we're gonna be talking about custom we're gonna have to make deep cuts supervisor bode then bailey thank you managers a couple things one um i'd asked a question last week about if we had any data on how much it costs businesses to sort of change

[02:47:07] how they're they're they're doing it when they do the meals tax i know that the county exec he received that question from me last week i don't know if that if you all have had a chance to look at that this is the point and point of sale appreciate that i would love to have that at some point um second i know that that some folks at least on the board have sort of expressed to the and sir vega you just mentioned it most recently sort of a a concern that you know hey we do want to get at this in subsequent years we have to find some other place to to to raise or

[02:47:43] what have you um this board is not precluded from giving the county exec budget guidance for future years to leave some on the bottom line fairfax county did it this year i believe brian hill left for his board \$20 million or so, not massive amounts, but we can consider giving the county exec budget guidance in subsequent years to give us more room, whether we want to then use that for more tax relief, for investing in places that are emergent that we don't necessarily consider through the budget year, what have you. So I hear the concern of, hey, we always spend down to a

[02:48:18] penny or a couple hundred thousand dollars when the county exec presents his budget, but it doesn't have to be that way we just give the county exec guidance from this board and their finance and budget to the full board or the full board does it we can give the county exec guidance that we want to see in subsequent years more money on the bottom line to talk about that so i wanted to offer that to folks because that was something that was expressed from multiple of my colleagues as as a concern so and i'm open to that conversation for sure um as it pertains to this year uh and where we currently are you know people have sort of talked out surpluses what have you i

[02:48:55] I will also just say that our finance staff, on purpose, gives conservative revenue projections, not knowing exactly where things are going to land. We don't want them to try to be as close to the dollar or penny as they can be because we want to make sure that if something happens in the opposite direction of the economy, we're not then stuck halfway through a budget year or the end of the budget year with a shortfall that we didn't anticipate happening.

[02:49:22] I, frankly, would rather be in a position where we have a few million dollars surplus rather than the other direction. So I wanted to speak to that concern also. And just the final piece is, again, I'm willing to talk to folks about it for a subsequent years. But where I am right now, again, since the 1% reduction just went into place a few months ago, I feel like we can see how this bears out more.

[02:49:45] I hear my colleagues on their concerns around this. I just get concerned, especially outright getting rid of a revenue stream. We have conversations all the time about having a diversified tax base. Thank you, Madam Chair. All right, Supervisor Bailey.

[02:50:00] Thank you, Madam Chair. Supervisor Bodie, thank you for bringing up the point about being more collaborative with the county exec and his staff and giving direction with the vision that we're trying to achieve each year.

[02:50:18] And I think there's area of opportunity for us to do that more. But that's what I like about how they set the tone to get us there. That's so critical because, you know, I don't know about anybody else. When I started, we didn't really have the tone. And so I really appreciate that.

[02:50:36] But to that, I think, again, this is an area where we really do need to stabilize. I mean, I hear Supervisor LaCroire when she talks about the small businesses because I have the same in my district. And I haven't heard a lot of complaints at all.

[02:50:54] And I'm pretty much in tune with what's going on in the district like she is. So I haven't heard anything, really. But because, again, it goes into the vision that we're trying to build for the county and what that looks like as we do that.

[02:51:11] We have to be respectful of our business owners, of course. But that's the reason why, and Tom, I applaud you again for your discussions with the county attorney. That's why I'm on her calendar tomorrow, I think. But anyway, to have that similar discussion for when I presented to she and the county executive about the cannabis tax.

[02:51:34] There are areas of opportunity in the state budget that we need to take advantage of in partnering with our state delegation when it comes to taxes. And so I look at that as an opportunity, just like Tom was saying about his discussion with County Attorney Roble.

[02:51:54] So I think before we take this leap, we really need to stabilize in what we have, taking care of business owners, but also we need to also look at people that come into the county because we are a very popular county, and we are growing, and we have a bigger vision than what we had back in even the early 2000s or mid-90s.

[02:52:20] And so we've got to balance that as well. So I just want to offer that as food for thought because I'm very sensitive to what you're saying, but I think we've just got to look in terms of what kind of vision are we trying to capture, even in bringing newer small businesses into this county.

[02:52:39] That's all I got. Thank you. All right, Supervisor LeCoy, the wrap. And then, I mean, we're deadlocked, but I'm just going to have Mrs. Madden do the roll call. I just want to say one last thing. And I think that I loved that Supervisor Bode said that he wants to have the discussion prior to so that we'll have some extra money.

[02:52:59] But I think that every time somebody goes out and last year when they were saying next year we'll do this and next year we'll do that and we'll look at it tighter next year, they were in fact talking to the county and saying we want to make some cuts in this area.

[02:53:16] So now being in a situation where we have to try to look at the budget and start making cuts is a problem. And just for anybody who has forgotten what Woodbridge is, I don't know if you've been through it lately, but if anybody could go up and down the streets of Woodbridge and see the empty and vacant buildings and the places that have been blighted and empty for years, it's the businesses that weren't able to be sustained in Woodbridge.

[02:53:43] And like I said, I appreciate everybody, this is an entire county thing, and I'm representing Woodbridge, but I'm fighting for our existence here. And, you know, we've got a supervisor here in me that wants to stay in Woodbridge and wants to build it up and make it grow.

[02:53:59] And if people can't afford to run their businesses here and people can't afford to go out to eat, then we're not going to be successful with building up Woodbridge and making it somewhere, a destination where people want to live and be. And that's all I have to say. All right, Ms. Matt.

[02:54:15] Andrea, if you could do the roll call. Okay. This is on the food and beverage tax. Supervisor Vega, yes. What percent? She's just a yes.

[02:54:33] Okay. Well, I wanted your guidance, but you just... Okay, I'm sorry. Yeah, I went home credit. All right, so I did call for a vote. Give me one second. We are going to have to... I want to move this because we're going to have to talk tax cuts, and we're going to have to make some deep cuts. I will go with 1% cut.

[02:54:51] If I support the 450, could I get one of you to come and support 1% meal estate? meals tax reduction I'm sorry I was undecided on the 450 but it already carried did it I thought we were tied no we'll just pretend like it didn't and what if you say yes lord they didn't realize that madam chair oh my god I support the chair one percent okay I'll take it all right I say we sit pat provisionally if as we now go into this discussion about cuts

[02:55:31] If we can find the money, we put it to that 1%. So right now you're a no. Well, you're provisional ballot. Okay, go on. Supervisor LaCroix? 1%. Supervisor Gordy?

[02:55:49] 1%. Supervisor Bode? No change. Supervisor Bailey? No change. Supervisor Angry? No change. Chair Jefferson? 1%. Four 1%, one provisional, and three no changes.

[02:56:09] so that's kind of technically does we do we go down one percent since we have a provisional because that's not a no so this is why you have to be careful when you abstain so that's one percent off the meals tax so that's another six six million um dave can you give us go through and give us where we need to be or i'm sorry how short we are so and just for everyone we are other taxes we do have to set we're going to have the be told discussion bond referendum potential tax

[02:56:43] savings recap plus its items of board interest so where are we right now with this new cut assuming a january 1 implementation for the food and beverage tax being reduced from three percent to two percent on the county side we have a 14 million dollar shortfall compared to budget recap in FY27, but the shortfall in FY28 is \$16.7 million because that reflects the full year

[02:57:18] of the reduced food and beverage rate. All right, I'm sorry, Supervisor, before I get to you, for schools, how short would they be? In fiscal 27, compared to budget recap, they would be \$18.9 million lower in fiscal 27 and \$17.1 million lower in fiscal 28.

[02:57:52] All right, Supervisor Bodie. Thank you, Madam Chair. Folks probably will know where I'm going with this. I appreciate, sir, Sir Vega, the conversation we've been having about this. Dave, if we then exempted from going from 415 on computer peripherals to 450, where does that leave us and the schools?

[02:58:14] So from \$415 to \$450, that would be seven nickels. That would be \$21.5 million to the county exclusively.

[02:58:45] So the pickup to the county would be about \$12.5 million, and it's a zero-sum gain.

[02:59:01] Do you have anything else? Based on that, we'd want to see if we could take a temperature check of my colleagues that they support, then exempting that \$415 to \$450. Don't everyone jump in at once?

[02:59:19] Supervisor, and can people please actually hit, if you want to speak, just make sure you hit it so that we can see it. I see some calculations going on, temperature check, side conversations.

[02:59:47] He wants a temperature, yeah. All right, Supervisor Angry. This is simple. So you've already set it at 450, right? And you're just asking if all of that now can be non-RSA.

[03:00:04] I'm going to say yes. I mean, is this going to make up the deficit of knocking off a percent? I mean, you are generally messing with the revenue that you need for the county to get things done. So at this point, you've already said it at 450. You might as well take that revenue and try to balance the rest of, unless we're going to take something else away.

[03:00:21] But anyway, yes. I do want to say this is also revenue sharing. We would have to, I want to look at the county attorney because it's a one-way agreement. Do we have to advertise or anything like that? Madam Chair, members of the board, you are only legally required to fund the standards of quality that the state sets.

[03:00:41] Anything above that is discretionary. It is a policy that you have in place that you can and have changed unilaterally in the past, and you can unilaterally change it going forward. All right, so hold on. So what is on the table?

[03:00:57] What we were discussing is what Supervisor Bodie proposed. we have the cnp tax rate today right now in this budget at four dollars and 15 cents he wants to take we've gone to 450 we've decided that he wants to take that new income and exempt it from revenue sharing which would give us additional um

spending power now i'm sorry um as i'm listening to you chair i don't know if this is helpful for the board or not as i am i'm as i'm hearing the board's conversation, this slide might summarize what's going on. Going from \$415 to \$450, there's

[03:01:35] a total general revenue increase of \$21.5 million. What would otherwise go to the schools, which is \$12.3 million based on the revenue sharing agreement today, would be coming to the county.

[03:01:50] So that's the revenue gain by exempting this revenue, \$12.3 million. I mentioned \$12.5 million. I'm sorry I'm not infallible. You're not caffeinated enough. So I do want to say this because we're now going to go back to the, it sounds like there's a desire to go back to the revenue sharing agreement.

[03:02:10] So if we're going to go back, you know, we did have two proposals. A number of us spoke. We have a proposal to actually exempt a part of our new revenue, but how is that different than what Supervisor Vega is suggesting about changing the calculation?

[03:02:26] And before I go, I'm going to, because I got another trigger finger. You're ready. Because I just want to clarify my comment of yes. And that's because I, the revenue shared agreement currently today as set is set. This is additional revenue.

[03:02:44] It's set at 415. So I'm not talking about messing with current set rules of the revenue shared agreement. But the increase that you all has majority agreed to 450, and we have now this huge deficit of the budget that we need to fix because we're still making all these tax cuts.

[03:03:02] The only way to do this is to literally take that revenue and make it all counties so that we can get ourselves caught up with everything that's going on. And that's if we don't make any more cuts. But, okay. So I'm just going to put you down. You are in favor of exempting new – and, again, let me be clear because we had two separate proposals.

[03:03:23] We had Kenny saying we have this set and we are new revenue from C&P will specifically be exempted. we have supervisor vega who's talking about changing the formula so i just want to be clear because and dave if you don't mind uh with the calculations obviously if we exempt new revenue that's 21.47 million and supervisor vega's proposal which is the 54 point what that failed like two hours ago but still i'm just still going to ask because i want us to have a comparison but i'm supportive of this proposal so we can't forget my proposal okay this is more money okay so all

[03:03:58] All right. So angry is in favor of exempting. You're in favor of exempting new tax. Vega, you're next. Vega is in favor. Bodie, obviously you're in favor. Okay. I just still have to ask anyone else. Jump in. Please let me know. I'm a yes. LaCroix. I mean, jump into the queue.

[03:04:21] Well, you know what? I'm going to go ahead and I'll just have, I don't know if anyone wants to speak to this. This is for discussion for me. We are going to still get into cuts. It is a struggle for me it is a real struggle for me because i do want our schools to share in our prosperity they shared in time when times were hard they shared in it they they had to take cuts they had needs that they weren't able to fulfill you know and so for me this is a hard one i'm going to be a no because i'm really going to look at cuts i'm still going to look at cuts um because i would

[03:05:00] rather i don't want to balance our budget off the back of our students that's how i feel i'm not Again, I know everyone has different feelings, but that's what this feels like to me. So I'm going to go ahead, unless, I don't know, you're in here, if you're still in here, but I was going to have Madden do this.

[03:05:19] Well, I was, do you want me to, I'm in the queue, do you want me to speak, or? I mean, I was just going to have her do the roll call. Right, but I just want to be sure that what Supervisor Angry said is what it is. The school division is expecting to get 415. Yes. they're not it's not a cut and i just want to be clear that it is not a cut they're getting 415 we're deciding on 450 so that we can go ahead and do what we need to do to keep our side operating and so for those reasons i i i support supervisor angry and supervisor body i think that our we can still do it i just think we need more financial discipline um but let's go ahead

[03:05:58] and let's do the vote okay yeah madden like football madden boc's okay supervisor angry yes supervisor bailey supervisor bode yes supervisor gordy yes supervisor la croix yes supervisor stewart yes supervisor vega c chair jefferson we we

[03:06:35] wait no no i'm sorry i'm a no i'm a no i wasn't paying attention i was because she was speaking Spanish I had to do I am a no I am a hard no I love I'm a huge Francophile but no sorry I wasn't all right thank you all right I'm just making my notes so then um well that's what I was going to ask him next we're going to go back to where is temperature check Mr. Funn so on the county side

[03:07:07] of fiscal 27 uh the county is now 1.7 million dollars less than we were at at budget recap And schools? \$31.2 million less than budget recap, but the school transfer would be \$1,088,000,000, approximately.

[03:07:34] So, wait, they're going to be \$88,000,000? I'm sorry, \$88,000,000? Oh, I'm sorry, \$1.8 billion? \$1.088 billion. So I just do have a question.

[03:07:52] Again, you may not be able to answer it. I'm sorry to put you in the spot. but how much were they requesting us this is fall short of what they were requesting from us uh yeah so my apologies um they're what they incorporated in in the superintendent's budget was consistent fairly consistent with uh what the county executive presented in february based on the preliminary revenue estimate and that was about uh 1 billion 119 million dollars so we are

[03:08:29] slightly short of what the schools requested so i'm going to ask people because again these have consequences and i've tried to reach out to people and have open discussions not everyone was really open or wanted to talk to me about where they're at and so we come into budget again we're going to have to make deep cuts again you know maybe not as deep right now the schools are going to have to make some serious cuts schools don't have to make cuts so i know that you're in the queue but i just want everyone to think about this if everyone's comfortable they're comfortable but

[03:09:08] But I just have to say this. We can disagree. We have a lot of disagreements. People are in different places. I've reached out to everyone just to get a sense of where we are. When we're making decisions on the fly, even though we're still getting numbers from Dave, there are consequences to what we're deciding. And so we're going to have to talk about cuts.

[03:09:27] We're going to have to talk about a lot of cuts, but the schools are also going to be able to talk about cuts. So I just want to let everyone know this is where we are at. Supervisor Angry. Thank you, Madam Chair. so to be clear you know we came into this thing i wanted to focus on the residential taxes we did a significant of that i didn't want to touch anything else we just took a percent off of the mills tax thus driving us further down in this well that we've been in personally i don't think that was a good move but i will say we can't have it both ways you can't want to make all these cuts

[03:10:02] and then we we were trying to figure out how to you know make revenue to do these things so we literally have an opportunity because we raised the cmp tax of 450 well you all did and the only way you can get out of a deficit which was whatever mr sinclair just said is to literally take that money and make it all county now that will be county going forward so it's going to be in a non-touch rsa going forward so every year that neck that next from 415 to 450 is going to be separate funds that come to the county personally for me now i'm definitely not willing to have a

[03:10:39] revenue shared agreement conversation next year i think we've just solved a 21 million dollar increase to our budget over time period how we got here is because we want to cut everything now to give everybody what they want but at the same time we need more revenue to do what we want to do in the county situation so i'm sorry that for the schools if i have to say i'm not gonna i'm not giving you his revenue shared it's only because we literally cut everything to give back to the people and then some and now we have to find a a way to make up what we're trying to do in the county so i'm comfortable with where we are and i and and i don't believe that in any way

[03:11:19] am i sliding our schools but if they are in any way slid then we need to have a reset and go back and do all these numbers over again. I'll just leave it there. Alright. I think we should be looking at numbers. And again, we do have different priorities. Your priority was the deeper real estate cut.

[03:11:38] Mine was more of a moderate in my opinion. People still see a decrease. It was a smaller decrease because I felt that I want to stimulate businesses and I want to stimulate small businesses. And that's why I went with the 1% off of the mails tax.

[03:11:53] I mean, we still have other things that we're going to have to do. We're going to have cuts to make. You know, for me, schools is my sacred cow. That was the one thing for me I really, even if I wouldn't have gotten what I wanted on the meals tax, well, I didn't get what I want.

[03:12:11] I just, it's for me, cutting from the schools. It's like we're taking from the least of these. This is my opinion. Again, I know a lot of folks here disagree. And I just want to clean up my last piece there because, you know, and I just had my seven-year anniversary on this board, the oldest guy here, I've been saying since 2019 that I wanted to, at some point, find a place that we could really affect the residents and residential taxes.

[03:12:39] We made \$500 million, as everybody knows, in the C&P tax, and I said that in the early days. I wanted to find a way to lower residential, get personal tax base up high. I realize you can't do that. Residential is always going to be high, but the reality is we're in a place that we can do that.

[03:12:55] But it didn't mean that we can do everything else. So maybe those are in future years that we can discuss meals tax. We can discuss all this other stuff. Right now, we had the money to simply do that and then really look inside of ourselves and make those cuts that we need to make. So that's my position.

[03:13:10] So I just want to be clear that I believe I've achieved everything that the citizens have been screaming for the last six years about their taxes. While we still have been doing well for our police, our fire, and everything else. We've got general employers coming next. I got it. We've done some great CIP projects.

[03:13:26] We've got the revenue to do that. This was a year to really get the citizens in a comfortable place. We did a lot more here today, and now we're not even halfway there. And so I just want to be clear of my intent. And so it wasn't to dig into anything where we are now.

[03:13:42] And the rest of this revenue now that we're short has to be made up somewhere. So I just feel that because the CMP tax was \$415 and that really affected the RSA and the schools are happy with that, this increase is the only way this board in this county can help itself out of the hole that we're in all right vega i don't i don't want to drag this help but maybe i'm just not understanding and maybe one of you or you madam chair can explain to me how this is a cut again the school division is getting the projected

[03:14:16] 415 in revenue yes dave at the the current rate yes yes get their share so 450 thank you so we bumped it up to the 450 right so that we can have additional wiggle room i don't understand how we can sit up here and say that it's a cut it's not a cut so i will explain we've already because what we've done yes we've raised cnp to 450 but that offset we made a lot of other cuts we made a cut

[03:14:49] to the real estate rate and we also made a cut to the meals tax so we're in the hole and what we had just voted on that change to um exempting new cnp tax we're still in the hole now we get a little bit more money okay we get a little bit more money for ourselves with that you know taking that um increase from cmp tax but the schools are still short because they're not getting that new

[03:15:23] 450 they're not getting that from 415 to 450 they're not getting that 35 cents um they are losing money because we cut the meals tax and they're losing money because we cut the real estate tax rate so what we're going to be giving them will be less than what they expected and requested so that's why it is a cut and it is below so if anything we are not fulfilling our obligations because we said okay y'all they were expecting to get a certain number from us and they always budget to the number that they get from us this year we gave a number they came in at that

[03:16:00] number and now we are taking a little away so supervisor bode i hope that explains things supervisor bode yeah thank you madam yeah so right now there is a delta between the superintendent's requested budget and where we are that that's it's can you give that number again dave it's like two hundred thousand dollars or so right say yeah can you say can you that number again i believe the superintendent's budget is based on a county transfer of one billion one hundred nineteen million dollars so it's more than what i said okay based on what the board has discussed an 85

[03:16:36] cent tax rate reduction food food and beverage by one percentage point to two percent increase in computer and peripherals to 450 with the county retaining all the revenue generated by that 35 cent increase in the tax rate the fy 27 school transfer will be 1 billion 87.8 million dollars and again can you do like what's the difference there what's the dollar 31.2 million dollars

[03:17:13] compared right to budget recap so is that there's about the chair mentioned a lot of that Their share of the reduction in real estate revenue going to 85 cents was \$27.8 million of the 31.2.

[03:17:40] So we still have, so I want to go through, so just to let everyone know what's next. We're going to be talking about other taxes, and we can come back. We're going to talk about all other taxes as advertised, and that's the fire levy, mosquito and forest pest management levy, personal property stormwater management solid waste and the development fees which include planning land or site development fire marshal building development and any i'm just going to say all other taxes as advertised i don't know if there's any discussion on this supervisor stewart

[03:18:18] as per our last discussion um so i'm i'm dave you said that the schools were asking for 1 billion 119 million approximately got it okay um that's the base transfer from the county it does not include those additional transfers such as the class size reduction grant the school

[03:18:57] security it does it doesn't include that it does not include that okay all right um all right thanks i have another question but i'm just still running some numbers but i'll circle back Supervisor Gordy. Thank you, Madam Chair.

[03:19:15] You asked about the fees, the development services. The one question I had, and this is something that came up in a conversation that I had with development services, is the size of the projects for data centers has become very large.

[03:19:34] And the amount of fees that they're paying is not commensurate with the size of their projects. And so I would like to see what the potential is to address that sort of deficit between what is actually costing development services to review these plans and what is actually being paid.

[03:19:59] And so I don't know if this is appropriate time now, but that's certainly something asking about the fees in terms of it's not necessarily raising the fee, but it's about expanding that fee across what the total project is really costing the county to process.

[03:20:23] I don't know if anyone can answer. Yeah, I mean, is that something that, I mean, could you wait? Do you guys have an estimate on what is the limit that they're paying on?

[03:20:43] What was that arbitrary limit that was put in place? And then kind of, you know, how we've moved and how the industry has progressed over the years to these massive campus facilities with multiple data centers.

[03:21:00] Is that something you could speak to, Wade? Thank you. Madam Chair, members of the board, Wade Hugh, Deputy County Executive. So in the fee schedule, we do have caps on fees. And that was really put in place in certain types of fees in the building fee schedule that based on how the fee schedule is structured and multipliers, sometimes pre-data center we would find, you know, it would generate astronomical fees just because of maybe the amount of wiring or maybe the number of fixtures.

[03:21:30] So we put caps in place. And that worked exceptionally well for us until we start getting these large data center projects. And I think to your point, which I think you're referencing, is now that we're looking at the fee we're charging for a data center, say, on the building side, we should be increasing that to cover our cost because you're getting the cost for that plan review up front. That inspection process can drag out and take time, and you're really not recouping cost. Now, the question is, have we analyzed it, and could I tell you what that delta is right now? I'd have to check with staff. I don't know that we've done a full analysis on it.

[03:22:07] That may be something that we look at for a future time, but, you know, granted, you know, whatever the workload lift is is what they ought to be paying for.

[03:22:25] And so I think that's something that we need to be taking, take a review at. And if there's other areas of that that we need to look at, because our labor costs are not going down either. And so the amount of time it's taking and then we're looking at additional FTEs to meet this demand.

[03:22:44] I think we need to set the fee rate structure that's commensurate with the demand signal that's coming from the industry. Thank you. Thank you. All right, Supervisor Vega. I just have, I don't disagree with what you're asking for, Tom. I just want to ask the county attorney, I know that in the past we've been told that we can't single out an industry.

[03:23:05] When it comes to this request, is it still going to be a blanket approach, or are we just looking, how is this going to work? Madam Chair, members of the board, we need to look into it because I'm actually just trying to communicate to see what we would have to put in place to increase that fee.

[03:23:23] And as Mr. Hugh and Mr. O'Connor said, you know, we don't just increase it to increase it. We get some data first, but we're happy to work with the county exec and his team on the analysis of it and then how to go about doing it and making sure that it is legally defensible.

[03:23:39] Thank you. All right. Anything else? i agree i think it would be great if we were able to do something i support what you're saying supervisor gordy if there's no other discussion i would like to supervisor bode yeah you slipped in yeah sorry um and it's a similar beat because i don't think it's something we should uh mess with right now but um my office has been engaging with with the team the county um county staff side about stormwater management and how we have a lot of to the same point whether it's data centers are

[03:24:13] these very large structures have a lot of impervious surfaces, and how right now, you know, right now we're now tagging residents and businesses with these larger fees to make up for the needs for a stormwater management system, but to me, some of these very large impervious surface heavy establishments should probably be paying a little bit more.

[03:24:36] I'm not sure what that looks like, so I know that we've been talking through, remember there's a threshold where you start a new class of once you get to a certain threshold of impervious surfaces you start a new class of what that fee should be again I know that staff is sort of working through that but I think that I wanted to plant the seed of that now again I don't think we've worked through it enough this year but for subsequent years I think we should talk about having a threshold there that once you get a certain amount of impervious surfaces you can have a new class and that doesn't set that's not targeting one industry that's hey there's a threshold, if you have X number of impervious surface or higher, you pay more in your sort of

[03:25:10] water management fee. All right. So if there's no other discussion, I'd like for us to go ahead and take a roll call on all other taxes as advertised. It's either yes or no.

[03:25:35] I'll go first and say yes. Supervisor Bode. Yes. Supervisor Gordy. Yes.

[03:25:52] Supervisor Stewart. Yes. Supervisor Angry. Yes. Supervisor Bailey? Yes. Supervisor LaCroix? Yes. Supervisor Vega? Madam Chair, which ones are the ones that are lowering the pest?

[03:26:12] So the fire levy is the rate is going down, but the average levy increases \$3. A mosquito and forest pest management levy fee, that rate is going down, and we're going to see a \$2 decrease. And then the other ones increase?

[03:26:28] Everything else is development fees is going up. Hold on. Let me pull up that slide. Sorry. I'm sorry. Let me pull that up. So, stormwater management, solid waste, they are staying. We're going to see increases in development, land, or site.

[03:26:49] You know what? Let me just make it easy. I'll be a yes considering some of the give and take that we've done. Yes. Thank you. All right.

[03:27:07] Everyone's unanimous. Yay. All right. Beautiful. Let's go back to BPOL. We've had a lot of discussion, and I actually printed that one out. So, if anyone needs the presentations, I have them. um but

i want to see because we had talked about this does anyone need a presentation no everyone's good all right i killed a tree for no reason um i want to see if people wanted to take any action on people i know we were talking about maybe looking at different fee classes i want to see if anyone had anything they want to say about this if they want to move forward with anything

[03:27:42] around people a license fee or not so supervisor bode i see you reaching yeah thank you madam chair um yeah i i i mean i i think we should talk about this we've talked about it for the last couple years um i guess to my question to staff is do we know at what fee level we break even if we administer option a which is the yeah which is the option of having the fee and not instituting exemption uh hi leslie weldon director of finance um we do not know that break even because we don't have an idea of how many businesses would register and because they

[03:28:21] currently aren't registered we don't necessarily have what their current revenues are so if we did a range how many would fall in that range we don't have the data all right supervisor LaCroix um I think we should not handle it this year or discuss it right now and I'll tell you what 500,000 is not a very big business and just you know once you start making 500,000 you you feel lucky that

[03:28:56] you are, you know, being able to survive and hope for the next year and starting to tax people. And I just don't think we know enough about it right now for us to go forward with that. Anyone else?

[03:29:16] I know we were still waiting to have discussions, but I want to, Supervisor Vega. I'm not sure if the team has that slide with the different options that you presented to us. I think it was in our Finance and Budget Committee meeting. If we could put that up there, please. Yeah, because it's not in this one.

[03:29:35] But, no, that's why I'm asking for it.

[03:29:57] Well, they look for it, Madam Chair, if I may. I haven't really been a fan, per se, but, you know, I'm obviously open to discussions and hearing what everyone has to say about it.

[03:30:23] There it is.

[03:30:37] Hello, Mr. Gordy. Madam Chair, thank you for this. And, you know, I go back to the fact that this is, I hate B-Poll. I wish it didn't exist.

[03:30:53] but it's what exists in Virginia. And I look at this from a few perspectives. And the one perspective that troubles me the most is the surprise that people find themselves in when they all of a sudden hit a threshold, and now they need to pay this tax. But it's not only now, you got to go back and look six years, and then you pay interest on all that. And it becomes a

[03:31:24] debilitating and often in some extent catastrophic surprise to business owners. I think it's better that we help our businesses manage themselves. We have better collaboration with them. They know what's coming in this way that does not become a surprise. I do, and while we, I mentioned last week the graduated uh fee structure i like option b um but doing maybe looking at a threshold if

[03:31:58] you're less than twenty thousand dollars of income there's uh you know a low fee you know up to a hundred thousand maybe it's a next fee and then above that to 500 or whatever and then we get into the other but i'll also we've talked a lot about the difference between the gross receipts and the threshold and the exemption um and i think the exemption is the thing that uh helps um do the math for folks a little better because it it helps them understand what's coming and what what the threshold is for when they would have to start paying the tax um that that once they

[03:32:37] hit that five hundred thousand dollar range um so i you know i'm for option b but looking at a more of a graduated fee structure on the license. Madam Chair. Yes, Mr. Schurter. So I just wanted to make note. We were doing some additional research on BPOL.

[03:32:56] It is not a discussion that we have to have, meaning that it doesn't have to be a part of the budget resolutions scheduled for the 21st. I say that to say that there are going to be some implications for businesses if this is implemented.

[03:33:14] That is with inspections and other impacts for businesses that we're not expecting to undergo some sort of additional requirement. I'd also say we were, to Supervisor Gordy's point, we were looking at this grandfathering question that the board or the committee asked.

[03:33:36] And so we may not, we don't have the answers as yet, but are preparing to provide some additional information for BPOL. All right, so I think right now we can go ahead and just table this one, because there are going to be additional discussions to be had.

[03:33:54] So for now, we'll just go ahead, no decisions on BPOL, we will table it. I do, before we get into potential cost savings, I do want to talk a little bit about the potential bond referendum. Because we had given the staff direction, functional direction to keep moving forward.

[03:34:11] I know I've talked to someone about this. I did send an email after further consultation with some of the members and with staff. I wanted to discuss considering deferring that until next year. Because right now, quite honestly, we just, it's not just that we don't just have the money.

[03:34:27] We don't have the debt capacity. And I think additional work needs to be done. I know in terms of the indoor sports facility, we've been talking about the landing. and there's still work, and they're still scoping that project, it would give staff time to give us better cost estimates.

[03:34:43] How much would some of these projects, like a new library, how much would it cost? How much, you know, debt would we have to take on, and what would be the operating costs? I still think that, you know, there needs to be discussion around this. And quite honestly, given that we're going to have to make up a lot of the cuts that we've made, it really is just we're in a really tough point position right now so supervisor bode i see you yeah thank you manager just some questions for staff i mean so manager i hear what you're saying

[03:35:16] but serve for staff if we if the bond referendum and we haven't obviously structured the questions yet but let's say they pass how long do we have to start drawing down drawing on the bonds generally once the voters approve assuming they approve the referendum the county would generally speaking have eight years to issue the debt um the county could petition an additional two up to two year extensions we would petition the circuit court to request an additional two

[03:35:54] years but to be to put it in a slightly different way us getting it approved by the voters doesn't immediately obligate us or doesn't obligate us at all to the debt right it does it does not as a matter of fact in the the 2019 referendum the mobility referendum that was approved by voters they authorized i believe up to 355 million of dollars of debt to be issued i don't think we've issued any uh at this point right although the board has had recent conversations sure about that as well and so then to that point dave thank you so even for the some of the um mobility and

[03:36:29] transportation oriented projects that were on that approved by the voters but then we found other ways to pay for it so for some of those projects correct a lot of it thus far has been nvta 30 revenue that we have uh as a as the board has chosen to cash fund for example uh the minneville road prince william parkway interchange project and then uh staff's uh proposed cip recommendation cash funding Devlin Road widening among others and VTA 30 percent revenue is a big

[03:37:08] part of why we haven't issued debt yet. Sure so I guess my final question is so if as we move forward and we let's say we do decide to have it this year and voters give us some authority of bonds if we still find ourselves in a couple years still not really able to take on the debt Because we have projects going through, whether there are projects or earlier point school projects, we could just not take it on, right?

[03:37:36] Ultimately, that would be a choice of the board. Right. Appreciate that. All debt that is issued by Prince William County must be authorized by the Board of County Supervisors, whether it be school debt or county government debt.

[03:37:54] So I appreciate that. So where I'm going with this and where I am and why I wanted to ask this question is I don't want us to feel like there's a sense of since the voters, we have to do it. We can't do it this year because if the voters approve it, there's an obligation to take on that debt. Because I understand the concern that, Madam Chair, you have about debt.

[03:38:12] But to me, a couple of things. One, I like referendums to have as most of a reflective turnout as possible. And my concern with that is if we wait until next year, we will likely have lower turnout in November than this year.

[03:38:30] And so the broadest sampling of voter and their sentiment as possible, unless we wait until 2028, will likely be this year in November. And that's not a partisan or political statement. Literally, we have midterm elections in even years.

[03:38:45] In this county, we have higher turnout than odd years. Last year was a little bit of an outlier, but still, even in a gubernatorial years, there tend to be lower turnouts. So I have said it several times. I like the voters to decide. And to me, the best time to have that is we have the largest potential voters coming out to vote, which would be this year.

[03:39:05] And the last thing I'll say about it, and I appreciate the thought of, hey, we can give staff more time to come up with numbers. Again, if staff can at least give us and give the voters rough estimates on what those ceilings are on those projects, we don't have to take on all that.

[03:39:22] It's a ceiling, right? It's not a floor. And if estimates come out lower than what we gave, what we got authorization from the voters, we don't have to take that on. And if for whatever reason we undershot it, well, then we have to have a conversation about that.

[03:39:37] But for me, ultimately, we have to have a conversation with the schools about their debt anyway. And so I still feel comfortable moving forward with the bond reform this year for all those reasons, especially knowing that we will have the largest sampling of voter sentiment this year as opposed to next year.

[03:39:54] Supervisor Bailey, then Gordy. Okay, just for clarity. I had my ear in tune to what Kenny was saying. Just for clarity, as it relates to our triple bond rating, because I'm real.

[03:40:12] focused on that. If we have the bond referendum process in tow, it doesn't, and it passes, it doesn't impact us until we use it. If we don't have it in tow, it doesn't impact us until we have to put it in play again. Am I, is that the thing? I'm just trying to understand because I don't want it to impact our AAA bond rating. And my understanding is it won't unless

[03:40:47] we use it I think for the most part that's correct supervisor Bailey however I do want to point out when the county's financial advisor PFM came and presented to the board their concern is our scheduled debt issuances not in fiscal 27 but in the out years yes as it relates to the county's revenue the the debt issuance and the associated debt service is outpacing our projected revenue in the out

[03:41:27] years of the five-year plan. I just want to, staff would just caution the board that PFM's analysis did not include Route 28, nor did it include a potential parks, open space, and library referendum.

[03:41:49] And Dave, if I can, Madam Chair, just one other question. Oh, I got a little time. That is why it's important that we focus on our reserves. Yes, I would just, staff would just remind the board, PFM had two concerns, our reserve levels and future debt capacity.

[03:42:12] They are, they're interrelated, but they are two separate issues. This board and the Finance and Budget Committee has made very proactive steps, and you should be commended for it in regards to plans for boosting reserves.

[03:42:30] So that's one integral piece that taking measures on. There is still the debt capacity issue. But I think the key word, thank you, Master of Fund, is integral.

[03:42:48] That's the key word. Thank you. Supervisor Gordy. Thank you, Supervisor Bailey. that kind of led right exactly where I was going because as I'm going back and looking at PFM's presentation, you know, as you look at the green to red, you know, the moderate debt and pension burdens is one of the things that's closest to the red.

[03:43:16] And in there, they, you know, each rating agency gives an opinion. It's very subjective, but based upon analysis, right? And so I think one of the things that we have to be careful is that we're not telegraphing something that subjectively could let them have concerns about our fiscal management.

[03:43:39] And so I would, you know, I'm why I would love to do a park bond this year. I am, you know, and just looking at what we've already the debt that's already coming in the short term over the next three to five years between us and the schools. it's a heavy lift. And so even if we passed a bond today, you know, I would say the earliest, you know, once we start getting kind of out of that bow wave of debt creation over the next few years, it may be a few more years after that before we could really even start looking at

[03:44:15] issuing bonds. And so I think it, given just this, these set of circumstances, I think it's worthwhile waiting a year and taking another review and in the meantime finding those things that are closer to the green and make them stronger supervisor vega than angry thank you supervisor bailey and supervisor gordy i too want to be on the side of caution uh you know while important uh libraries parks and i know that at the center of this conversation is an indoor sports

[03:44:53] complex. You know, I want to remind folks that we have really serious priorities that we have to fund. As Dave stated, 28 is not included in this. We don't even know really how to properly fund this. We're still having those conversations, but I'm sure you all have seen and read the news.

[03:45:14] There was an eight-year-old, nine-year-old that died. And, you know, our office has been working since I've been in office to try to find solutions, remedies to this situation. I believe, and I'm waiting for Petey to confirm on this, but we've had four fatalities in the last five years.

[03:45:34] And when we talk about our strategic plan, school is a piece of the pie. But when it comes to the funding, it takes a great portion of that pie. And it leaves us in limbo, where we're now talking about bond referendums, or we're now talking about how we're going to fund this, how we're going to fund that.

[03:45:50] We have some serious, serious projects, some serious improvements that we are going to have to undertake, and I believe that right now the prudent thing would be for us to wait just to kind of see how all of this balances out, and I would hope that there is consensus on that on the board, and thank you, Madam Chair, for bringing it up for further consideration today.

[03:46:12] Supervisor Angry. Thank you, Madam Chair. just real quick so we in 2019 i'm going way back when we in the 2020 board had those bonds out for some highways some parks we only really use we only use one of those bonds didn't we one of those um uh what the citizens want i think it was is it for the park or the intersection with for the park predominantly for the parks now it staff a lot of those project budgets because of

[03:46:49] covid and scheduling because we didn't schedule those park projects to all start in the first year after it was the referendum was approved a lot of board members sitting here today are dealing with project shortfalls i think in the case of supervisor vega and hellwig park there wasn't enough in in the referendum and and so there was difficult decisions to scale back the original

[03:47:23] project scopes that were envisioned um and so and and i i you know you're working with the parks and recreation team on on neabsco district park and and might be running into the same right and my point they really wasn't the whole process but my point of all that was this is that it was open to the people to tell us what they wanted now if we sit up here and got all these visions of what we want i think that's wrong but the when we did that in 2019 the people came out and said what they wanted we didn't have to act on any of that we remember we went from a from two swimming pools

[03:48:00] one on the east one on the west so a big old track indoor and all this stuff and had all this stuff and then it got dwindled down and matter of fact the indoor complex even got taken off and so it wasn't even on there but the point of this whole discussion is as it comes to these bonds this is what the people on the election year generally come out and say well it's ever on the ballot what we think they want but we did that by being at the hill performing arts center open it up to the public they came out and told us generally what they wanted to see in the county that they were willing to pay for so i'm not sitting here saying we should throw all this stuff on there but i'm saying if we're going to be listening to the people as we discuss all night all day

[03:48:37] then let the people speak and see what they want at least offer that option to them to let them come out and they may say they want nothing and also lastly just because they want something doesn't mean we have to do it because if we don't have the funds to do so and it's not the right time, then we don't do it. But I think when you're talking about the voice, as we've been saying this entire day, let the people speak. Supervisor LaCroix. I would like to go ahead and share what Supervisor Angry just said because letting the people speak means that we're listening.

[03:49:16] And when we listen to them, whether we act on it or not or find the funding or not, it makes a huge difference to be heard and i agree with every single word you just said all right it sounds like again i just want to give this is not something necessarily i just want to give be able to see are we going to keep moving forward with this process or end it i'm just going to quickly go down the line bailey move forward and where are you give me a minute ma'am stewart

[03:49:47] we wait we wait okay wait bodie is move forward i believe angry is move forward so two move forwards one wait i'm a wait you're a wait you're a move forward i'm a wait you're a wait gordy's a wait so we have a wait and he's awake we've got two move forwards bailey i'm sorry you were your wait your wait where are you your wait and bailey's a wait so we're gonna hold off and defer this to

[03:50:23] 2027 the actual referendum all right keeping this train moving moving and grooving we are now going to go on to potential cost savings um we have a major hole that we are going to have to repair i know some people maybe have things already that they have teed up i don't know if people also do we have something mr sinclair yes and i apologize to the board i neglected to mention this earlier just so just to recap in fiscal 27 the county is 1.7 million dollars um in the red

[03:51:01] yes but in fiscal 28 we're four million dollars in the red and the reason for that again is is the full year impact of the reduced meals tax rate all right i am i'm going to call for another brief for access because i know some of us i have to go grab a couple things and there might be some discussions need to be had we may i mean we are going to have to make some serious tax cuts but we may have to revisit the rates again i think that we're going to have to revisit the rates that

[03:51:34] we said earlier because we've gone too low um we've got supervisor vega madam chair you know we've spent so much time and there was a majority consensus on those rates i would recommend that before we start to revisit rates we actually get through the portion of what cuts um have been recommended and then we kind of see where we're at that's what i'm saying actually you just reiterated what i said we are going to get into cuts but i am giving people a break because there still going to be conversations that need to be had and maybe some things that we're going to look at give people additional time because i don't think everyone was prepared to come here to make

[03:52:10] cuts so i do want to give people additional time to talk through cuts and if we are not able to cut enough we will have to look at rates again i know we've had kind of that conversation and you know it was a quite fruitful discussion but just like we went back when we visit the revenue sharing agreement we're going to have to revisit everything because we may not find enough cuts so I'm going to give folks, I think half an hour is fine. Let's go ahead and take 30 minutes and we'll

[03:52:40] be back here. Thank you. So let's go ahead. We are going to talk about some things that we are able

[03:54:08] to cut from the budget. And then, you know, we will probably have to revisit. We'll see, you know, some of our earlier rates and get into recap. I know that this is going to be kind of like longer snipe so i hope everyone's comfortable and all that stuff so let's go into potential cost savings i know that a lot of folks have ideas um i don't know where to start i guess i'll start at the end with you mister you don't have anything all right so i will start because

[03:54:47] i need to get my computer up and running one other thing then i'll start with supervisor bailey one of things my staff and i were talking about is um some of the positions that we're hiring rather than

hiring them for July 1st hiring them for January 1st um and so give me one second because I want to open what I started working on with my team and there may be some positions that we're going to have to also cut out right as well so I'm sorry so we have a bunch of new positions that

[03:55:27] we are hiring for um you know and I know that it's really urgent that we get people in for um you know our fire and rescue and our police um but if there's any way at least some of our sworn police positions if we can make those um January 1st hires that would save us I think six hundred and thirty thousand dollars um if we I'm just looking at things that my steam and I were kind of talking about I know we have a trail maintenance full um FTE and a project inspector for parks you know I hear the voice of some of my friends who are you know really in support of trails but those

[03:56:06] are positions that we might you know be able to cut um shift the public health food inspector higher to January that'll save us about fifty three thousand dollars um sustainability I hate doing this but maybe delaying those hires and talking about new hires for that department next year um we were talking um FFV vehicle additions maybe deferring those again as well um shift the noise ordinance expensive bless you to half a year including equipment training personnel if we can

[03:56:39] save um make savings to that that will be 208 000 a year um omni ride I know this is a tough one but looking at ending you know like no additional subsidy so that would save us 1.2 million I'm just And obviously, removing the parks and bond referendum, that saves us money.

[03:57:01] I'm throwing out some things and some ideas. I can certainly slow down, and we could talk about each one of these individually. But we should look at cutting some positions. And again, if we can delay hiring for some of these positions from July 1st to January 1st, that would save us money.

[03:57:18] But I just wanted to kind of go with the idea. Are people comfortable talking with the department or having discussion with moving some of our positions to a January 1st start and making some staff cuts, some cuts to what we have in the budget? I don't hear anything.

[03:57:37] People are quiet. Oh, I have to refresh because I was like, what the heck? All right. Supervisor Bailey. Yes. Madam Chair, to your question, I, you know, let me just say I agree that we should do some cuts.

[03:57:55] in terms of hiring here, in terms of the FTEs. But I think when we hire, I would not like to determine when we hire. I think the county exec, that's his responsibility, and I don't want to get in his lane because I would think that I'm still the HR director that I was in the past and I'll make a lot of mistakes because this is different.

[03:58:20] This is a different industry, and this is a different environment. So I wouldn't want to get in his lane in terms of when. But one of the things that I really want to share with my colleagues is I think that there is an opportunity.

[03:58:36] The county exec has done, he and his staff has done a yeoman's job in bringing us to a point out of the darkness into the light in terms of where we are with recruiting and staffing.

[03:58:53] And I said that at the beginning of this evening. I think where we are now is stabilizing. I think that's very important and supporting the stabilization of our staff and supporting the stabilization of our staff. I think one thing that we've done, though it was a struggle getting there, but I think we came to a

decision, is we have the collective bargaining piece in place in terms of the negotiations and protecting employees.

[03:59:21] I think that was critical in this environment and in the regional environment. One of the places that I think we could really slow down just a bit, stabilize a little bit more, is the first part of the compensation market adjustment and the classification and compensation study.

[03:59:42] I think that's an opportunity for us to stabilize a little bit more, say \$15 million, \$15.404, \$405 million in our budget, and also hire where needed.

[04:00:00] Now, when I went through this, certainly we want to make sure that our public safety environment is taken care of and our sheriff departments taken care of.

[04:00:16] And so I would absolutely support that and our planning. We have a lot of criticism about our planning department and the staff that they're in need of. So I would support that. We made promises, promises made, promises kept to the Commonwealth attorney in the past.

[04:00:36] We never gave her exactly what she asked for, but we were incrementally, the county exec, make sure that incrementally we were giving her what she was requesting. So I would definitely support that. Parks and Recs, the Occoquan Greenway and Trail Maintenance. Then executive management.

[04:00:53] I'm going through the list now. I would absolutely support that. and fleet management. And then we've got an executive management. We've got two FTEs there, finance, public health, adult detention center, and again, public safety, communications, but the fire and rescue, absolutely, and developmental services, and even the legislative services that we had on the list. But I think we would make a really good decision if we stabilize

[04:01:30] in our community, in our county's community, if we looked at that \$15 million. And I want to offer that to my colleagues just to consider, not to say we're not going to do it, but to save from my list \$1.3 million with the FTEs that we are trying to hire, but also on top of that \$15 million.

[04:01:57] I think that would really help us in terms of our budget. So I just want to offer that for your consideration because I think that we still need to focus on making sure that there is leverage in the collective bargaining negotiations and that we can fund it when there is leverage.

[04:02:19] And so that's my story for now. I'd like to have that discussion, please. So you're talking about page 47 of our budget book, the general service market adjustment. It's not what you're referring to? Page 47. I don't have that in front. Let me see what you saw.

[04:02:35] Madam Chair, point of order. Yes, Supervisor Vega. There has to be a more organized way to do this. Because right now we're just talking and wasting time. And if I may, you gave out some recommendations where we can offset, and so did Supervisor Bailey. But nobody's keeping track of that.

[04:02:52] And I think that as you're making said recommendations, we should probably be testing, right, or getting a feel for the temperature of the majority as to whether we support it or not. because it's very unorganized, and I don't think we're going to get anywhere. You're right. What I was throwing out was some suggestions.

[04:03:10] I want to take the temperature of the board. So before I get into what Supervisor Bailey said, I should take the temperature of the board. Are we comfortable making staff cuts to the budget? And you

don't have to. We don't have to take. I'm just trying to make sure I see people. Are we comfortable making staff cuts to the board?

[04:03:28] Yes. Hold on. Before I go into it, I just want to say, that's something that people are generally comfortable with because we can also go back. And I know this is something you really didn't want to do, but I do think it's worth us going back and looking at the rates again. I know that we've had these conversations ad nauseum, but really we can keep making cuts. The real problem came from when we were all over the place and not everyone had discussions with everyone. I think it actually, let me just go back. Let's go ahead and look at the rates again. Let's go ahead and look at what we've done for real estate.

[04:04:03] We went to the highest that we could for C&P. I hate to do this. Let's talk about revenue sharing and meals tax again, because this is where we got in trouble with the budget. We got in trouble when we went to really low rates. We got in trouble. And again, there were a lot of conversations that weren't had.

[04:04:19] People were kind of, I feel, spitballing some of the things they were thinking about. So let's go ahead. Instead of going into cuts right now, I think we could still do that and have the conversation. Let's go back and talk about the rates. Is there a desire, hold on, for anyone to go ahead and reopen discussion on the rates?

[04:04:37] Supervisor Bailey. Madam Chair, I would like for us to, as Supervisor Baker is saying, without confusing it, I mean, instead of going back at the rates, I would like for us to look at the cuts that you initially said we would look at when we came to the dais, because I think that that would help us solve a huge fiscal problem in this if we take the opportunity to do that.

[04:05:05] I think that would be an answer to our prayer if we do look at it. Now, I don't want to, I mean, I understand what she meant about individually. I said a lot. But I really would like to get, if we could, a temperature on that compensation study and that \$15 million because that's a chunk of money.

[04:05:24] And I just would like, would sincerely like to have a temperature check on that before we go and talk about rates because we've made a decision on that already. so hold on again we're all over the place and i would love to hear what your suggestion is but i do want to get back to what she said i've had a couple people during the break who said that they wanted to go back to rates that's one of the reasons i also brought it up but so let's go on first i'm going to ask her before i go back to you what is do you think is a great way to do this because we are you know um i'm open for suggestions i know compensation study i was talking about some of the position cuts i'd like to see and some of the again i was just throwing that out as a

[04:06:02] temperature check but i would love to hear what you were thinking supervisor vega yeah madam chair i don't think we need to rehash what's already been settled right because when you talk about going back and revisiting rates a lot of the give and take and negotiating in a bipartisan fashion that went on also took into consideration the 450 cmp tax so if you do it for one we're literally going to have to do the entire process over again and i don't think that that's fair to us i don't think it's fair to staff and i don't think it's fair to the taxpayers so what i would recommend is is that dave give us a quick summary of where we left off before we went on the 15 minute break

[04:06:36] and if it's okay with the rest of the board instead of saying you know this is you know at recap we were here we were there can you just give us numbers based on what we've already settled here today

right now because it gets a little dicey when you know you refer back to recap numbers and And so I wrote down that we were in the red \$1.7 million before we went to break.

[04:07:00] Is that still true? That's correct. In fiscal 27, but in fiscal 28, we're in the red \$4 million. Yes. And, you know, that also, I guess we can also talk about, even if you offset hiring folks, you know, January 1st, that still doesn't bring us up to speed in FY28, correct?

[04:07:20] Staff is here to support the board, but a word of caution. Moving start dates, budgeted start dates for positions to January 1, for example, that's one-time savings in fiscal 27. It will not help solve the fiscal 28 issue.

[04:07:36] Thank you. And so my recommendation, if it pleases the majority of the board, is we go down to what's been agreed, where we're in the red, and then we start to talk about the cuts because that will start to decrease the \$1.7 million and hopefully put us back in the black or in the green if it pleases the majority of the board.

[04:07:54] i hear you what i'm going to sue and you're right let's i will make sure what do is orderly i've already made some suggestions i know supervisor bailey i'm sorry mr shorter did you have something before i continue yes madam chair so what i'd suggest um as we approach this what i would want to do just because we do have the agency directors here it seems like if we're going to talk position by position that i would want uh i would suggest that maybe board members go agency by agency to ask for clarity on specific positions. In terms of the compensation and

[04:08:28] classification study, I'd like to just take a minute or two to talk a bit about what the product of the compensation study was and what we mean by classification versus compensation. So there's a compensation portion, and I think that is what Supervisor Bailey's referencing, but a very important classification product that was delivered with this study that I would suggest we move forward with separate from the compensation. That said, if we're going to move down this path, I would suggest that maybe we allow agencies to just give more color to why they

[04:09:08] have asked for the positions that they've asked for, and maybe I'll add a word or two if necessary as well. Madam Chair. Supervisor Vega. Thank you. Well, I appreciate the county executive's suggestion. Again, we are pushing nine o'clock. Having to give further descriptions and refreshers on these positions, that and the other, we're going to be here until midnight. I'm sorry. I'm going to have to say, I think that's actually an excellent idea and I'll go through with other people. I mean, we can keep debating the process and I know there are other people in queue. We can keep debating the process because that does add on time. We have made cuts

[04:09:44] to a level that a lot of people are surprised and are not sure where to go. And when we signed up for this job. We signed up to be here and get the work done. I realized that no one wants to be here late. I don't want to be here late. I was actually, well, I was actually prepared to be here late because as in last year, we went down a road that was not sustainable and we really had to make some tough decisions. So I think it is fair. I mean, I could take the temperature of the board again, that will keep the discussions going. I think it's fair to go agency by agency and look line by line. Some of the things, you know, we can call in, you know, safe and secure community And people who have questions or things they want to discuss, give them that chance to discuss.

[04:10:22] This is not going to be wrapped up easily or quickly. I think that we owe it to the public. If we're going to do this process, we've got to do this process. It is messy, but we've got to keep moving forward. So I don't know if there's anything you want to say to that. Well, I'll just add, Madam Chair, that when, you know, folks already made their case to the board as to their ask.

[04:10:42] And if you're going to be calling department heads or whoever to remake the case that's already been made, we are going to be here for a very long time. And I want to add, Madam Chair, if I may, right, that this is now our budget. We already know what the asks are. We've gone through it.

[04:10:57] You asked for us to be prepared here to make recommendations on what those cuts are going to be, and people are ready. So we're not remaking the case. We're not coming up and presenting again. You know, if people have questions about specific positions or, like, for example, I was, you know, saying, hey, maybe we can, with some of these positions, have a delayed start date.

[04:11:15] What impacted what that had? So we already had, I have positions that I certainly would like to eliminate. You know, I don't know if there's going to be questions or discussion on this. You know, I put my ask out there. Someone else came back with it. So what we can do, again, they're not remaking the case or redoing the presentation.

[04:11:35] What I think would be great is we'll go ahead and finish what Supervisor Bailey had said. We will have the discussion about that item. If people have, we can go agency by agency, which cuts or quadrant by quadrant, perhaps. whichever is easier, which cuts we would like to see made.

[04:11:53] Is that something that you feel like? I want to hear from the rest of my colleagues. I'm trying to get in. Wait, hold on. Hold on. I'm not finished. I will call on folks. And I hear you. We can take the temperature of the board, but again, this is adding to the discussion time. You know, we can do it in a more orderly process.

[04:12:09] We'll start with what Supervisor Bailey had put out there. We can go agency by agency or quadrant by quadrant about what cuts we want to make. But if you would like to hear from additional people, hold on, Supervisor Angry, you may go. Thank you, Madam Chair. Dave, what is the shortfall we're working with now? 1.7, that's this year.

[04:12:28] 1.7 million in fiscal 27, 4 million in fiscal 28. 4 million in fiscal 28. Madam Chair, I don't mind being here, but I do want to make sure the time is productive and we're efficient. So my question would be, you mentioned going back to the tax rates.

[04:12:47] I'm not willing to, so I think you can take a temperature check of the board. If I'm not willing to go down on the residential at 85, I would be willing to get rid of that 1% for the mill tax. I don't know where the board is with that. Thirdly, I think we should be talking about big-ticket items. So if Supervisor Bailey wants to talk about the class and comp and the 15 mill, then that clearly would take care of every position that is on this.

[04:13:11] And I don't want to go down line by line to start talking about what Mr. Shorter has presented as far as employees goes. Now, I get it. There are some questionable things that you want to discuss. But I think sitting here for each of us to do that, what I need to know is, are we willing to either budge on the residential tax, which I am not?

[04:13:32] Are we willing to budge on that 1% and put it back, which will probably put us back in the green? And are we willing to discuss this discussion about \$15 million, which would clearly end the discussion tonight in every position which would be covered? So we are going to go ahead and we're going to have a discussion on the item she brought up.

[04:13:49] But I also think it's fair to limit. I know where you feel, and you're very strongly and very passionate about the real estate tax rate. However, it's not fair to say, well, we're going to leave this alone, but we're going to go ahead because I don't care for this other tax. Hold on. I don't care for this other tax so much, so we're going to have to move on that.

[04:14:04] I mean, the thing is, we also talked about revenue sharing, and we went back and had a whole other discussion on that, and we've put the schools in a really bad spot, okay? We've put the schools in a really bad spot. And so, again, I've reached out to folks, tried to have conversation to gauge where people are at, you know, just so there were no surprises.

[04:14:23] There were surprises. But this is what happens. This is what happens. So, wait, hold on. I believe this board has put ourselves in a very bad spot. And all I'm simply saying is I'm only one vote. And I think in interest of an eight-person board, the decision would be simple if we just went down some high-chicket things and figured out what those numbers are.

[04:14:46] I think we can go through high-ticket things, but again, I've had people come to me and have conversations between the boards. So what we're going to do... Wait, can I say something? Hold on. Wait, hold on, folks. Point of order, Madam Chair. Wait, before I'm about to gavel. Madam Chair, I said point of order, and based on our rules... Five-minute resets.

[04:15:03] Madam Chair. Oh, no, five minutes. Unbelievable. All right, we are back. I know we have people in queue. I'm going to say what I think is the best way we can continue to have on, let me refresh, discussion about the process. I do think we should go with the big-ticket items.

[04:15:18] but we should also go agency or quadrant by quadrant. How about that? We'll start with big ticket items. We will go quadrant by quadrant, and then we will go back to some of the discussions that we've had previously because there has been a desire from some people to revisit those conversations.

[04:15:39] If we want to continue to talk process, I'm happy to continue to talk process. It may keep us here a little later, but again, this is what we signed up for. So, Supervisor Stewart, you're in the queue. So, I get the whole thing of having folks from different agencies come up and state whatever it is that they feel like they need to state.

[04:16:05] But, you know, just to be fair, it is all in the book. You know, I have my cuts boiled down to page numbers if anybody needs to follow along with me. And, you know, and look, I'm even ready to discuss those now. All right.

[04:16:21] Supervisor Bailey. Thank you, Madam Chair. Let me just say, sorry, Supervisor Vega, but 27 hours, we can do it again. I'm just saying. I'm just saying. Just a little levity on the board. But I sincerely would like for us to consider what I had proposed for my colleagues to consider it and talk to me about it.

[04:16:47] I don't need to go through line by line. And I was just saying that not to confuse people, but to say where I thought our focus should be. But, again, I don't want to get out of my lane, but we do need to do some cuts in the FTEs.

[04:17:02] But I think the biggest cut that we can do, if you're talking cuts, not completely, but at least for a year or maybe shorter, but now for this budget cycle, is the \$15 million, which would answer a lot of our questions if we do that.

[04:17:20] And I don't need, I mean, whatever the county exec feels comfortable in doing, I understand what this is. I sincerely do. And I don't want to be a surprise to anybody, but when we talk about cuts and where we need to make the cuts so that we can do other things, I think this is an answer to our prayer, as I said before.

[04:17:41] And we need to work together to make sure that this chunk of money, this \$15 million, is something that we can allocate differently right now. I understand the purpose of it. I understand the classification and the compensation part of it.

[04:18:00] But I think it's a big chunk of money. I'm not saying that the other piece was the \$12 million for the compensation increase merit step. Yes. But right now, we need to stabilize. We need to stabilize.

[04:18:17] And I think that that would be a good opportunity for us to do that. Now, the other cuts, my staff and I have gone through and collaborated with other colleagues, \$1.3 million, the other cuts. But that is a big amount that I would like to hear from my colleagues in terms, and we've had discussions, at least six of us, but discussions about it.

[04:18:42] Because I think it's important to look at as we go forward. All right. Supervisor Vago. Thank you, Madam Chair. What I was trying to convey before the break was, in terms of the procedure, how we're going to do this, is the board speaks in the majority. And while I understand that some folks have approached you about wanting to talk about rates or whatever it may be, I think that you should check the temperature so that we make sure that the majority is on board.

[04:19:06] If we don't know, right, who the board members are who are interested in revisiting whatever it is, then we're not going to know if it is, in fact, the majority or not. And so I just recommend that, you know, we do things via straw poll as we have all night, right?

[04:19:23] It's transparent. And the final outcome will speak for itself. The board speaks in the majority. But I also support the recommendation that we tackle the big ticket items first because that will give us a better understanding of how much room we have to work with. I definitely think we should tackle the big ticket items.

[04:19:40] And I want to go quadrant by quadrant because I do have some things that I want to cut. They may not be big ticket. But, you know, again, if this is going to be our budget, it's going to be our budget. So starting with big ticket items, Supervisor Bailey has already mentioned, and I just want to go back to that.

[04:19:56] Let me go back. I have my book, if anyone needs to see. And I'm going back to what you said, Mr. Schor. So I was looking at page 47, the general service market adjustment. Is that what you're talking about, Andrea? I'm sorry, Supervisor Bailey. Are you talking about holding off on the, so yeah, that's page 46.

[04:20:18] and \$4.47 on our budget book. So you want to hold off, excuse me, on the market adjustments. Yes. All right, Supervisor, and we're going to stick with this on the market adjustments. Supervisor Bode. Yeah, thank you, Madam Chair. I think it's worth talking about.

[04:20:34] I guess my only question for staff is if we spread it out over three or four years, what would be the savings instead of the full \$15 million? All right, thank you for that. And I'll be, I fully understand where we are in the budget process and won't at all be trying to, the board is where the board is in terms of some of the cuts that will be discussed.

[04:21:02] What I was interested in is making sure that staff was able to speak to the impact. And so in terms of this study, I wanted to make sure that we were clear that there was a classification, set of classification recommendations that impacted the bans or pay scales in the same way that we are doing with our collective bargaining agreement for police and for fire, that the adjustment to pay scale keeps our government up to market. And I would like to move forward with the classification, the administrative classification portion of the recommendations

[04:21:42] from the study, even if the board decides that it does not want to move forward with the compensation. And so that was the point I was wanting to make. In terms of a three-year implementation, we can maybe do the work of putting together a recommendation over the next, bless you, over the next few minutes to make sure that we are, that we're providing a good recommendation. But not prepared to do it right now, but I can email with Dave to figure out.

[04:22:16] Supervisor Bailey. Thank you, Chris, for explaining that. Certainly with the classification piece, I'm just going based on the title that I saw. Certainly with the classification, because that keeps us moving forward in terms of the direction that you want to go with staff.

[04:22:32] I am specifically talking about the compensation piece to the board. I'm sorry, because I couldn't hear you. You're saying you're specifically talking about the compensation piece. So to make sure I'm clear with both of you. So, Mr. Schroeder, you want to keep the pay bans, the different groups.

[04:22:49] Is that what you're talking about? Yes, Madam Chair. Keep the groups, but we'll keep the different groups, but we just will not fund it. Is that what you're saying, Supervisor Bailey? Is there any further discussion on this particular point? Anyone else wants to jump in on this one?

[04:23:06] Supervisor Angry. I would just simply ask to Mr. Schroeder's point. Is there staff that wants to talk to this or what you just said, the information? Obviously, there's a major impact that this will have on the workforce.

[04:23:25] That said, what implementing the classification portion of this will do is allow us to come back to this in the future because the pay scale would have been updated. So there might be some smaller scale individual reclasses that I will need to come back to discuss at some point in the future.

[04:23:49] but I did not want to lose the opportunity and the timing. The study happened at a very specific time, and if we do not implement the pay scale adjustments and we come back to this in a year or two years, we will be that much further from market, and it will cost us much more.

[04:24:11] Supervisor Bailey. Thank you, Madam Chair. Understanding what you just said, Chris, I think because we are so good at how we manage our money, I think when I say stabilized, I mean we are getting increases in terms of revenue into the county.

[04:24:28] And we're at a point now, I think, collectively, not just with the classification and compensation piece, but totally we're at a point where we need to look at those revenues that we're getting in and how we're spending and to assure that everybody is getting taken care of.

[04:24:46] And so certainly I understand what you're saying and respect what you're saying. My thing is just stabilizing the county. That's my thing. And I think we're at a point, a juncture now, with our revenues, where we are able, with the monies that we have, to stabilize.

[04:25:05] And so that's critical. I don't think we'll lose the momentum based upon who you are as a county exec and the staff that you have. I don't think we will. But I think we have had three years of recruiting and retaining, and now we need to classify specifically as we are making sure that people are supposed to get paid what they're supposed to get paid.

[04:25:31] But I'm also looking at the fact that we just instituted a new collective bargaining ordinance that we're going to have to take care of. And so in balancing that with the revenues that we're getting in, I think it would bode us well if we looked at that in its entirety as we are taking care of the benefits and the staff.

[04:25:52] I think it just, for me, I feel more comfortable with that in terms of the dollars that we are going to have to spend in the future. And I don't think it will take two years for that. I really don't think it will take two years, but I think it's worth us waiting and looking at where we are right now.

[04:26:10] Madam Chair, I wanted to make sure I answered Supervisor Bode's question. So we are at a three-year implementation for compensation and classification. It would save us for FY27, \$3.9 million, and for FY28, \$7.5 million.

[04:26:29] And because this was originally planned as a two-year implementation, there would be no savings in the out years. So we're going to stick with this one because we're going to do big-ticket items. So we're going to stick with this one. Does anyone have anything else that they want to say around this?

[04:26:49] Any other discussion? Because if not, I can take, I can have Andrea Madden do a roll call. Anyone else on this particular one? All right. BLCS Madden, that's a new game. This is for the market adjustment, \$15.405 million.

[04:27:08] Good. Supervisor Stewart? I agree with what, yes, I agree. Yes. Supervisor Bodie? Yes. Supervisor Angry? Yes, with a caveat.

[04:27:25] I understand that this would more than likely hurt our employees currently. I also understand that we have put ourselves in a place where we need to get out of. So, unfortunately, I believe this revenue is what we need to do really right now as a big-ticket item to, you know, right the ship, if you will.

[04:27:43] So, yes. Supervisor LaCroix? Yes. Supervisor Vega? Yes. Supervisor Gordy? Yes. Supervisor Bailey? Chair Jefferson?

[04:28:02] Yes. Vote unanimous? are there any other big ticket items does anyone else please jump in queue if you have any other big ticket items supervisor um stewart please jump in the queue i see you now all right supervisor stewart can we just so we can we define big ticket relative to something that's going to save us like you know a couple million um but actually before i do that i want to say where are we now where we currently stand with making that change and with all the other cuts we've made. Are we in the hole, not in the hole? Where are we?

[04:28:41] As a two-year implementation, are we just moving the \$15.4 million in fiscal 27, or are we also eliminating year two in fiscal 28? That is worth discussing. Supervisor Bailey?

[04:28:59] I'm looking at fiscal year 27. 27 only? Yes. Is it the same match for 28, though? What is 28? It's \$10 million. So \$15 million total and so you splitting that between two years is what that is no it costs 15.4 million in fiscal 27 but in fiscal 28 there was another increase so that's got 10 million for a cumulative amount of got it okay no i think you're just saying this yes okay so i think we also need to clarify everyone

[04:29:36] is cool with it for fiscal year 27 correct i'm just looking around fiscal year 27 everyone is shaking their head. So for fiscal year 27 only. I appreciate the board's grace. We just need a moment to modify something. Thank you. We can do that. And to be clear, I just want to make sure that we're working on the numbers correctly. It's a two-year implementation with 15.4 in the first year, 10 in the second. Are we eliminating the 15.4 completely or are we just pushing it to the

[04:30:13] second year? So then let's go ahead and it sounds like we were just for this year pushing it to the second year is that what or let's understand what you want everyone looking so bailey says yes stewart bode angry okay so in fiscal 27 we have a positive balance of 13.7 million however in

[04:30:49] fiscal 28 we're still in the red 4 million because there was one-time savings in fiscal 27 all right hold on real quick i want to ask um what is the schools portion with this can you calculate schools real quick where they would be this is all on the county all on county side all right I'm sorry all right supervisor wait I have Bailey then Vega no I was I was going to say uh Dave to to what you just said will be in the red in 28 that's what you just said correct that's correct to the tune of how much again please four million still four million still

[04:31:28] so my recommendation is that for 27 we stabilize to see what the revenues will be and I'm more than certain, with \$550 million or whatever the number is, trillion, M-O-U-S-E, we will be in a position, a better position, to project in 28.

[04:31:48] That's my aim in recommending this. Madam Chair. I'm sorry, Mr. Shorter? Yep. So we have to balance the budget. Five years out. Okay. So that's why we're going to have to continue to make cuts and possibly having other discussions.

[04:32:07] Supervisor Vega. Thank you, Madam Chair. I will also offer to the board that while we don't know what those numbers are going to be, assessments will go up. We have data centers that are going to come online, and it's going to inject more money into our coffers.

[04:32:25] So while I understand that as of right now we're in the red \$4 million, we cannot ignore the fact that we are going to see another infusion of new money coming into our coffers. and I'm not a betting woman because I don't like to lose, but if I were to bet, I would suggest that the forecast looks promising without getting Dave or anybody else on staff in trouble because we don't know what those numbers are going to be, but I do think that they will be favorable.

[04:32:52] So we can't ignore that important factor. But I hear you. I'm with you. We will hopefully have additional money coming in. However, we still have to balance. So that's unavoidable. Does anyone else have any big ticket items, anything that's a couple million dollars, a million, a couple million?

[04:33:15] Because if not, this is why we're going to have to go quadrant by quadrant. And to be clear, because people keep asking, it's not that I'm asking people to come up and share. I'm asking people if you have cuts in a particular quadrant, we are going to focus on that quadrant. Supervisor Stewart. Mine are just cuts for FTEs, but total about 1.6 million.

[04:33:38] And that's what I was going to do quadrant by quadrant again. I'm not asking people to come up and to justify their existence. I think that that is a more orderly way of how we are going to approach some of the cuts. So looking at that, I'm going to go through our different quadrants.

[04:33:58] We have government operations, performance, innovation. Hold on. I just want to make sure I'm getting all of our quadrants correct. And if I'm not, Mr. Shorter, I trust that you will. We have health, well-being, and environmental sustainability. We have mobility, economic growth, and resiliency, safe and secure community.

[04:34:21] And we have non-departmental agreements, donations, grants, and memberships. So what I'm going to start with, I'm sorry. All right, we also have questions because people were not sure where things fall under.

[04:34:37] We will get to them. Maybe we'll throw that under government operations, performance, and innovation. Is that a quadrant? That's a quadrant. Yeah, it's a quadrant. So, all right, we're going to start there. Supervisor Vega, where it is?

[04:34:53] Hold on, let's steal your little sheet. Yeah, I think that that might fall there. Internal systems, the infrastructure technology fund, it's over \$3 million. And I had that on my list, if it's something that could wait for the time being.

[04:35:19] I'm bringing it forward as something that my opinion is that it can wait. But, yeah, Internal Systems Infrastructure Technology Fund, and it's \$3,040,000. That would be the savings. Page.

[04:35:36] I don't have a page. It's not based off of the budget book. It's just based off of... So are we, Madam Chair, how do you want me to react to these? So I was hoping that people would be able to say what it is that they wanted to cut in each of these quadrants, but I know we do, again, still have questions.

[04:35:59] If you want, we can come back to that. If you want to look at exactly where that was coming from, the better help us. I can, and please, I want to be as respectful as possible, or as I can be. You know, Mr. Schroeder, you said, how do you want me to respond or react?

[04:36:14] Is that what you said? Okay, respectfully, this is the board's budget now. So the decision is up to the majority on the board. I am not sure that there is a reaction, respectfully, that is needed. I've been asked by the chair, you know, to make recommendations.

[04:36:32] I'm putting it out there. And so for the sake of time and for the sake of the process, it's now our budget and our decision to make. I think part of my question is I'm not sure where that's coming from. And, I mean, yes, internal.

[04:36:50] I can find out. If you can find out. So I'm going to go ahead. I don't know if anyone, oh, I'm sorry, Supervisor Stewart, you have something from this quadrant. Yes, I have several things from this quadrant, and I already know the page number, so I'll just kind of go in page number for those of us who have the budget books with us.

[04:37:07] So starting on page 73. And maybe we can go kind of one by one. Give us a moment. Yeah, it's going to be one by one. Okay, hold on, hold on. 73. Yes, I brought my book. Madam Chair, if I can. Yes, sir. So, again, happy to not say a word here, but my reacting was only to make sure, especially if we're talking about infrastructure investments, technology investments, often these are critically important for security of our systems.

[04:37:40] And so it is perfectly fine. This is absolutely the board's process at this point. I've made my recommendation. But if you would like, we are certainly prepared to talk about implications. If we are eliminating more than just FTEs, that will have a more far-reaching impact on our safety, wind, or security of our systems.

[04:38:07] I just want to make sure that if the board is interested, I'm happy to react and or ask staff to come up and react. But I'm also happy to stay silent. Did you have anything else you want to add, or I'm going to go back to, did you?

[04:38:26] No, no, no. So we're, so I'm sorry, right now, Supervisor Stewart is ready to go through things that he wants to cut. I was giving you and Mr. Shorter time because you had some back and forth. Did you have anything else to add? If not, I'm going to go with Mr. Stewart. Also, please, please, please, Jeannie, put on your, if you want to speak, just jump into the queue.

[04:38:44] Okay, jump into the queue. All right. So, George, and let's, what is the first thing that you're looking at? All right. So the first thing is the Green Fleet Mobility Manager at 169,626. So you're okay with the sustainability communications outreach?

[04:39:05] Well, so what I'm looking at is like, it's not for this year. And what overall sustainability needs to be working with each division on its overall policy. So that's number one. But as far as the the green fleet mobility manager we need to hold off specifically on that right now so that one piece so number one so it looks like they're two they're together um it looks like number one page 73 sustainability community communications outreach and green fleet mobility

[04:39:40] manager yeah environmental and energy sustainability and that's um you're saying how much because i'm looking at two ftes you want to cut just one of the positions yes all right um any reason for just one well not to this year especially since sustainability should really be working with i mean look we might need more than that but you know until we we can get sustainability to work with each division on on its policy um i don't want to do like a a shot in the dark at the moment

[04:40:17] um and i want to move through these with alacrity so page 74 uh next page uh volunteer coordinator liaison um just the way this is written this doesn't occur um and madam chair i don't know if you want to vote on each one first or just go through let's go through yeah okay go through real quick and then we'll talk about them and if anyone has anything else yeah volunteer coordinator liaison um the way that's just written it's it's not it's not a position it's a task

[04:40:57] of a position all right um community navigation specialist um one this year and then one next year i'm sorry not this year and we should we should wait and see on that page 84 our um our osha compliance trainer um i believe that we should do only one or actually cut both and find a company to come in and train two times annually.

[04:41:32] Anything else? And page 85, security techs, one this year and one next year if still needed.

[04:41:51] That's going to be a hard one for me. But one of two, like just doing one of two. I kind of feel like that's one of those ones we really need. That's a security technician positions for critical security operations for fire and rescue pharmacies. I got it.

[04:42:07] And then the final one is keeping the CFO as director of finance on page 95. A lot of those duties overlap, and just those duties overlap, and so can't really see spending \$300,000 on what occurs as

redundancy.

[04:42:38] Supervisor, hold on. Supervisor Bailey. Yes. I can appreciate what my colleague is recommending, But here's where I do need the county exec to help me with this and the agency in terms of director of finance.

[04:42:53] I know we've had some restructuring there in terms of responsibilities. But I just need to understand what that position is because I understand the criticality of what we do.

[04:43:10] And I do understand in the past that our former CFO was doing both jobs. So I just need to understand what that is, please. Sure. So we have restructured our finance function, and we're the former director of finance, supervised, or oversaw one department.

[04:43:35] That function is now larger with many more expectations, with added staff over this last few years, and the CFO would be overseeing multiple departments, or I should say a department and multiple agencies versus what we've had before and that is a single director overseeing a single department. Okay thank you I appreciate that because I had a feeling that's what it was but I'm not a financier so I wanted to make sure that and that's something that

[04:44:10] knowing the growth of the county and knowing what we're talking about in terms of finances How do we cut that and bring it back? You know what I mean? Or do I need help in terms of making that decision and understanding what my colleague is recommending?

[04:44:30] Is that something that we can wait on, or is that something that's so critical that we need it absolutely now? It's very difficult to answer that question. I mean, I think the recommendations I made to the board were, in my mind, critical for the county and for the organization.

[04:44:54] Of course. Of course. I believe, given the workload, that the positions that I've identified are absolutely needed, especially at this level, because right now we are depending on single executives, single managers, to oversee significant functions with very, I would say, inappropriate span of control.

[04:45:18] And so I do consider it critical, but it is up to the board. So when we say inappropriate span of control, can you unpack that for me a little bit, especially as it occurs to Director of Finance and CFO?

[04:45:40] Sure. So the way that we're structured right now is the Office of Management and Budget as well as Finance report under me. And finance is divided into basically seven divisions.

[04:46:01] We have, see if I can get them all, we have tax administration, we have real estate, we have treasury management, we have financial information systems, financial reporting and controlling, risk and wellness, and I think I'm missing one.

[04:46:20] I think I got them all. Okay. And payroll disbursements. That's the other one. All very critical functions and all requiring an executive to be hands-on.

[04:46:38] And so when I say span of control, I mean for an executive covering those kinds of functions, to have responsibility of that many divisions, an office of management and budget, and the larger finance umbrella is a lot for one executive to oversee.

[04:46:57] I don't consider these redundant. Got it. And looking at the org chart, I see under the director of finance slash CFO, There's a director's office, support and senior business services analyst, and there are two deputy directors of finance, each one overseeing, well, one oversees assistant financial services

director, real estate assessments, and one is the assistant, and oversees another position of assistant financial services director of tax administration,

[04:47:33] Whereas the other deputy director of finance oversees fiscal services director, treasury management, fiscal services director, assistant fiscal services director, functional systems services, another assistant fiscal services director for risk wellness and services, another fiscal director for payroll and disbursements and financial reporting and control.

[04:47:59] Now, for each one of those individuals, are they not overseeing those departments in an appropriate manner that has them report back to the deputy director of finance in their tree of the org chart and then report to you?

[04:48:18] Is there something that's falling out in the day-to-day fiscal management of the county with the org chart positioned the way it currently is? I guess the best way to answer that is it is a juggle to do both finance and OMB and not to have a director to manage, like, the day-to-day to oversee what the deputies.

[04:48:46] So they do have where each area rolls up to a deputy, but then those areas also, that means every escalation comes to me while also trying to do the budget side of the house. Got you.

[04:49:02] And so does anything fall out? Uh, it depends on the day. Most of the time we can, we can do what we need to do, but we certainly have things that get behind that need escalations, uh, and to improve the communication.

[04:49:19] Okay. So with, um, so if, if we split this into director of finance and CFO, who would be reporting to who? So I would assume that the deputy director of finance and the deputy, but both that deputy directors of finance would be reporting to the, um, the director of finance, who would then be reporting to you, okay?

[04:49:44] Would those responsibilities that you oversee on a daily basis still fall to you, even though it's one person reporting to you versus two? No, I think that that would change some of what I do, because some of the functions of my position as director of finance are driven by code, and so it would sit with the position with that title and not with me.

[04:50:10] Okay, thank you. Supervisor Vega. Thank you, Madam Chair, and this is a perfect example of what I was trying to avoid, right? You know, you've mentioned several positions. I'm not sure, and maybe I'm wrong, Mr. Shorter, that will get you to say if any of the positions that are being put up to be cut are not critical, right?

[04:50:33] And so this is why, you know, we have to use our best judgment. We have access to the budget book. We have access to other resources so that we can make a decision because I don't think that we'll get to a point where any position is deemed not critical.

[04:50:51] And we need to make the decision ourselves. All right, Supervisor Ingrid. Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Schroeder, first of all, let me just say this to my fellow colleague board members. In the military, yes, I'm going to go there.

[04:51:08] In senior leadership role, you rely on your SMEs, the subject matter experts, to help you when you put them in a position such as Mr. Schroeder is in tonight. So, Mr. Schroeder, the question is this. Are there any non-critical roles that you have in your proposed budget that you can pull out to help us get this \$4 million deficit cut that we can then potentially possibly bring back next year?

[04:51:35] I feel that you are a real big part of this discussion because you know these positions and your staff knows these positions better than we do. And we have a small issue of some funds that we need to find to clear up.

[04:51:51] And I believe truly that you must play a role in this at this point. And I don't want to put you on the spot like that. But if it's a non-critical role, and I get what we're saying, that every role is critical. But I want to ask if you.

[04:52:06] I appreciate the question, Supervisor Angry. What I will say, the team went through, and I know everyone in the dais knows this, a very extensive process for us to get to this point. So that is why it's a little difficult for me on the spot to identify one position here or one position there.

[04:52:26] What I will say is that if we have a goal of \$4 million or \$4.2 million, Dave, help me out, that we need to get to, then I'm happy to work with the team over the next \$4 million exactly.

[04:52:43] If given a recess, I'm happy to work with the team. If the board is interested in going in that direction, work with the team to identify FTEs and other cost savings opportunities and make a recommendation. I was not prepared to do that. I'm sorry, are you done?

[04:52:59] I just wanted to fully understand that. And I just, to me, now if we're going to do a recess, that's the kind of recess I want to do to allow you all to be a part of this situation that we're in. That's just my two cents. I, and you know what, I'm sorry, I, you know, again, Mr. Schur, I hope you don't feel like we're putting you on the spot when making these cuts, because I know that the team, you and your team and everyone has made, put a lot of effort to us. We got ourselves into this position, y'all. We did. And it's painful. I know it's painful. I know that people, you know, it's going to, we're going to be here late, but we got ourselves into this position.

[04:53:33] We have made a lot of cuts. And now because we've made those cuts, we've got to find a way out. We've got to find a way to balance the last for the next over the next five years. You know, I've mentioned going back and having because some people have approached me looking at rates again. I know that it's not popular for everyone. There's some people who really don't want to have that discussion again. But we got ourselves into the situation. And I do want to apologize to staff. You guys worked very hard on this budget.

[04:54:04] We're already looking at people not getting market adjustments, and that's a really hard vote to take, and I am sorry about that. I hate balancing the budget on the backs of our employees on behalf, on the backs of our schools.

[04:54:23] And that's why I was saying maybe we need to look at rates again, because what we did were straw votes. It's not set in stone. It's not set in stone. I think we should have that conversation, because this is going to be a very long and painful night. Again, Supervisor Bailey joked, some of y'all did the 27-hour meeting.

[04:54:39] That's intense. It was focused. It was focused. But that's intense. So I want to go back to you, Supervisor Vega, and then Bailey. And then I think we should do a recess to give Mr. Shorter and staff time to look through things that they can potentially cut.

[04:54:55] You know, Madam Chair, I'll have to disagree. And I think that it's better when I say respectfully so that nobody gets offended. Thank you, Supervisor Bailey. I don't think that we put ourselves in that

position, and I certainly think that this is a learning opportunity for next budget cycle so that, you know, the county executive also, you know, comes to us with a budget that anticipates, you know, cuts or that gives us the option because we were not presented with those options.

[04:55:26] we have 550 million dollars in new revenue right and every single penny is being spent and so i would argue that no we did not put ourselves in this position we are working with what we've been given and now it is up to us to decide what the final budget is going to be and so we we we take what's going on here tonight and hopefully next year we will have more options prior to this meeting that will help us guide this ship in the right direction all right supervisor bailey thank

[04:56:05] you ma'am chair um i agree with you supervisor vega and i and i i think we this is a learning opportunity for us and i agree with supervisor uh angry and what you're saying you know our county exec works uh and i'm not trying to i know you're here i'm not talking about you while you're not here. I'm talking about you while you. He works very hard in making sure that this county is moving in the direction that we put out in the newspaper that we are. And I think we're doing

[04:56:40] a yeoman's job at this. And I don't think this is a negative place where we are. But I also think that the board, we're smart people. We don't have to be here for 27 hours. We can make big decisions and move on with the big decisions.

[04:56:57] And to what Supervisor Angry is saying, Mr. County Exec, we have put you on point, but you always rise to the occasion. And so I'm just going to offer this, and this may be the wrong thing to offer, but I'm just trying to get us to the next level.

[04:57:15] If we ask him to go and see if he can save us \$1.5 million, is that the wrong thing to say? Is that the wrong thing to propose? I'm just saying that because in the discussions that I've had with my colleagues, I know I've got 1.3 here, but I don't want to get in his lane.

[04:57:36] He's carved out a lane for us to drive in. We've got to make a recommendation to him of what we want, to what Supervisor Vega is saying. And so if we could just ask you to help us, if you can find \$1.5 million to salvage for 27 so that we can go into 28, Would my colleagues be okay with that number?

[04:58:04] We'll need to solve for 28, I believe, in the out years. But, yes, it is totally the board's prerogative at this point. But if the board is asking me to take recess and work with staff, absolutely happy to do that.

[04:58:22] We will provide recommendations in the best way we can. All right, Supervisor Gordy and LaCroix. Thank you, Madam Chair. Yeah, I just want to reiterate, this is the taxpayers' money. It's not our money. It's their money.

[04:58:39] We're building a government to help support the needs of the community, but it begins with them, and they're the ones paying for this. And I think we also have to be respectful that, you know, they're the ones sacrificing in order to make all this growth take place. And so while we are trying to figure out a way to provide the right level of government services to meet the county needs, We also need to recognize, as we started this conversation, affordability for our community is a very challenging problem on many fronts.

[04:59:10] Now, looking at a \$4 million, if we're looking at 28 and we're trying to balance 28, we're talking about 4.004 of the budget. So we're talking about four-tenths of a cent.

[04:59:26] And so looking out at 28, we could go through that budget for 28 and just say, look, we're looking for, you know, potentially across the board, four-tenths of a cent reductions in order to help us balance that budget for next year.

[04:59:47] But, again, knowing revenues are going to go up, we're going to end up with a surplus this year. We do not expend every dollar that we budget. It's a budget, but that doesn't mean we spend every dime. And so, but what that does mean is that we balance our budget, but it also means it gives us that window of opportunity for next year to derive a budget based upon what priorities are and what the needs are.

[05:00:12] And so, you know, I don't know that necessarily we have to cut from 27 in order, but we can look at 28 and say, let's plan for a 0.004% reduction in order to balance the budget.

[05:00:33] Supervisor LaCroix. I want to reiterate what Tom just said and what Chris just said, because really a .004 decrease would make that number for us, and if it just went across the board, and if we're looking at whatever percentage just minute, just across the board, it's not going to hurt any one department.

[05:01:01] It's just going to help us make sure that the citizens are spending their money properly and we're able to give them back what we've promised. So I'm thrilled with Andrea's suggestion, and I'm thrilled with George's suggestion, but I'm also thrilled with Chris's that said, Let me take a minute and see if we can't pull something out of the budget for us.

[05:01:27] Because it is, like Tom just said, the money is the taxpayers. All right, thank you so very much. So I am going to give Chris 20 minutes to go ahead and work with staff to see what cuts can be made.

[05:01:44] I think that that is a great process, and so we'll see what cuts can be made. If there's any other discussion about what things maybe people really, really, really need to see if there's anything like that, we can go ahead and have that discussion. So 20 minutes, give or take.

[05:02:18] All right, everyone, we are back. I'm sorry, no things took a little bit of time.

[05:02:35] Thank you for everyone. Thank you to staff again. I know that it's getting late. So, you know, I appreciate everyone. Mr. Shorter, you have some proposals for us. Thank you very much, Madam Chair, members of the board. Appreciate your patience. I'll just, I'll start by saying that we went into this understanding that we had a surplus for FY27.

[05:03:00] So there was already a \$13 million surplus going into the discussion with staff. What we were looking to deal with is a gap in FY28, so to deal with the structure, the five-year plan. And so what we're recommending, I'll do FTEs first, is a reduction in aging by one FTE, health by one FTE, sustainability with one FTE, and our community services by two FTEs.

[05:03:36] We're also recommending pushing out the Splunk, which is a cybersecurity program. We're recommending that we eliminate that, and we will come back to the board in FY28, mostly because of implementation.

[05:03:51] We believe that the other two programs could be implemented first. Cybersecurity programs could be implemented first. We're also recommending a reduction of an FTE in public safety communications, the deputy director position. We are changing out-year assumptions or recommending we change out-year assumptions on our health premium increases from 10% to 7%.

[05:04:19] That saves us \$1.8 million. We are also recommending, finally, assumptions related to the county's insurance premiums, So workers' compensation, casualty insurance, property insurance.

[05:04:34] We're not projecting increases in those insurance in the injury rates, if you will, mostly due to some of the investments that we're recommending with training and other improvements that will hopefully help us reduce injury rates.

[05:04:51] These recommendations give us or meet the gap that we have in FY28, but it exacerbates the one-time surplus that is assumed in FY27. So we've gone from \$13 million to \$15.9 million in terms of surplus in FY27, but we filled the gap in FY28 and created a structured balanced budget.

[05:05:20] All right. Does anyone have any questions? Madam Chair. Hold on. Let me actually, I'll go to you and let me refresh. My screen keeps freezing. Okay, Supervisor Vega. So we have only six positions, correct?

[05:05:40] Correct. And what is the total savings for those six positions? Dave might be able to help me with the... Savings of those six positions is about \$800,000.

[05:06:07] I'll stop there, Madam Chair, for now. Anyone else? Supervisor Bailey. Yes. So, Chris, thank you. The surplus of \$15.9 is for FY27?

[05:06:28] Yes. Okay. Anyone else? Because otherwise, I just want to take a straw. Supervisor Bailey, you're still in. Do you have anything else? No, I can't clear you.

[05:06:46] No, no. Yeah. They do it or you can withdraw. So I can't, unfortunately. So does that sound good to everyone? Because if so, we can go ahead and take a straw vote to accept those cuts. Let's go ahead and do the straw vote.

[05:07:05] Supervisor LaCroix? Supervisor Stewart? Yes. Supervisor Bodie? Yes. Supervisor Bailey? Yes. Supervisor Gordie? Yes.

[05:07:22] Supervisor Vega, it's a good start, yes. Supervisor Angry? Yes. Chair Jefferson? Yes. Vote unanimous? So, Mr. Funn, I have to have fun. So, Mr. Funn, where do we currently stand right now?

[05:07:41] As the county executive, we are \$15.9 million to the good in fiscal 27, and we are evenly balanced. In fiscal 28, there is a balance of \$12,600. All right.

[05:08:01] We're making progress. um i know people have other is there anyone else who have other things that supervisor bode i see you oh i just wanted to ask if um if we were done with cuts if we go back to tax rates but i'll wait until we're done with cuts yeah if we have any additional cuts um let us know if not supervisor vega what you got no i don't have any additional cuts i will just um restate my position that if we're going to go back to rates we need to take a straw poll to see if that is the will of the majority on the board all right let's go ahead and wait supervisor bailey then we can do

[05:08:35] that um we're going to go back to rates supervisor bode mentioned let's go back to rates yes we want to do a quick strong poll and i said sure i mean i think that the majority of the board would like to go back to rates but did you have anything you want to say or do you have more cuts uh no well no i don't have any more cuts i i wanted to say thank you to chris and to staff for spending your time that way we really appreciate it uh and if whatever the majority wants to do i yeah i think most of us you know a lot of us want to go back to talk about cuts um re-examine that because again

[05:09:12] maybe there are things we can tweak you know again still looking at being sensitive to um the rising costs of supervisor la croix i'm not sure a lot of us want to go back to the cuts let's just do a Quick straw poll. Okay.

[05:09:28] So, okay. So, Bailey, do you want to go? So, I am going to be on the record, yes. I want to go back and have that discussion again. Andrea? Okay. Stuart? Bodie? Yes. Angry? I mean, no, unless we're just talking about the meals tax and putting that 1% back.

[05:09:48] You don't want to go back, but you'll talk about meals tax. You know what I'm saying? I don't want to discuss the residential tax. I'm set with 8-5.

[05:10:04] We are. But if we want to go back and talk about the meals tax, I'll go back. But if they both come together, then I don't want to go back to talk about it. Vega? No. LaCroix? Gordy? My perspective is not yet.

[05:10:27] I would like to have a conversation about Sheriff and ADC FTEs and their compensation. And I think having that conversation prior to going to look at revenues, you know, we should see if that's really even necessary.

[05:10:49] So it sounds like... Madam Chair, I don't want to go back. My answer is no. So then if you... So we're all okay. No, yes, yes, yes. Only one thing.

[05:11:05] So then, okay, we're no. So then we do not go back. We'll continue with cuts, and we will not revisit the tax rates. did you still have an appetite does anyone have appetite no there's a little discussion about revenue share yeah madam chair yeah i mean i guess at this point we'll have to talk about further cuts because we go back to revenue share we're going to create a bigger hole in the in the county on the county side all right let's go on supervisor guardia what did you want to discuss yeah so um you know we've we've been doing a lot in safe and secure communities with fire with

[05:11:41] police um and the county uh executive provided an eight percent um uh increase 8.2 percent for um i believe it for sheriff and for and you know for the uh market adjustments um but in and you also in your you had what five foreign sworn positions for sheriff as well in your um in your

[05:12:10] proposal. And so one of the things in looking at the demand on the sheriffs with what's happening in the courts is people are having to be borrowed and people are having to have overtime in order to meet the demand signal for what's happening in the courts. And so I would like to propose that we look at six warm positions starting July the 1st, one civilian, and I think you came back in your

[05:12:45] recap about civilians, looking at one civilian to start in July 1st, and the 8.2% market adjustment effective July 1st, and then looking at adding the other six on January 1st, the other civilian on January 1st, and then the balance, market adjustment on January 1st of 7%.

[05:13:11] And then for ADC, also in January 1st, adding them, adding the balance to get to 15% on January 1st from the 8.2 that would start on July 1st. So we'd look at a six-month increase starting January 1st for them.

[05:13:31] Okay. I want to make sure that I follow. So we started in February at proposed with five FTEs for the sheriff at \$1.2 million. Supervisor Gordie, you're saying adding how many additional FTEs?

[05:13:48] Adding one on January 1st, or I'm sorry, July 1st. So it would be one more on July 1st, and then the balance of six on January 1st. January 1st of 27th.

[05:14:06] Correct, of 27th. Okay. We'll have to do the numbers. I'm sorry. Just for clarification, Supervisor Gordy, we have one sworn position starting July 1st.

[05:14:27] Yeah, on top of the five that's already in the budget. And then another five starting January 1st. So that's a total of six in addition to what's already in the proposed budget? Correct. Okay. Thank you.

[05:14:43] Seven. Total of 12. Right. It'll be seven. So six in January of 27, one in July, and we'll do the math quickly.

[05:15:01] So it'll be half in 27 of \$1.2 million and the full cost for the one FTE. And other than FTE, Supervisor Gordy, was there something else?

[05:15:25] And then the 7% market adjustment on January 1st, so it splits it. And is this for the sheriff's office or for ADC?

[05:15:51] That's for the sheriff's. Okay. So there would be an 8.2% market adjustment on July 1st. That's already in the proposed budget. And then on top of that, on January 1, a 7%. Correct. So there would be a compounding effect there.

[05:16:08] Yeah. And then for the ADC, and I just want to say I would commend Colonel West. He went from a 71-person vacancy to down to two. He's hiring for that. And because of what's happening in the region, while the pay raise is going up, it's not keeping up with growth in the region.

[05:16:33] And so I believe if we can get them to 15 to keep them competitive, to not lose the people they've been training and bringing on, which we've talked about in the past, if we could look at also adding that 7% for them on January 1 so that he can maintain competitiveness within the region.

[05:17:03] To do the numbers? Okay. It should be, for him, it should be 2.881 on January 1. 2.881? I believe so, yeah. Okay.

[05:17:20] So, Madam Chair, we can either do these numbers while you all are talking or we'll need to go back and take some more time to calculate? I have other people in the queue, so let's go ahead and have some additional discussions on the dais if there's more time that is needed.

[05:17:38] We can all tap dance. I don't know, sing. Supervisor Bailey. Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to circle back on something that Supervisor LaCroix had mentioned earlier that I think that the entire county, all supervisors can benefit from, And that was for the redevelopment and assemblage program.

[05:18:09] So it addresses the blight and the empty buildings that we have across the county in terms of utilization. And it's in reference to something that our economic development director presented to us to partner with and coincide with the small area plans, but also to address mixed use and blight across the county.

[05:18:31] And so that's to the tune of \$2.5 to \$5 million. So I just want to bring that for discussion. So, yes, we can have this. I will be honest with you. I'm just really nervous about adding too many things back in because we still have to balance five years out.

[05:18:50] And that's my real concern. That's why I want to talk about the rates again. I am really nervous about adding things back because we already cut from schools. You know, I am nervous. I'm just going to say this. I think that there's a lot of worthy things that we can discuss, but we've cut a lot.

[05:19:11] Maybe if there's any other things that people want to cut before we add back, that's just where I am. I don't know if anyone else I hear, we agree on something tonight. Give me five. Let's go. I'm a little nervous about adding back in.

[05:19:27] Supervisor. I'm sorry. Man, sure. Bless you. Bless you. Who was that? All right. Gotcha. I'm good with that. I just wanted to recircle back and make sure that that is, you know. I mean, I think that's a really worthy cause, and that's something I 100% support.

[05:19:42] I'm just nervous because we've got to find where we are five years out. That's the biggest thing. I'm looking at Mr. Fun. All right, Supervisor Stewart and then Mr. Fun. I'm sorry. I'm using myself at this point. It's late. Yeah, I was only just trying to find out just where we are.

[05:20:01] Do we have to go back and recalculate now? Okay. Are you ready? Do you have the numbers? I know. You're still calculating. All right. I know people are tired of breaks, unless there's anything else. I'll just say everyone five minutes. Yes. Because someone needed more time. All right. Five minutes.

[05:20:25] Don't stray too far. Five. Is five enough questions? Because I know. So Supervisor Gordy, they are calculating your recommendation. Did anyone else? I know Supervisor Bailey talked about the revitalization fund, which I do think is important. But again, I'm just nervous right now about adding things back did anyone have anything else that they wanted to talk about while we're waiting for the calculations if so hold on let me go ahead and refresh because i've been having a lot of problems supervisor bailey i don't i want to clarify something and and pardon

[05:21:02] it's late and pardon my um i'm tired like y'all don't want to admit it but i'm tired but here's the question that i have in in this proposed budget based on the discussions that we've had tonight. What are we giving to our schools? Transfer to the schools is \$1,087,798,080.

[05:21:39] Done. \$1,087,798,080. Done, right? That's what we're transferring. That's where we're at currently. That's where we're at currently. Okay, so and I'm just clarifying now. So the vote that

[05:22:05] we took earlier that Mr. Bode proposed we we voted no on that correct I'm just I'm trying to understand what did we do on that vote so I'm just to make sure this is I believe we are talking about the C&P so so we advertise the C&P at 450 we assumed in our projections the 415 and so the

[05:22:40] additional revenue is what the board just talked about this evening and i i'm assuming additional yes the revenue that is is at between the 415 and the 450 that additional revenue is what the board dealt with this evening uh-huh and what the board's what the board has via straw poll approved is using that additional revenue for the county okay and not not the schools yes okay i'm clear

[05:23:12] all right any other speakers and just to clarify this is still below um what what we are giving them supervisor is still below what they had come to us and asked for so there's still a delta i understand okay all right um are you guys ready we are all right let's go so with uh mr gordy's suggestions for the sheriff in the adult detention center that brings the balances in fiscal 27 we are

[05:23:52] good to 12.6 million in fiscal 27 we are in the red in fiscal 28 by 4.8 million can you get those numbers again fiscal 27 we are 12.6 million dollars to the good in fiscal 28 we are in the red 4.8 million all right um so supervisor gordy i don't know if you had anything to say to that because

[05:24:31] that unfortunately doesn't help us right it's what where what um this is my proposal i'm one of eight what do other people think anyone want to jump in or we can just do a straw poll because i know it's

getting late anyone all right let's go ahead and do a straw poll yes ma'am supervisor angry oh he jumped in you have some because i i it's a straw poll is only gonna get a yes or no

[05:25:06] out of me but let me go back to the beginning i'm out i was only in here for this budget season to get the citizens a tax break that made sense and we did that and the rest of this we found ourselves in this deficit so you know i don't have any positions or cuts or anything i want to do with anything period and so i'm i'm here listening to this now i'm going to say i love my sheriff my adc if 2027 we're good and we've got that together it's the 2028 we're looking at does that mean that

[05:25:42] We can't figure 2028 out later because this is the whole budget has to be fixed. And what I mean by that is if we didn't do what you're asking for, then it puts us back to even for 28, though. We can do what he's saying for 27.

[05:26:00] We just can't do it for 28 right now. Otherwise, we go back in the black. That is correct. As a reminder, we are for FY27, \$15.9 million surplus currently. and we are balanced, practically balanced in FY28.

[05:26:19] I mean, so it's real simple. Otherwise, we're going to start cutting some things for 28 or we just work with 27. Understand the need, but I'm going to have to figure this out. I'm going to make this quick suggestion, and I do apologize deeply because I believe in the safe and secure community, and I will look at you in the eye and say I apologize deeply.

[05:26:39] We have to balance not just this year but next year, and we're not able to do that. I really propose that if we have additional things that we want to add to the budget, they should only be one time for this year. I really don't want to add.

[05:26:56] I feel bad because we've had to make some really deep cuts tonight. You know, people, we are offering tax relief. We are offering tax relief. But if we're going to continue to offer tax relief, we cannot add stuff that's going to be ongoing expenses.

[05:27:15] I say if we have anything to add, it should be one time. And we really, it should be things that would have a lasting impact. I do would like to see something to revitalization. I think that's critical. And it helps across many districts. It is late.

[05:27:30] I know people are tired. I'm not trying to be here for 27 hours. I don't think I have that kind of stamina. I don't even want to test it. But if this is just, again, my one-eighth, whatever we add should be one time for just this year so that we stay balanced. And it really has to be mission critical.

[05:27:48] Not that you're not doing missional critical work, but it has to be something that's really going to be so urgent because I don't want to keep going back and finding cuts and there's not an appetite over people about reopening some of our tax rates.

[05:28:06] We did what we did. I was hoping to have more flexibility with things around the meals tax. I got my 1%. I can live with it. And so that's just my suggestion, Supervisor Bodie, then Gordie.

[05:28:22] Yeah, thank you, Madam Chair. I guess I don't want to belabor this, but I will anyway, because this is what we're here to do, and this is the whole point of today. I guess if I could ask Supervisor Gordy, looking over there, is that, you know, I understand why this is important to you.

[05:28:40] I understand why with Sheriff Hill and Colonel West here, why we want to talk through this and we want to have a discussion about these positions. But again, to Madam Chair's point, there's no way for

us to add that to then balance next fiscal year's budget unless we go back to tax rates.

[05:28:58] So I guess pulling back the onion on what you said earlier, Surajigordi, if we agreed, at least plurinarily agreed it to your proposal, are you willing to go back and look at tax rates? I would say that I would be willing to go back.

[05:29:19] But before I do that, I'd like to ask, we're still sitting on \$12.6 million surplus. Is there no way we could transfer \$4.9 million from this year and apply it as revenue for next year in order to balance that budget? So that was actually a standard practice by the county about 12, 15 years ago.

[05:29:43] When the real estate market crashed and the bond rating agencies, they weighed in on that. Technically speaking, they would consider that a use of one-time funds because you're banking it in fiscal 27 into the county's reserves and fund balance and you're using a one-time source of funds to fund a recurring expense in fiscal 28 i don't necessarily agree with the bond rating agencies i don't think leslie does or the county executive does

[05:30:17] but the county was warned about being put on negative watch for precisely that practice okay Yeah, I mean, because at the end of the day, I mean, look, it's accounting.

[05:30:38] There's dollars and cents, and then there's accounting. And then there's a budget. A budget is a guide. It's a document. And it outlines priorities. And so, for me, it is a priority to make sure that we've invested and been able to build up our sheriff's department to meet the needs, the court requirements continue to grow. We've provided more FTEs for the Commonwealth's Attorney for that very purpose. Well, it also means there's more people needed to cover the

[05:31:13] courts because of the demands in the court system. And so, and then with the ADC, again, they have done a tremendous job of trying to recruit, train, and employ, I mean, 71 sworn officers in one year's time and to get them back to where they were. But if we're not taking care of these officers and comparatively to what's being offered in other parts of the region, again,

[05:31:47] this is the challenge that we have. We've spent all this money on training them. And if they go somewhere else to get a bigger salary, now we've got to spend the money again to train someone else. And so we're just, so I would rather retain the ones we've trained, and otherwise it's going to cost us more money in the long run.

[05:32:08] And so I'd love to find a way for us to get to yes on this as best as we can, knowing that, again, we live in this competitive, dynamic environment, and it's unfortunate because we're almost in a, what I would consider to be a spiral that no one knows how to stop.

[05:32:27] I mean, we saw what Arlington did on police going to \$90,000. And so the competitiveness around here is very challenging, and we've got to make sure that our folks have the ability to keep up and us demonstrate that we are going to maintain that competitiveness with the other jurisdictions so that we can keep those that we've trained.

[05:32:57] But to go to your question, I'd be happy to have the comment open, go back and talk about it. But that doesn't mean I'm necessarily going to support it. Sure. If I could just – he took most of my time, Madam Chair, so I could just very quickly – because I just – I'm, like Madam Chair, I'm nervous taking one-time money this year to pay for positions that we know are going to be ongoing and salary in places that are going to be ongoing, especially knowing how close we are to the margins there.

[05:33:25] So I would feel a lot more comfortable supporting that if we can find some way to meet on getting more actual ongoing revenue for next year to pay for it. All right, Gordy, and then Vega, then LaCroix. You're done.

[05:33:41] All right, Vega, there you go. Your time to shine. Madam Chair, you know, let's not pretend that this has to be a choice between our residents and public safety, okay? We asked a county executive to go back and to find \$4 million, and he did just that. We don't have to go back and revisit the rates that we already agreed on.

[05:33:59] We can ask the county executive to go back and find more cuts if that's the route that we want to go. But we can continue to do this and fund this by making more cuts. There were other folks who had other recommendations. So if there are any other supervisors that still have not voiced what their cuts would be, right now would be the time to do so.

[05:34:20] If there are no other suggested cuts, then we asked the county executive to find additional cuts that he could recommend to this board. Supervisor LaCroix. I'm just thinking that we did it a little bit backwards because you were kind enough to go out and find something before we asked for more money and so what you basically did is found it pretty quickly and efficiently and then we asked for more money and I'm not sure I think that, of course, what Andre is asking for is something that's crucially important,

[05:34:59] especially to Woodbridge and to Dumfries and to Dale City and a lot of the areas. But I do have to say I was in the court system for 30 years, and I know what the deputies do, and I know how much work they are.

[05:35:15] And if our security is asking for more positions, I really, I almost feel like we owe it to the whole community to give it to them. All right.

[05:35:32] I'm going to jump in because this is hard when we're talking about safe and secure community because I know we're not meeting everyone's need. We're not meeting all the police needs. We're not meeting all the fire and rescue needs. And, you know, it's a hard job that our staff has to do to kind of weigh these things.

[05:35:49] If we want to talk about additional cuts, I'm saying that we shouldn't be doing any additional OmniRide subsidies. That's something I'd like to offer up as a potential cut. That would save us \$1.2 million. So please indulge me, Supervisor Gordy, before we get to what you are talking about, let's just go ahead and talk about additional cuts.

[05:36:11] And one of them is the OmniRide subsidy, \$1.2 million in savings. how are people on that um put yourself in queue supervisor angry supervisor angry now are we swapping out omni ride to take care of the officers or are we still going down trying to make cuts because what are we doing i think we i think we're going to need we need to do a lot of things we still have additional cuts i think people still maybe have things that they want i'm still not ready i mean again i apologize deeply i'm not ready to add additional ongoing

[05:36:46] expenses. I think we need to have these discussions more fully as a board in other years. Because again, when we're adding additional positions, when we're adding additional ongoing costs, I get nervous just right now because of all the cuts we had made. And again, I hate asking people, thank you for all that you do. I hate asking this. But we really are down a hole. We've also talked a lot about maintaining

our credit ratings. I don't want to do anything that's going to impair that in fact you know I say make a few more cuts if people have other things you know

[05:37:22] maybe we don't make additions this year so are you asking to keep the cuts going so that we can get more positive in the already balanced budget that we are right now are we balanced right now for the next well again fiscal 27 and if we if we're adding what Tom says we're not we're not balanced and I think we have to answer that right now and I thought we did and my position was we're funding for 27 we can't fund for 28 I think are we are we are we asking that and saying that and if we're gonna fund for 28 then are we saying to cut further swap one one are we gonna

[05:38:01] like cut Omni Ride enhanced services to then try and fund the shares and add because then that's a new conversation I think I think they're two separate things I knew even Supervisor Vega had mentioned that I'm sorry like she had mentioned maybe continue to find additional cuts I there might be some other things in the budget that we can take a look at before we add any new spending but I thought that's what we just did when we sent our schmeese back in the back to figure out from yes we from that version because what else are we talking because if we have projects that we want to do I think it's very wise of this board to not introduce any new projects right now

[05:38:39] because we don't have the funds to do so very clearly like put so I don't know where we're going with this at this point, Madam Chair. All right, Supervisor Bode, Stuart Bailey. Yeah, so we can go back for a second to Madam Chair.

[05:38:55] I figured that we're at least going to start with your proposal around the OmniRide subsidy. Can you just talk about that for a second? Madam Chair. Yes. We had a quick comment on OmniRide subsidy. Regarding the \$1.2 million increase in the proposed budget for the OmniRide subsidy, I just wanted to remind the board, please, That is funded by NBTA 30% residue.

[05:39:22] It would do nothing for the bottom line. But that's still a discussion we have to have, correct, whether we want it to come out of? That conversation can still happen. But it won't happen. Of course it's a little important. Gotcha. I appreciate that. I appreciate that.

[05:39:38] Supervisor Bailey, then I'll get back to that.

[05:40:03] \$4.8 million in the red in fiscal year 28.

[05:40:23] We're okay in 27. We have a positive balance of \$12.6 million in fiscal 27, but we go negative \$4.8 million in fiscal 28. And so, Dave, you said that. And that's recurring through the rest of the five-year plan.

[05:40:40] Excuse me. Okay. And so, Dave, you said that it would not, your recommendation in the past was for us not to move money from 27 to 28 is what you said? Right. Bond rating agencies call that a structural imbalance, meaning fiscal year 28 revenue isn't being used to fully fund FY28 expenses.

[05:41:04] So using fund balance from fiscal 27 to fund recurring costs in fiscal 28 and so on. So optically, on paper, that would not look good in terms of reputation of the county and how we – And I'm not trying to put you on point, Dave.

[05:41:34] I'm trying to make sure that we are making good fiscal decisions as we go forward and be realistic about it. I don't think it's a practice staff would recommend at this juncture. Thank you.

[05:41:50] Well, we would be recommending for the \$15.9 million for FY27 are one-time costs or one-time investments. An example of that might be that you want to take the Redevelopment and Assemblage Fund and put money aside in that fund one time, not reoccurring from the surplus that we've identified that still remains in FY27, so that there is no additional cost incurred in FY28.

[05:42:20] If there are other examples of that where it's one-time cost that will not reoccur in FY28, That is what we would recommend the board identify and not move funding from FY27 to FY28.

[05:42:37] Okay, okay, I'm clear now. And just for the record, for the redevelopment and assemblage fund, that is, in fact, what I was recommending. But I don't want us to, because we have such a great financial reputation, I don't want us to mess that up, for lack of a better word.

[05:43:02] Though I agree in supporting, you know, our public safety entity, there has to be a common-sense approach to it. So I'm just, that's my one-eighth. Supervisor Stewart. To piggyback from what Supervisor LaCroix was saying about not doing this backwards, I think we need to look at everybody's add-ons and then recalculate and see where we are.

[05:43:38] So did you want a response or do you have more to say? Because I can respond. Please. All right. We can look at folks' add-on. I am really cautious and very nervous. There are things that I wanted to add on. There are things I want to add on, like, you know, fire and rescue, giving them their enhanced physicals.

[05:43:58] I really want to add on. I would love to add on redevelopment. And, you know, and again, I think for fire and rescue, that's so critically and vitally important. I would love to add on the restaurant week, but you know what? I got my 1% meals tax cut. I'm going to be happy with that.

[05:44:14] I'm just going to leave that one alone. So there are a couple of things I know I personally want to add on. If other people have things that they want to add on, I think, again, we should focus on one-time expenses, one-time expenses. But I do want to go back to what Supervisor Gordy will finish out with his proposal, and then we'll talk about other one-time expenses.

[05:44:34] We do need to go back and talk about using NVTAF funds for OmniRide. That's a discussion that we need to have. So I feel like I'm wearing folks down. So let's go back and finish out. Let's do a quick straw poll on what Supervisor Gordy is suggesting, and then we can move on to see if anyone else has one-time things that they want to add on.

[05:44:54] I'm just really cautious because we made some really deep cuts. I'm just very cautious about everything. So unless there's any other, you know, let's go ahead and let's take a vote, a straw vote on Supervisor Gordy's proposal. Supervisor Angry?

[05:45:11] Yes for 27, no for 28. Well, geez, I guess no. Can't do either then. Supervisor Stewart? Yes. Supervisor LaCroix?

[05:45:30] Yes. Supervisor Bode? No. Supervisor Bailey? Yes. Supervisor Vega? Yes, only if we find additional cuts.

[05:45:47] Supervisor Gordy? Yes. Chair Jefferson? We're going to have to find additional cuts. I mean, that's it. So we're going to have to go back to the well even more. I am going to...

[05:46:03] Wait, hold on. Supervisor Vega. Can you tell me if all of the FTEs with FIRE are part of the collective bargaining agreement? 30 are.

[05:46:19] 30? Thank you. All right, we're going to have to go back to the wall and make additional cuts. So I know people are tired of the recesses, but I'm going to give us a 30-minute recess and I'm going to have a conversation with our CXO to see what else that we can cut in order to make all of this work. Thank you.

[05:46:46] He is hopefully on his way. I think he is. We have folks coming back.

[05:49:04] Great. So let's go ahead. I know Mr. Shorter and his staff, thank you guys very much. Getting late. I think we're having a search and rescue party. Mr. Shorter, what are some additional things that you and staff have found?

[05:49:21] All right. Thank you very much, Madam Chair, members of the board. So what we have spent this time doing is really working through what was the structural surplus in FY27 but deficit in FY28.

[05:49:38] What we've come up with is a recommendation that we restore the compensation portion of the class and comp study to the extent that we implemented over three years versus over two.

[05:49:54] And so what that means is that we are no longer putting the pressure on the FY28 budget, but bringing some of that pressure back to 27. And so based on our calculation, implementing the compensation for general government would put us at just over a million dollar surplus in FY27 and a \$2.7 million surplus in FY28.

[05:50:25] This gives our A bands for general government over three years, 4%. I'm going to just do all three years, 4%, 4%, 4% for A bands, 2%, 2%, 2% for B bands, and then for C, D, and E, 1%.

[05:50:42] That will stretch out the impact, and that gives us, we are able to then incorporate the request that Supervisor Gordy has made for Sheriff and ADC. We did include eliminating the ADC lieutenant colonel at \$318,000 in the recommendation as well.

[05:51:06] And that was it. That gets us back to where we need to be in terms of a balanced budget. All right. And can you, again, give me those figures for doing all that? Where are we this year and where are we next year again? And Dave, you may want to be more specific.

[05:51:24] I have us at just over a million dollars for FY27, and I have us at 2.7 million surplus for FY28. Is that right? And what that does effectively for general government employees at A-BAN, it gives them a 4% increase market of 4% over the next three years.

[05:51:50] For B-BAN, 2% each year over the next three years. And for C, D, and E, a 1% over the next three years. All right. Thank you so very much. Honestly, I have to say that makes me feel better because I hated taking away. And that's the hard thing here.

[05:52:12] When we have these discussions, it's not just theoretical. It's what is the impact? And again, I understand the position that the sheriff and ADC are in. But we're also in the same position as a county. we have talented staff but we don't want to go to other jurisdictions and i don't want the director staff to go back to their staff and explain you know what you've been really working hard you've been doing two jobs sorry that you're not getting what you're due and let's be honest when we're always talking about the private sector we always make the you know um comparison to the private sector but we're also not thinking that people can leave us and go to the private

[05:52:48] sector we are in a competition for talent so i am fine with what you are proposing i will say to the board, you know, if we do larger increases for sheriff and ADC, again, you deserve the money.

[05:53:04] I just want to be mindful that next year when we get to fire and rescue and police, we're also going to, they're going to be looking, you know, to us, what about us? And all of our first responders, all of our emergency personnel are very important. They are all very important. And I want to make sure that people are compensated and that we are able to recruit and retain the talent we need. But we have to look at this more holistically. And that's what my concern is.

[05:53:35] My concern really, and again, it's not with the work you do. It is because, and I know she's dying here, but come on girl, you've done 27 hours. All right. We have made such deep cuts today. I feel like we're just kind of winging it at this point. And that's a big concern of mine. I feel like we are winging it. So I do want people to be mindful when we're asking for additional positions that have recurring costs over a year, just be mindful that, again, not just we have to balance out five years, but when we're taking these votes, we have to really critically think. We just cut a ton of

[05:54:12] stuff. It's hard to want to add some things, at least for me, back in. Supervisor Bailey, LaCroix, then Bodie. Yes, Madam Chair. Chris, thank you so much to you and staff for going back to recalculate. What I'm interpreting is that you're saying that we're putting the \$15 million back in the budget? Is that what you're saying? We are bringing it back to FY27, where we pushed it to FY28. I'm sorry, I cannot support that, because it has nothing to do with whether

[05:54:47] we, for me, it has nothing to do whether we appreciate our employees or not, and how we want to elevate them. Absolutely nothing to do. It has to do with us being very fiscally responsible in terms of how we want to uh really protect our citizens as well and and and i as as we've said across the board from the very beginning when we got on sat on the board uh we as we voted in a straw poll to protect our citizens to make sure that they were a part of the decision and to

[05:55:24] take that back from them, in terms of that, I think we need to reset ourselves. Nobody wins that way, including the employees. And so I'm sorry, I can't support your recommendation, because I think we had made a bipartisan good decision earlier in terms of where we wanted to go with this budget. But I'm going to suggest something a little bit different. Maybe we can not take the

[05:55:57] 1% from the meals tax, put that back in, and then we can support the sheriff's request. We can support the assemblage, which is what we had in the budget already to institute. And we could also give a little bit back to our schools so we're we're now in a discussion we're rehashing what we had made a good solid decision on and so i'm okay with that i've sat up for 27 hours and we madam chair we can do it again we can do the kabuki dance but i think we had a balanced budget

[05:56:34] and i made a mistake and i'm going to take it back the vote that i did earlier the straw poll on yes supporting it i don't support it because we had a balanced budget chris came back the first time i think your first decision was excellent and so we we need to go back to that and and and look at this in a totally different way because um everybody wants to support adc and the sheriff and and again complementaries to the great job that you've done what how we've been shepherding

[05:57:06] you through your process so we can do that if we stabilize a little bit more don't look at the meals tax right now uh and and and uh incorporate those three things and and call it a night i think that's the that's the smart thing to do um that's just my one sense because 15 million dollars is a lot of money and um right now our citizens uh have been coming to this board to this chamber talking to us about how we're not listening and I think in a bipartisan way this evening we listened

[05:57:45] and so it's not about us winning up here it's about the people that we serve winning so that's just my two cents I you know I would like my colleagues to chime in on it so we're just going to go ahead right now and talk and just go ahead and state where you are with Chris's proposal so you're a no I'm just going to go okay I'm going to go with everyone in queue and then I'll go down the line so bode um it's your turn and where are you sure so i actually uh support chris's proposal and i'm not going to say too much more other than that i i appreciate you smooth smoothing that that

[05:58:23] that hit out over the course of the year because i i think that just as we have conversations around wanting to attract and retain top talents in our law enforcement agencies i support that we also need to make sure that we're doing the same thing by our rank and file and again one big piece of why, again, appreciated the county exec's original recommendation around this is it really looked after those lower band folks, those entry-level positions, the folks that are frankly going to have the hardest time being able to pay to live in this community. So I think that the

[05:58:57] counties that came up with a pretty good way to fix that imbalance by smoothing that out over three years versus two um and i'll uh i guess manager just be clear you're just asking about the county exec's current proposal right yes sir all right i'll just leave it at that thank you all right um gordy at la croix um i appreciate uh everything that uh chris has done and i can stand by with what you've uh what you've done um yeah i know this this has been it's been

[05:59:32] challenging and I appreciate the patience and so I can support it. Thank you. LaCroix. I'll be honest I'm a little bit confused. We took seven hours and we talked about everything that we thought in a bipartisan way how it should go and now we're just trying to find money so I actually am confused at where we are right now. So I will interject Chris maybe you're better to interject

[06:00:06] so basically yes we've been we were in a hole we're in a big deep hole and we started to get out of the hole but then there's additional spending and things that people want and so because of that we're trying to figure out how to make things work we're trying to figure out how to um get to where supervisor gordy was shepherding us and so chris and his team went back and looked at additional things that they can do personally i'll just interject real quick and i'll give you my time all right it is on my time now um i do support this because i feel really

[06:00:42] bad for our county staff and if they need to be made whole as well then if this is the way to get people to where they need to be i think this is the proposal we have and i will say we don't have a lot of money to spend i really don't want to add on anything else i mean i know and i'm sorry we have some people in this room who've been waiting for here because there are other things that we wanted we talked about adding on we don't have the money at some point if we're going to be honest we have to say we've done enough we don't have the money we don't have the money so this is what chris's proposal is i mean if you want him to go through it again but it's basically restoring

[06:01:20] the compensation it's going to be over three years rather than two and then eliminating position lieutenant colonel i'll let you go through and working with additional increases for their staff so that's i can have chris explain again but i just want to say this i think we need to stop with additions. Yeah, I agree. But let me just ask, does this mean we're going to go back to the meals tax? Okay, great. Thank God. So where are you? Are you a yes, no, need more information?

[06:01:48] I'm going to be a yes then. All right, then Vega. This is extremely frustrating and it's a slap in the face because we took a straw poll and we agreed to support Supervisor Bailey. We didn't asked for

readjustments. We asked for cuts. And here we are going back on something that we had already agreed on. A request was made by Supervisor Gordy. If we couldn't get there, then we go back

[06:02:26] to the negotiating table. What does that look like? Does it look like maybe doing half? Because I can entertain that. Adjusting budgets is hard work, and we have to make tough decisions. But we're more than capable of making those decisions. Not everybody is going to get what they want.

[06:02:45] these are tough times for everyone if people at home are being forced to make adjustments to their finances to their personal budgets we can do the same maybe this year it will be one department this department that department and next it'll be somebody else we have to get creative we have to come to the table we have to come with an openness willingness willingly to negotiate and we and we don't see that it's like we throw something out there and if that doesn't work then we throw everything that we've worked on and agreed on in a bipartisan fashion out the window, and I don't think it's fair. And so, no, I am not going to support this. I'm going to keep pushing for real

[06:03:23] cuts, not readjustments. This is not the best that we can do. And so, no, I don't support this. But I do agree with you, Madam Chair, that if we are getting out of the red, going into the green or the black, whichever color you want to give it, being in the positive, we have to stop continuing to add more spending, because we're not going to be able to do this all night. I'm not supportive of another 30 minute, 5 minute, 15 break. We've got to figure this out and we've got to figure it out right now. And I thought that we had done that five hours ago. Well, I'm going to go to Bailey Stewart and then we can take a strong poll and see where we are. Again, and then you two, but hold on.

[06:03:59] I have Bailey, Stewart, and then I'll go around for the people who haven't spoken. I can wait until, go to Stewart first because he hadn't spoken. I've spoken already. You know, I agree with Supervisor Vega. We've already kind of decided on this.

[06:04:19] And so that I get where staff is coming from, but that that wasn't the route that that I think we were looking for. And yeah, that that's what I that's what I got on this so far.

[06:04:37] So I take it you're a no. Where are you? Yes or no? No. OK, so you're a no. So Victor, angry, no pressure, but it's all eyes on you. Let me let me just say this. I don't like none of the route we took tonight.

[06:04:53] and I pretty much am going along as these changes are happening. I did not vote for a 450. I told you I was in this for the citizens. We got that tax base set. I wasn't in this for the mail sack. It took us further down the road, the rabbit hole. I've now got school folks thinking I just took revenue share from them because the money that we need to get out of a \$20 million deficit, the best solution was to make that money all the county so we can get ourselves where we need to be.

[06:05:23] Now, we've changed on this money for the employees because we've added more positions because we continue to say, and I love my first response in public safety, too. We just don't have the money. Now, the solution lies because right now, let me just ask the numbers again.

[06:05:39] Dave, we are where? Are we now? What is the balance? Where are we at right now? With what's on under consideration, FY27, we are to the good \$1.1 million.

[06:05:57] In fiscal 28, we're to the good \$2.7 million. Now, I don't like how we got here, but we are now once again back balanced. We ain't even done yet. So I don't know if we're going back in the negative again because we still want to talk about more things.

[06:06:15] so regardless of the fact that we've changed on the 15 million i don't know what a way other way we can get here how do we get here because is there another solution to this i don't see it i don't see that there is and renegotiate so so then i guess it looks like where are you victor i know hold on where are you yes or no i tell you i tell you i could close it all out and send us on we'll take it back in renegotiate so you're a no and LaCroix you want to change to a no

[06:06:55] all right so then we are going to have to continue negotiations so Bailey and I can have a roll call Bailey's a no Bodie's a yes Gordie's a yes LaCroix is now a no you're a no I'm a yes Stewart's a no angry's a no so um the no's have it um more people are a no so before we go back and and ask for anything else i just want to go back to what we're talking so it seems like we don't want to do anything with the market compensation that's just a non-starter what about adc and sheriffs are we

[06:07:30] are you willing to look at something else on that i think vega you talked about what may be doing something different because that's where we went back into the hole do you have any suggestions around that i mean if it pleases the majority i'm happy to entertain half of your proposal to get somewhere versus nothing i'm not sure if you're you're you're open to that again i just point to the fact that uh we have a you know if we're looking at the priorities in this i think the the ftes because the demand signal for the the um the

[06:08:10] sheriff's department it their requirements keep going up um the rules keep changing they are required to put more sheriff's deputies in the courtrooms. Teenagers cannot be handcuffed so now you need instead of having one person you got to have three and and so it is it is getting more the the requirements continue to grow in order to meet the rules of engagement and and security within the courthouse. If crime was going down and we were having fewer court cases it'd be one

[06:08:47] thing but that's not the the trend so um so um my position is i want to give them what they need in order to in order to retain and meet their requirements and retain um the the folks that we've trained to do the job um but i'll you know somebody would need to put a proposal on the table and i appreciate the flexibility supervisor bailey and we're going to stick to gordy's proposal because everything else, what we were talking about, is dead.

[06:09:25] So do you have anything to say on the previous conversation about Chris's recommendation, that failed? So did you want to talk about what Bordy's – I'm sorry. Well, I would like for Supervisor Gordy, do you have a recommendation? I mean, I think it – I would like to hear one.

[06:09:45] I'm not going to make one. I'm not going to make an alternative recommendation at this point. If somebody's got an alternative, I'm willing to entertain it. When you say alternative, you mean alternative to what you've suggested already?

[06:10:01] No, no, no. I mean, for what you've suggested, do you have a recommendation as to how we get there? To get there? Yes. I mean, look, the problem of where we are is not because we cut too much revenue on our side.

[06:10:23] It's that we pushed expenditures from 27 into 28. That's why we're at this challenge, and it's from the compensation study. I mean, we're literally shifting it from a three-year program to a two-year program. We're shifting one year's expenditures into the next year.

[06:10:40] So that's created the \$15 million challenge for us to figure that out. That's why I didn't agree to it. And so, you know, but we've got needs this year that we've got to meet, but it's next year's problem that's

going to keep us from meeting this year's requirements.

[06:11:00] So, um, so I think we've got to look at how we got to why there's a deficit in FY28 and, and it's, it is driven largely because we've, we've pushed expenditures into 28. Um, and, and, uh, we, which is interesting because we can't push revenues into 28 from 27. I wish we could, we discussed that, but apparently people don't like that, uh, on the, in the rating agencies, but we are pushing expenditures into 28 so you know you can understand why i'm a little

[06:11:37] frustrated that we can't do both but that's where we are um and so um i don't know that that answers your question but uh you know it doesn't but it's okay it's yeah but no it doesn't but it's okay because what you were doing was telling the saying the reason why and i i think we're there. We understand the reason why. But I want to go back to us having a balanced budget before we went out the last time, because I don't want to waste any more of Chris's time nor his

[06:12:13] staff's time. And I want to say it just would not look good for us as a board to have been here seven hours and then unbalance the budget. That doesn't make sense to me. So I want to go back to the balance budget that we had before, and I want to talk about how is it that we can suffice

[06:12:47] what Tom is requesting that we all know we want to do for the ADC and the Sheriff's Department, and the way that I think we could do that is by not doing the 1% meals tax. Now, I'm putting that back out there because that could be a discussion as well and so madam chair like you said you know we got to give up I'll give up whatever I need to give up if that's the one thing that we could afford that's in the balanced budget is the redevelopment and assemblage but if that's going

[06:13:25] to be a tiebreaker for whomever up here okay but the way we get back to that balanced budget and we do what we need to do for our public safety is we do the meal we get rid of that meal we keep the mills jacks as is stabilize and then come back and i hate to say that jeannie because i understand from your perspective and i understand from my perspective because we are we're on the route one quarter i get that but we we got to give up something and i don't think as a board if we're really trying to be make this a bipartisan decision it's not good for us to walk out here

[06:14:03] with an imbalanced budget and not look at our citizens so i just want to put that out there All right, Supervisor Bodie. Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to go back for a second to something that Supervisor Vega said about sort of cutting the request that Supervisor Gordie made in half.

[06:14:22] Would want to see if staff can run the numbers and what that looks like and start from there. Again, support the sheriff, support the ADC. They are getting already some additional help from the base budget that the county executive put together, but I understand the desire to give them more.

[06:14:40] However, to the point, we are still currently in an unbalanced place, and I want to see if there's some savings that can be had by cutting that Supervisor Gordy's proposal in half. Wait, I just want to understand. If we don't adopt Supervisor Gordy's proposal, are we balanced?

[06:14:59] Yes. Okay. So what we're trying to do is to see if we can get additional monies for these departments. So, yes, I appreciate if you can run the numbers. Do you have anything else, Bodie? because if not, I'm going to go next. Stuart. I agree with Supervisor Bailey. We just can't have it all. And there are things that we need. We need, I get a couple of things. I understand it. I get it. You know, there's this talk about, you know, the police are on the front line and

[06:15:37] things like that. But, you know, the sheriff and the ADC, you know, they're on the front line too. It's a different part of the battlefield, but they're on the front line too. And it's, it's necessary. I don't know any other way to say it. And yeah, maybe we started with too aggressive of cuts. Maybe the thing to do was to talk about cuts and adding on and then go to the

[06:16:16] end and say, well, where do we need to adjust the hot and cold to get where we need to get to while still also providing a, you know, a tax relief for our residents.

[06:16:32] But, yeah, I agree with Supervisor Bailey. Supervisor LaCroix, then Vega. Yeah, the problem that we have is we have spent hours discussing it and giving a point here and a point there and a couple pennies here and there, and we've worked out and negotiated for a long time and my understanding the last time we went out and why this has all gone topsy-turby is because we said we just need a little bit more

[06:17:10] money for the the the county to find and instead he came back in and as I I love the county I think that they are working really hard but in my head I think he just undid what we voted on and so I don't get that. We didn't ask him to go outside and undo what we voted on. We needed some more money. We needed to buckle up just a little bit more and to have you find someplace where we could do that. And so now coming back in, we're taking it away from the citizens. And the meals tax was

[06:17:46] just so vitally important and part of the hooray that we were doing finally for our citizens. So, I mean, I'm just, like I said, it's getting late, and maybe I'm getting a little bit, you know, having grandma issues, but I don't think we said go back out and undo what we voted on, and I think that's just what happened.

[06:18:12] Like I said, when I was listening, I was like, it almost felt like I was, like, I got sucker punched, like, what just happened here? That's why I said I didn't understand, and no offense. I appreciate you so much, but I think that's what I'm – I just can't imagine us going backwards after spending such an amazing amount of time going forward.

[06:18:38] Madam Chair. I'm sorry. I just want to make sure that I clarify just for the purpose of giving the facts on this. The \$15 million, \$15.4 million was in the budget, And it was in the budget that the second iteration that you all approved.

[06:18:59] What we are suggesting is that we move the 15.4 instead of implementing it in two years, we implement it in three years. So we didn't bring money back into the budget that you all recommended be taken out. We just moved it in a way that essentially allowed for us to have more budget capacity over a three-year period versus over a two-year period.

[06:19:24] So my understanding, leaving this room, was that you all did not want to see new money coming into this budget. You wanted us to fix the imbalance that existed in the budget while also absorbing the recommendation that Supervisor Gordy put forward.

[06:19:44] And that is the solution that we brought back. Did you have anything else, Supervisor LaCroix, or did you? Yeah, I did. It just feels as though what I was expecting is just finding a little bit more money so that we could fund the sheriff.

[06:20:09] And, you know, hopefully, because I looked and saw that all of a sudden the money was gone to do anything that Ms. Bailey wanted to do for the fund. So it just feels like we went backwards here.

[06:20:27] and because if we're going back to talk about the meals tax we are clearly going backwards i i want to land this i think that we've we i'm going to go to you vega i think we need to find solutions let's just focus on the solution because i you know and i want to hear people and i respect everyone's opinion let's find a solution either we find a solution that maybe you know we have to do a little bit left for sheriff and adc or maybe we just have to drop this because we keep talking about needing to find cuts needing to find cuts so we this is decision time supervisor vega and

[06:21:03] then unless people have a solution let's find solutions supervisor vega thank you madam chair actual cuts are the solution and that's the only way we land this plane you know i find the first round of cuts suggested by the county executive interesting you know where they're coming from Aging, health, sustainability, community service, and public safety communications.

[06:21:26] \$800,000 in savings. And then we go after health premium increases and insurance premiums. Again, it's our budget now, folks. My friends on the other side of the aisle and my friends on the same side of the aisle. It's our budget, and we have to do right by the taxpayers of this county.

[06:21:44] And the way that we get there is by cuts. I had asked, Dave, if the positions for the fire and rescue system were all part of the CBA, and you said 30 were, but there are 35 listed. So does that mean that five are not?

[06:22:00] I see 35, and the reason why I bring the five up is because if those are not, that's over \$600,000 in savings in those five positions. There are five civilian positions, non-sworn positions in the proposed budget for fire and rescue dealing with the administration in terms of payroll has gotten much more complicated, procurement activities, they need help from an administrative standpoint.

[06:22:34] point. Okay. So in terms of solutions, Madam Chair, you know, again, I don't know if everybody got their recommended cuts out in the open. I still have additional ones that we can talk about. But we definitely have the opportunity to make the numbers work without having to revisit what we already agreed on, whether it was the 85, the 450 C&P, 1% of the meals tax. We don't have to

[06:23:08] revisit any of that if we make additional cuts. Okay. All right. So hold on. So then I honestly think the answer is really easy. I just don't think we add any more spending and I'm so sorry. I know we have people who have been sitting here all day. I just don't think we add any more new spending. I don't think we add any more spending. That's my suggestion. No more new spending.

[06:23:34] There's a few things maybe we could talk about additional cuts if we need to. I do want to get into OmniRide and the NBTA 30% funds because that's a concern for me. I don't think we should spend anything else I think that the budget is what it is we've made cuts we've we've made a lot of cuts tonight I don't want any no spending that's what that's my suggestion I'm sorry y'all no new spending no new spending I don't I don't disagree I just want to make sure that we you know land this plane with the sheriff and ADC again I am open to doing half I don't know where everybody

[06:24:10] else stands right but I am open to do to doing half if that is not the wish of the majority of the board then that should be stated because then i think that we can really close this and and move on to the next okay so then let's go so half do you mean instead of an 8.2 percent market pay adjustment are you saying 4.1 what is it exactly that you're so it was 8.2 percent effective july the first and with the seven percent market adjustment on january the first um and and it's Six sworn officers on July the 1st and six sworn officers on January the 1st.

[06:24:50] So you'd split it up over a six-month period. And so you wouldn't fund the 7% and the six sworn in the first six months, but only in the second six months. And then for ADC, it's the 7% that would kick in on January the 1st.

[06:25:13] So I apologize for giving this to me again. So ADC is 7% as of January 1st, and for a sheriff again? They would have 8.2 on July 1st. That's in the budget. But it would add the 7% on January 1st.

[06:25:33] And then again, the sheriff we're talking about, just give me that real quickly again. So half of their request would be implemented in the first six months on July 1st.

[06:25:50] Six sworn officers, one civilian. And did you do the civilians in that markup, Dave? Sorry, we had one civilian position. Okay, so one civilian. And in January or July, remember?

[06:26:10] July, okay. And then 8.2, and so 8.2% market adjustment on July 1. And then the other half of the request is the other six, and then 7% in January.

[06:26:28] So thank you so very much for going through that again. We had already talked about that. It was voted, we didn't have the money. That's why they went back out to see where we can get the money. We didn't have the money. I remember, you know, that passing, people wanted to do it, but we didn't have the money, so we went back out to find the money.

[06:26:50] Do people still want to continue to fund the money for this, or do we want to maybe look at tweaking this? Madam Chair, I do want to clarify, so that in July the 1st, we already have five, The 8.2% is already in the budget, along with five sworn officers is in the budget and one civilian position.

[06:27:14] So that part, the only thing that would have been added on July is one more sworn officer. Then everything else is what is the addition to what's above the budget. So it's six positions. If we cut that to three.

[06:27:31] So then, so you're thinking for sure for January 1st, maybe instead of six new, cutting it to three new positions? Yes. So if we cut that to three new positions, and then are you still looking at going with the 7%?

[06:27:52] I still think we have to look at trying to make sure that their salaries remain competitive within the region. And so I think that part is important as well. And granted, that's where the biggest cost driver is, is on the market adjustment.

[06:28:08] I think I'm personally, I think giving them the share of three new positions for January 1st is fair. I can live with that. But if we perhaps hold off on the 7%, again, I understand that we want to be competitive.

[06:28:26] I hate having these discussions so late in the night without really going through and thinking about the other implications to our other first responders. And it does feel like, you know, we've made, again, so many cuts. We've made so many cuts.

[06:28:41] It doesn't sit well that we've told other staff that you're not getting what you expected. So for me, I'm okay with, Sheriff, January 1st, three additional new hires above and beyond the budget.

[06:29:00] Let's take out the 7%. And with ADC, take out the 7% for January 1, because the 8.2 is already baked in the budget, I believe, correct? So then, you know, we will give the Sheriff three new positions for January 1st.

[06:29:18] I can live with that. And I think that that's still, you know, I'd like to see the numbers on that. But before I do, I just want to see if people feel good about that or feel like they can live with it. Madam Chair, do you see my line? Oh, sorry. Supervisor Bailey. Yeah. I feel good about that, and I could support that.

[06:29:38] And I think, you know, I agree with your rationale about what you're saying about the comp. That gives us, you know, additional time to support the sheriff going forward.

[06:29:53] We did the same thing with the Commonwealth attorney, not salary-wise, but with the FTEs. So I could support that. So Supervisor Bailey can support it.

[06:30:11] Supervisor Stewart? Support. Stewart, support. All right. Let's just go down. Actually, if there's no one else who wants to speak out, I'll have Andrea do the roll call, and then we'll see where we're at.

[06:30:33] For Sheriff, just three positions. Supervisor Bailey? Yes. Supervisor Bode? Yes. Supervisor Vega? Supervisor Gordy?

[06:30:49] I prefer the 7% increase as well, so I'm no. Supervisor Angry? Supervisor LaCroix? Yes. Supervisor Stewart? Yes. Chair Jefferson? Yes.

[06:31:06] Motion carries 7 to 1. All right, Mr. Sinclair, where are we now? Fiscal 27, we're to the good \$15.4 million. In fiscal 28, we are short, but only \$300,000.

[06:31:27] What a big difference that makes. All right. all righty then madam chair mr gordy supervisor gordy so does that also since we rejected the proposal by the county executive the uh lieutenant colonel position for adc is still retained within your budget yes and that's inclusive of what you just talked about for uh okay thank you all right

[06:32:03] supervisor stewart then bailey and again let's focus we're going to focus on making some stuff of? I mean, I love the comments, but we're going to have this focus on cuts, y'all. What you got? What you got? Supervisor Stewart. Director of Finance, \$300,000. So you, before I go, Director of Finance, \$300,000.

[06:32:23] I'm going to go to you too, Andrea, and then we'll discuss. Do you have cuts, Andrea? Okay. Andrea, what are your cuts? The, I'm sorry, Fire and Rescue Coordinated Care.

[06:32:41] And how much is that? And I'll take all these ones. Gordy, I see you in there. You got anything? Well, no, I was just on that.

[06:32:59] I just want to make sure that that position is not related to the pharmaceuticals and the management of those pharmaceuticals. Because remember, they took away the ability to have it. Now the fire departments have to maintain the pharmaceuticals.

[06:33:15] I just want to make sure that that position is not that position that's helping us manage the pharmaceuticals since it's not being retained at the hospitals anymore. No, this position was focused on supporting our high 9-1-1 users.

[06:33:32] So it was not focused on pharmaceuticals. Okay, thank you. I'm going to be honest with you. That's one that hurts, that community court. That's one that hurts because that's one, again, it's bringing community care. Our fire has EMS, obviously. These are people who are trained medics.

[06:33:49] And so they're being able to help people with health care who, again, are their frequent flyers. So that one for me, I'll be honest, that's a hard one. If that's the will of the board, you know, we'll take a

straw poll. But let's go ahead first with Director of Finance. And let's go ahead and take a straw poll on where we are with that position.

[06:34:12] Supervisor Vega. Yes. Supervisor Bode. No. Supervisor Gordy. Yes. Supervisor Angry. I'm sorry, I just got to ask a question. Didn't we talk about this position?

[06:34:27] Was that the position we spoke at? I think you said we need it. You need it? Yeah, I'm going to have to say no. Yes or no, sir. no no no okay supervisor la croix yes supervisor bailey yes supervisor stewart yes chair jefferson no i have to count i'm so sorry two three okay that one is a five three yes to no okay so that

[06:35:07] will be cut that's five hundred thousand dollars i mean sorry three hundred thousand three hundred yeah and fire and rescue what was that position again do you want to cut under the name uh why is it denoted as a pilot program? Is it something that we are trying to introduce, test initially?

[06:35:36] I mean, I understood what you said, but why is it a pilot program and it's not an institutional program? So through community services, we already have crisis response teams who can be called today to meet residents where they are if they are experiencing a crisis. What we are trying to do here is create a link between fire and rescue and community services and our public safety communications where we are essentially proactively reaching out to the top users of 9-1-1. Those

[06:36:14] residents that are calling our 9-1-1 service system most often that we want to go meet them where they are proactively to find out how we could provide better access to health care so that they are not using the 911 system to deal with what in some cases are issues around medication management, getting to their primary care physician, and other matters that we could be more proactive in helping really provide better access to health.

[06:36:47] And my second level question, is this something that we can cross-train for until we can actually start the pilot program? I'd ask the chief to come in and talk a bit about the program. Good evening, Tom LaBelle. I have the pleasure of being your fire chief.

[06:37:26] I apologize. I didn't catch the whole question. My question was, is this pilot program something that we can cross-train to do until we can afford to pay for it? No, ma'am. So we did the initial pilot about a year and a half ago.

[06:37:43] This is an extension of that. The effort is focused on getting people to stop using really expensive firefighters and get them to the assistance they need so that we can start dropping the demand on the fire department, start slowing the growth of the fire department.

[06:38:02] So the program has been, we've done the pilot program already. So now you're asking for FTE to support it? To actually do the work. We had a little bit of space so that we were able to assign somebody to it for about six weeks.

[06:38:23] That's what I mean by cross-training. We were able to prove that now we'd like the position full-time. Okay. And, Chief, point blank, is this something that we can plan for because of the cruciality of our budget?

[06:38:39] Is it something that we can plan for at a later date? I believe that this will save us funds over the long haul. I believe there are multiple communities both in the Commonwealth and across the United

States of America that have already proven this method works, and it slows down the growth of fire departments, and it makes sure that people actually receive the resources they need, not just a fire engine.

[06:39:03] And with the current pilot program that you have instituted already, has it been successful? Incredibly successful, ma'am. And how many people do you have there now? We have nobody there now. How do you measure the success? So we had a short-term, six-week pilot project where we went out and engaged with high-call utilizers, got them connected to the right county resources because 911 is the easiest thing to do, but it isn't the correct thing to do.

[06:39:28] And so we were able to get them to the right resources, and in one case, we stopped an individual who was calling about 15 times a week to 911 and get them to actual services that they could use. Okay. Okay. Thank you.

[06:39:43] Thank you, ma'am. All right. I'm sorry. Supervisor Vega had a question for you as well. Don't go anywhere. Yes. Chief LaBelle, how does the non-emergency line play into this? So I'd have to defer to communications.

[06:40:01] I think most of the folks that we're talking about, though, probably aren't using a non-emergency line. They've gotten used to calling 911. Quite frankly, we teach them to call 911. And so they call us up for everything from they're unable to get from their bed to the bathroom and then to bring them back to their bed, helping them with groceries, helping them get upstairs to their apartments, and rather than finding, again, different methodologies, including a 3-1-1 option.

[06:40:33] Yeah. And do we have any data on the age population? We did collect it. I don't know it off the top of my head, however. I think it's important to have that. Not sure, just thinking ahead here. We have a Department of Aging not making assumptions, right, as to who's calling, but I do think that there's an opportunity to use additional resources to perhaps enhance.

[06:40:56] I would agree, and as a matter of fact, we've spoken to the area office on aging. This is a team approach. This just happens to be the fire department member of the team. We see ourselves working with quite a few folks, quite a few agencies.

[06:41:13] also including not-for-profit agencies. I'd also like to say I think there's a large number of folks who volunteer in the community who would be interested in assisting as a volunteer. - That's good. - All right, I think this is, let's go ahead and do, unless there's any questions, let's go ahead and do a straw vote on this one.

[06:41:36] - Supervisor Angry? - Yes. - Supervisor Bailey? - Yes. - Supervisor Bodie? - No. - Supervisor Vega? - No. - Supervisor Stewart? - No.

[06:41:51] - Supervisor LaCroix? - No. - Supervisor Gordy? - No. Chair Jefferson. No. That is a failed two to six motion.

[06:42:07] Okay, let me just get a quick temperature check. Mr. Sinclair, I think, are we balanced for next year? Just want to be sure. Like zero? So just maybe a little bit more to go? Fiscal 28, we're down 115, 116K.

[06:42:32] Yeah, we're down. Yep. So 115, around 115, 116. All right, so we have more stuff to go.

[06:42:55] I'm going through some of my notes. Some of these things I know we've already talked about. If anyone else, actually, go on.

[06:43:15] Madam Chair, I got confused on the last vote. I meant to vote yes. I thought that no was to not fund, right? And I got confused, so my vote is a yes, not a no.

[06:43:36] So you would like to fund it or you'd like to cut it? No, I think that, you know, based off of what the chief said, that we have an opportunity here to use volunteers and whatnot, I think that this is a position that could wait. Yeah, I'm the same. That was confusing. Yeah. So we'll redo it. So this is to, so I'm going to be very clear.

[06:43:57] This is if we want to cut this from the, so I'm just going to make sure that if this is a position you want to cut from the budget, you will say yes. No, you said yes. Okay, so this is a position that you want to cut. So already in the budget, say yes if you want to cut it.

[06:44:13] say no if you do not want to cut it. We got it? Yes, ma'am. I'm starting over. Okay. The question is to eliminate. To eliminate. So yes, we want to eliminate or no, we do not want to eliminate. Very good. Supervisor Angry. Yes. Supervisor Bailey. Supervisor Bode. No. Supervisor Gordy. No.

[06:44:37] Supervisor LaCroix. Yes. Supervisor Stewart. No. Supervisor Vega. Yes. Chair Jefferson. I do not want to cut it now it is a 4-4 all right yeah we are really it stays so let's go ahead and look for some other things i know that people are tired of the recesses but i feel like we know we can keep going down i want to keep going i was gonna say 15 all right let's go madam chair yes ma'am so can

[06:45:11] we talk about the five positions that I had asked Mr. Fun about? That is 673,880. And this is for the ones that he said were civilian professional support staff for fire. We can go around. I will just say we are cutting positions for them. And we just added positions for another department.

[06:45:37] you know again i would prefer to be consistent but we can go around the horn and see where people are supervisor angry just one question are these positions currently funded uh or staff with uniformed personnel do we know if these five positions we're talking about in fire and rescue are currently these are new positions so these are new positions these are new positions and and just a point of clarification for the board um the total cost of the five is about 674 000

[06:46:12] 300 000 is via a budget shift within fire and rescues existing budget today so the additional cost in the proposed budget is the net of 374 000 which would equate to how many personnel And the question is, if the \$300,000 they're spending inside of their budget, how many people can they hire with that versus that other \$300,000?

[06:46:46] Approximately three. Okay, so there we go. So that's two we're talking that we can cut there, I believe. So, okay, we're going to go to Supervisor Gordy then.

[06:47:03] Supervisor Gordy? Are we just talking about this? We're talking about this one because I have something else, too. Yeah, I've got something else. I have a lot of other stuff, too. All right, so, you know, what would be great? I don't know how much more if you want to kind of type it up and send it to us.

[06:47:21] That might be easier while we go through some of this stuff so we can look at it. I mean, do you know how to type? Can you type real quick? Okay. Honestly, because you type it up, I can have my team actually print it out and give it to everyone. That might make it a little bit easier. So this is, we're going to look at cutting these.

[06:47:38] How many positions did you want to cut again from Fire and Rescue? Well, based off of what Dave said, I think we're looking at two. Dave, what is the number for two? the numbers um yes so the the

net general fund impact of 374 000 that's about three positions okay and and i'll just throw it out there madam chair call it 125 000 per position okay and 25k

[06:48:15] um you know i'm also if if we had to make adjustments for the adc and for the sheriff's office i think it's only fair that we look at making some adjustments um in the commonwealth Attorney's Office. They have quite a bit of asks as well, and I think we have wiggle room there.

[06:48:32] You know, we could do two attorneys, look at the three paralegals that they're asking for, and we can also talk about the Occoquan Greenway. That's a little over, I think, 115K, and so definitely have opportunity here to increase our coffers.

[06:48:55] So I will say the positions that you're looking to cut for fire and rescue are already baked into the budget. They're already baked in, right? No? Not those three positions you mentioned? The CA's positions are, if I'm correct.

[06:49:12] So the five FTEs that were part of the proposed budget that you all are looking at are baked in. They are part of the original budget. Am I answering it? I don't know if I'm fully understanding your question. Yeah, that was my question.

[06:49:28] So, what I'm trying to avoid is things that, I mean, when it comes to our first responders, if we have stuff that's baked into the budget, as we do with fire and rescue, that's different than adding something that was from recap, which is what we did for sheriff.

[06:49:46] So, that's why I think there are other things that we can cut. I'm hesitant to make any more additional cuts to our first responders. I think that there are other things that we can look at. You mentioned what Occoquan Greenway and some other things. I get the point you're making, but, you know, at the end of the day, if we have to make cuts, we have to make cuts.

[06:50:06] I don't think that there's anything that says that we can't, you know, make a cut that's already been baked into the budget. Again, it's just the recommendation, right, of the CXO, but ultimately we make the final decision as to whether or not we fund it. That's true. I'm just saying, though, because, you know, we were talking about giving additional to one group that was not in the budget.

[06:50:27] To go back into the budget, someone that's already baked in and make a cut. it just for me it really feels fundamentally unfair i mean we have more stuff as you've said we have more stuff that we can cut um you know so if you want to take a straw um straw poll over cutting those three positions we can do so i am just feeling that there are other things that we can look at cutting so madam chair maybe the best way to do it is we put the our recommended cuts out on the table and we have those and we just go down the list what we support i think it saves

[06:51:02] time okay that's fine so fire and rescue cutting three positions that's around 125 beats what else you got you said commonwealth attorney you wanted to do what two attorneys two positions what else the aquaquan greenway and how much does that say wait first of all how much does commonwealth

[06:51:28] attorney save but that's yeah i have it i just have to look it up here the greenway i have that 116, 420 for the one FTE for the Greenway.

[06:51:54] So how much? 116. Okay. 420.

[06:52:09] Supervisor Bailey, you mentioned the Coordinated Community Care Pilot Program. That's what we just did with. Yeah, we just did that one. Chief LaBelle, yeah. Yeah, we just did that one. That's the other

one that I had. That was the four floor, four floor, you didn't go anywhere. Let me get the numbers for the two attorneys in the CA's office, and then you can come back to me.

[06:52:27] I do have one question. trying to keep up with everything did we talk about cutting a position for a full-time position for trail maintenance mr shorter is that one of the things we talked about cutting uh not that i recall okay i think i'm not sure how much that would be i've also asked my team to look at that but um if we cut that or is that the ocaquan greenway the greenway that was that was the trail maintenance okay um is it the trail maintenance it just says ocaquan greenway Okay, so then that's already included in yours.

[06:53:02] Yeah. In whose? Did somebody else say that already? No, you. Okay, and then I have the numbers for the two attorneys in the CA's office. That's 320,648. Wait, 20, roughly 220, okay?

[06:53:19] All right. And just, again, you know, food for thought, they're asking for an additional three paralegals, and that's another 303,819. And, again, just for consideration, willing to do one, two, negotiate.

[06:53:36] But three paralegals, \$300,000 and \$3,819,000. All right. Does anyone have anything to say about these? Anything else they want to add? And we can talk. I guess, yes, let's get everything else people want to add for cuts, and we can talk about everything at once and keep it moving.

[06:53:58] Supervisor Stewart, I guess you're in queue? Yes. Again, as I iterated previously, I don't believe we need two OSHA compliance trainers. I really think that we can either deal with one or we can cut both and find a company to come and train annually.

[06:54:24] So that's number one. Wait, what's the amount? \$197,625. That's page 84.

[06:54:39] Is that both positions or just each one? Let me double check. That's one position.

[06:54:59] That's one position. That's one position? But if we eliminate both, it's \$395,251, but we would still need to hire an outside company to come. Okay. Yeah. And I know we've had a lot of discussions about hiring contractors.

[06:55:15] Some people love it. Some people hate it. Anyone else? Is that all you have? If not, if so, I'm going to Gordy. No, I do have more. So the volunteer coordinator liaison for \$200,000, again, that's on page 74.

[06:55:38] And just in reading the prescription, it occurs to me as a task that can be folded into an existing position. And what was the price tag associated with that one again? \$200,000. Okay.

[06:55:54] What else you got? Did we deal with the Green Fleet Mobility Manager? We got rid of one. Which one did we got? Yeah, we got, that was the one we got rid of. We still have the strategic communication, or we still have the comms position in sustainability.

[06:56:13] Okay, got it. And, yeah, that's what I have so far. And we did talk about security techs, but that one kind of got shot down almost immediately. All right, Supervisor Gordy, what you got? I would suggest we're increasing, and if this was included in the earlier, I apologize, the community partners increase is \$425.

[06:56:38] I would suggest we reduce that down to \$300. Anything else? All right, Stuart, you missed one. So, page 180, the project inspectors, eliminating both at \$291,078 with construction transfer to transportation.

[06:57:12] We can wait and see until they're needed. Kind of a scary one, but all right. One other thing I had, it's only \$6,000 or something. It is Good News Community Kitchen. It's a very small allotment, but they've moved. They're in Chicago now.

[06:57:28] and i wish i would have add i don't know i mean they may still be providing services i know they're they used to be an uncle con do you know i don't know kenny if you know anything about that now they moved so we can cut that that's like 6 000 hold on wait mr sinclair what you got just a point of clarification for the board's consideration regarding the project inspectors and parks and recreation the salary and benefit costs are cost recovered to the capital projects that they are working on all i'm trying to say is there is no savings to the county's general fund by eliminating

[06:58:05] them let's take it out take it out all right we take that one out so i'm going to look for the one that i had good news can be in kitchens only like six thousand something oops we can move that one out um and thank you staff i don't know if you probably have to go back and read a lot of the stuff to make sure that you um capture everything that we've talked about i'm going to look for that one. Is there anything else? Supervisor Bailey. Yes, Madam Chair. I've wanted to point a clarity with Supervisor Vega. For the Commonwealth Attorney, you cut

[06:58:44] that by what? I didn't hear. No, what I recommended was two attorneys. That's 320,000. Three paralegals three hundred and three thousand okay the the only thing that I

[06:59:09] have is reduced the senior center without walls to one senior center without walls mm-hmm we actually quit we actually cut one from that program in our initial we did okay so do you want to keep that you want to continue the

[06:59:40] cut or no yes okay and how much would that save uh 121 is it 121 it's already so it's already included it's already done right so when we we went back the first time to find savings this was one of the positions that we so we don't need to do yes okay okay duplicative okay so and mine was good news community kitchen that was like 6 000 because they've moved thank you elijah anything

[07:00:17] else if not if this is the totality of our remaining cuts which we can go through and talk about them and see where people are on each of these we have good news community kitchen fire and rescue cutting three positions commonwealth attend attorney two positions two attorney positions aquacan greenway which is the trails um ocean compliance trainers volunteer liaison and cutting community partners from \$425,000 to \$300,000.

[07:00:50] And that is what I have for our remaining cuts. Is everyone clear on that? Senator Vazor Vega? I'm clear on this. I guess I just want to ask. Let's say \$170,000. It's really \$169,000, \$313,000, but let's say \$170,000 for the public defenders.

[07:01:11] I know they're not asking for any FTEs, but this is supplemental for their salaries. What is this for? Yes, so what we are doing essentially is increasing the local supplement for the salary.

[07:01:29] It is currently 25%, and we'd be increasing it to, Dave, remind me, 35%. What is the percentage? Yeah. Local, not the state. Correct. And is that mandatory? It is not.

[07:01:46] Okay, and I bring this up because when the pitch for the Public Defender's Office, when that was made to us, I supported that. and it was because it was going to be to no cost to us or impacts to our

budget. And here we are. I think one of the supervisors reminded me that, you know, it's the second ask, right?

[07:02:08] And so if you're going to bring something forward and say that you want to implement a program because it's not going to be an expense to the county, then that word needs to be honored. And so if it's not legally required and or mandatory, I would recommend that we perhaps add that to the list of considerations because I know that our friends who love our fur babies also are asking for a position, and I would say that, you know, that \$170K that is being given to the Public Defender's Office can very well go to fund that.

[07:02:45] All right, thank you. I do want to add on a couple of things. Since we're talking about the OSHA trainer, removing, using contractors, there are vehicles associated with that. And so if we're going to go ahead and do that, if that is what people want to do, I just want to name that we should remove the OSHA vehicles, if we remove the OSHA trainers.

[07:03:10] And I believe we have security technician vehicles, and that's like around \$190,000 for those vehicles. What I'm going to do, so this is going to be kind of hard, and I'm going to go ahead and I'm going to ask everyone where they are on each of these things.

[07:03:39] And if there's any confusion or clarity, we can go back over, and I'll talk to Andrea Madden about this. But I'm just going to go down and over all the things that we have because this is a lot. So, Supervisor Bailey, on Good News Community Kitchen, where are you on about \$6,000?

[07:03:57] Yes. So, removing that, so, and this is, okay, so all these are cuts. So, it's a yes if you want to remove it, no if you don't. Where are you with Fire and Rescue? Yes. Where are you with Commonwealth Attorney?

[07:04:14] Yes. Where are you with Occoquan Greenway? Yes. Where are you with OSHA compliance trainers? Yes. And the car. And the cars.

[07:04:32] Yes. Volunteer liaison? Yes. Community partners? Yes. So you are good with all of the security technicians?

[07:04:51] Yes. Their cars? Yes. All right. I'm going to go over to Stuart. What say you with Good News Community Kitchen? Yes to all the above. So you are yes to all. All right.

[07:05:09] Give me a second because I'm trying to write this. Kenny, where are you with good news? Yes. Fire and rescue? No. Commonwealth attorney? No. Occoquan Greenway?

[07:05:25] Nope. Can you be any more enthusiastic? I think you can. I could. Okay. OSHA? Nope. And the car? Volunteer coordinator? No. Community partners?

[07:05:44] No. All right. Angry? I had security texts as well. No. Is there what? Security texts? No. I do have a question. Where are we, Dave, in 28?

[07:06:00] I know 27, we're in the green. Where are we in 28? \$116,000 short. Okay. Yes to all. All right, give me a minute, folks, because I have to.

[07:06:17] I'll go. Vega, where are you? Yes to all. LaCroix? Yes to all except for fire and rescue. Ditto. So you're yes to all but fire and rescue.

[07:06:35] So while the yeses have it, I'll just say good news community kitchen, I'm a yes. Fire and rescue, I'm a no. Commonwealth Attorney, no. Occoquan Greenway, yes. OSHA plus CAR, yes. Volunteer Coordinator, no. Community Partners, no.

[07:06:52] Security Technicians and CAR, yes. So these were all things getting cut. If, Dave, do you guys need the numbers again so that you can balance? I mean, we're good. I'm sorry to ask.

[07:07:09] If you could just go through each of those one more time. I will do that, and I will have people who suggested these also go through that. So Good News Community Kitchen, and I'm sorry, I'll have my team look up where that is in the actual budget book. It is about \$6,000 right there.

[07:07:24] So that's about \$6,000 for this year. Fire and Rescue, there were three positions to cut at roughly, what, \$125,000 each? Yes, Lee? Yeah, \$125,000 each. So those were the positions that you guys discussed.

[07:07:39] Do you need more clarity on that one, or are you good? Do you understand? I just need to know if it's a cut or not. It's a cut. Okay. Everything that we suggested will be cut. Commonwealth attorney, two positions will be cut. Occoquan Greenway, the position associated with that, will be cut.

[07:07:59] The OSHA compliance trainers and the cars associated will be cut. The volunteer. I'm sorry, on the OSHA compliance, was that one position? Both positions. Or both positions. And the cars associated with it.

[07:08:16] It's all included. Okay. All right. Well, there we go. OSHA compliance. Yes, I'm sorry. A volunteer liaison, that's a cut. A community partner is going from \$423,000 to \$300,000. Madam Chair, I do have public defender.

[07:08:34] A public defender, I'm sorry. Public defender, two positions, yes. I'm sorry. It was a... I'm sorry, Commonwealth attorney, two positions, right? Right. Oh, public defender, too?

[07:08:50] I didn't get that one. So everyone's cool with public defender? No. I'm a no. I'm a yes. Hold on. Andrea, you're a yes. Stuart, where are you? Public defender, no. Bodie is a no. Where are you, angry?

[07:09:08] 175? It is the salary supplement that we are providing. Not mandatory. Okay. So you're no, no, no. I'm a no. Vega, where are you, public defender? You have to cut that salary supplement.

[07:09:26] You're a yes. LaCroix, you're a yes. And Gordie, you're a yes. It looks like it failed. It's 4-4. 4-4. Do you support to cut it or do you support to keep it? Sorry. I'm sorry.

[07:09:42] Sorry. And could you do a count again of the fire and rescues? Wait, hold on. Two things. I want to do what we just did. I'm going to have Andrea Madden do a roll call. And then fire and rescue. All right. So Andrea Madden, do what we...

[07:09:59] Public defender. To reduce the salary supplement. Angry. Bailey. To reduce it.

[07:10:18] Yes. Yes. To reduce the public defender. Yes. Sorry. It's okay. Supervisor Bodie? No. Supervisor Gordy?

[07:10:36] Supervisor LaCroix? Yes. Supervisor Stewart? No. Supervisor Vega? Yes. Chair Jefferson? No. We are at 4-4. So it doesn't move forward. Hold on.

[07:10:51] I do quickly, because someone mentioned the fire and rescue, we want clarity on that one. So we can do it. Let's do a roll call. Before I get to the people in the queue, let's do a roll call on fire and rescue, cutting those three positions. Doesn't have to be three. Okay.

[07:11:07] It doesn't have to be three, but right now we're talking about three. microphone please they're getting three positions or whatever three hundred thousand that the fire and rescue is funding out of their budget so they're getting whatever that amounts to three

[07:11:42] two positions and we're simply saying whatever that rest is you can cut this year and potentially fund next year or whatever so so i'm confused but okay so we're cutting into the you got me a little confused you said we're going to bottom line he said there's five positions that fire and rescue has in these new positions they want but they were going to take three hundred thousand dollars of their own fund out of fire and rescue to pay for however many positions that pays for i don't know the individual whatever that difference is is we don't we don't have to pay for that instead of

[07:12:18] them getting five positions maybe they're only paying for three out of their budget that they can provide giving us the option for 200 000 or whatever that could be that you can put back into this deficit that we're trying to make up it seems like we've made up our deficit but i would say we did but i do want to continue this conversation because i just i know a couple people you guys have your lights on but this was one for clarity because we might have actually that might have actually been a failed motion but with supervisor vega what i understand she wanted to cut three presentations. They were at 125 each. Correct. So we are going to do a roll call to make sure that

[07:12:56] we have everything correct. And if you would like to cut these positions, say yes. If you do not want to cut them, it is a no. Supervisor Angry. Yes. Supervisor Bailey. No. Supervisor Bode. No.

[07:13:15] Supervisor Gordy. Supervisor LaCroix. Supervisor Stewart. Yes. Supervisor Vega. Yes. Chair jefferson no we are at a 4-4 so there is no action taken on that one so we did take action on good news community kitchen commonwealth attorney you want to change your vote on the commonwealth

[07:13:51] attorney so let's go ahead and do a straw poll on commonwealth attorney this is to eliminate two attorney positions and three paralegal positions yes thank you supervisor angry i'm sorry can we separate those out we're gonna have to yeah and before can you tell me where we are now with the 28 number all right while you're doing that let me just remind this world because i want to tell you let me remind you you continue talking about fire and rescue our police and our sheriffs and

[07:14:30] adc don't have an alternate service you have a full volunteer department inside your fire and rescue you're not discussing once about utilizing that to help offset a lot of what you're doing So I agree, fire and rescue, police, public safety is important.

[07:14:49] Let's not forget that pool of personnel that you have to play with as you're working on these numbers, okay? I have got to say, I went to a volunteer installation this weekend. I forgot to wash my, they gave me a nice party gift, a nice drinking mug, and I love our volunteers.

[07:15:10] You're right, they're amazing. And they've already been plugging in a lot of holes. Because of them, we have lower expenses in that system. But let's go ahead. We're going to separate out. For Commonwealth Attorney, we are going to do the two attorneys, and then we're going to do the three paralegals.

[07:15:28] We're going to do them separately because some people may vote differently. So two attorney positions. It is in the budget. It is a vote to cut it from the budget. So cutting it means a yes, and do not cut it is a no. So let's go ahead and roll call. supervisor vega which one are we doing first attorney two attorneys yeah they're asking for four i'm suggesting we cut two yes supervisor la croix yes supervisor angry yes supervisor bailey

[07:16:01] yes supervisor bode no supervisor stewart yes supervisor gordy yes chair jefferson no that motion passes six to two all right now we're going to talk about the three paralegals again This is our new budget. If we want to cut it, it's a yes. If you do not want to cut it, it doesn't know.

[07:16:28] Supervisor Bode. No. Supervisor Gordy. No. Supervisor Stewart. Yes. Supervisor Vega. They're asking for seven. I'm suggesting we cut three. Yes. Supervisor LaCroix. Yes. Supervisor Bailey. No.

[07:16:49] Supervisor Ingrid. Yes. Chair Jefferson. No. That is a 4-4. So no action is taken. So with these new changes, Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Funt, where are we? We're to the good in fiscal 28 by \$828,000.

[07:17:10] Just to recap, that is cutting two Commonwealth attorney positions, cutting Occoquan Greenway positions, cutting OSHA compliance inspectors or OSHA compliance trainers, cutting a volunteer coordinator, reducing the increase to the community partner program from 425 to 300,

[07:17:42] cutting the good news community kitchen and the security tax. Yes. So you said we are for this year 828, and then next year where are we?

[07:17:59] 100,000, yeah. We were 800,000 to the good in fiscal 28. That was the problem. Oh, fiscal 28 were to the good. All right. So, folks, this has been painful, I'm sure, not just for me, but everyone. Before I get to you, Supervisor Stewart, we do have money to add, but I'm really hesitant, and I'm sorry.

[07:18:22] I'm really hesitant. I don't know where other people want to go. I want to go to you, Mr. Stewart. I do want to also land the plane on OmniRite using NVTa funds. So, Mr. Stewart, Supervisor Stewart, where are you at? Yes, so I just wanted to know what that made 27 look like as well, fiscal year 27.

[07:18:51] Fiscal 27, we're \$17.3 million to the good. Thank you so very much.

[07:19:09] Supervisor Bailey. Yeah, I just, I want to revisit something. Did we take a straw poll on the redevelopment and assemblage? We didn't get there. We didn't do, what we have been doing is focus on cuts on things that have been baked into the budget. We did add something that we haven't done before.

[07:19:25] Just making sure. So, I do want to ask this question. Are we going to use NVTa funds for OmniRide? That's a big thing. It's not necessarily, again, as they've explained, it's not going to change our budget so much, but I know our transportation department has expressed concerns with us touching NVTa 30% funds, so this is not something I support, so I just want to do a stroke hold.

[07:19:54] Do you support, or do you want to use NVTa funds to support OmniRide? Maybe we need Rick Gonzalez if he's still here, but are there any questions? I see your trigger finger, Supervisor Vega, discussion. But Dave is busy, and I think I need him.

[07:20:11] I just want to make sure. He said we can't use that money elsewhere, right? It's only for transportation. But we have other transportation projects like Route 28, which will come back. We have other funds, other needs. And Rick Conazales has explained to us that, you know, we already have some dedicated funding now to go into a third bucket.

[07:20:33] It could impact us on other transportation issues. Rick is still here. Mr. Gonzalez, I'm sorry, Mr. Sinclair. Just a point of clarification. So there are a couple choices for the board. If you do not want to use NVTa 30% funds, and that's a use of \$1.2 million in the proposed budget, does the board want to use a different funding source for that, or is the local subsidy a cut of \$1.2 million?

[07:21:11] So there's kind of two decisions there. All right, Supervisor Angry. Madam Chair, because before I even want Mr. Cannondale to speak, I'm saying, yes, I want to continue using NVTa funds for armed rights.

[07:21:27] So I think we should go through that first before we have him even come up here to give us a speech. So I'm simply saying, yes, leave it the way it is. And if you want to cross this bridge next year, we can have that discussion. But I'm perfectly fine this year. Isn't this the first year we will be tapping into NVTa 30% funds?

[07:21:43] So it's not a continuation. This is a new funding. We are using a new funding source for OmniRide. Correct, and I'm perfectly fine using this funding source this year. All right, so I kind of want to go through all these.

[07:22:01] If we had to find a different funding source, you know, we're going to have to figure out which funding source or we're going to have to make the cut, but let's go ahead, Supervisor Bode. Yeah, so I was just going to say I warned about this and I don't think we should go down the road of cannibalizing NVTa funds, but I also don't want to have us have reduction in services for OmniRide, so I'm kind of stuck with this one.

[07:22:23] So I'm just going to go around, Supervisor Vega. What does this mean for our budget? It means, well, first of all, using NVTa funds, it means that we're going to have less funding, and Mr. Canizales, actually, I'll have you come up and explain.

[07:22:42] I think you will do a much better job than I can. Madam Chair, members of the board, Rick Canizales, your Director of Transportation. NVTa funds are classically used for capital projects. NVTa delivers three different taxes to us.

[07:23:00] They deliver NVTa 30%, Grand Tourist Tax, and TOT. Two of those funds have already been taken by the transit component. So the Grand Tourist Tax and the TOT Tax already go to OmniRide. Now we're dipping into the 30% fund, which is what classically gives you your funding matches for your grants, gives you your project funding, gives you the funding to not take out debt for transportation projects.

[07:23:28] And I've talked to this board before about this, where we're going down a slippery slope where we're using all our transportation funds that come into the county for transit, and we're leaving none for capital projects. Again, \$1.2 million of this year's budget is probably about 20-some million, \$23 million that we get a year.

[07:23:54] It's a small amount, but I know that the budget deficit for PRT or OmniRide next year is running about \$4 million. So we're going to dip into those funds. So, again, we're just, like the chairwoman said, we're sliding down a slippery slope where we are digging into our capital program, and we will have no monies left over for the capital program to be able to take from MBTA.

[07:24:14] So I know this is a popular discussion, but we need to have it. Are you still in the queue, or did you want to take something? Maybe I misheard, but I just want to make sure that if I misheard, then I'll

stand corrected. But does this help our budget?

[07:24:32] Yes or no? Does it impact it? How in terms of? If the board chose to remove the \$1.2 million use of NVTa 30% funds, it does not help the bottom line, the balances that we've been discussing all evening, because that NVTa 30% funds may only be used for mobility purposes. It's not fungible in the sense that it can be used to fund other aspects of the budget. Thank you for that. I'm a little crazy, but not that crazy.

[07:25:09] With that being said, you know, now that I've rejoined PRTC, and out of respect for our Chairman, Supervisor Angry. I'll go ahead and support that we leave it as is, but certainly want to continue to have conversations about it come next budget cycle. All right, let's go ahead and take a strong vote on this. I'm sorry, Supervisor Bailey. No, ma'am, we already cut

[07:25:46] VRE money from the 30% automatically, so that gets taken out of that fund already. This is an additional 1.2 for OmniRide that gets added to the budget, to the 30%. So if I may, just to recap, as Rick mentioned, NVTa 30% revenue, county gets about \$23 million annually. In the proposed budget, there's \$5.8 million of that NVTa 30% revenue to satisfy the

[07:26:18] county's local subsidy to vre now there's another 1.2 million that's proposed for omni ride combined of that 23 million 7 million is is being used up in the proposed budget for omni ride and the vre local subsidy all right folks ready i'll see phrasal croix i was just going to say that OmniRide is probably the most important thing that's going on in Woodbridge because the people

[07:26:56] that need it the most are using it all the time. And I would encourage everyone to support it because it's so vitally important in our underprivileged neighborhoods. All right, let's go ahead.

[07:27:14] Can I just ask for clarification? Is the question to use? nva to use to fund use nvta to fund omni ride so a yes is to continue or no to use to yeah to use it a no is to not use it thank you okay supervisor ingry yes supervisor bailey yes supervisor la croix yes supervisor stewart yes supervisor bode yes supervisor gordy i guess yes for now supervisor Dr. Vega?

[07:27:52] Yes. Chair Jefferson? I would prefer to find another funding source, but out of deference for the PRTC chair. This is another one of those conversations where we say we're going to do better.

[07:28:10] But let me just say this quickly. We always say we're going to do better, but we don't. We're not doing better. And so we always say every year that we're going to look for cost savings or we're going to do things, but we just don't. So before I get to you, go ahead and just say the vote tally.

[07:28:26] I'll just be a yes. Vote unanimous. Okay. Supervisor angry because I knew Bailey was in there. I had a question for Tom, so I can wait. Okay. Go ahead. Look, and I just want to be real clear because this isn't about me. It is about our bus transit system. And we have been saying for the last five years that we know the motor fuels tax is running low, and we have to find an alternate solution.

[07:28:49] We just went through \$500 million of gross revenue that came in. I believe next year we're going to have revenue that we can actually look at, a dedicated funding stream for OmniRide, PRTC, that we need to have a real conversation. We say that. So I'm not saying we're kicking the can on the road, but what we're doing is surviving our bus system because, true enough, to Supervisor LaCroix's point, people ride the bus, and they need this source of transportation.

[07:29:15] And when you start messing with routes, each of you will be getting emails about that. So the best we can do now is sustain what we have, but we really do need to have a conversation about a

dedicated funding stream for OmniRide. Supervisor Stewart?

[07:29:34] I tend to agree with Supervisor Angry. It's very, very important in the Gainesville District. It's the only link we have. I go once a week to greet riders, and the praises that they sing for it, it's amazing.

[07:29:53] and it we just we need i mean like food and water we need it here's my one concern i guess we need it and i love omni right that is my preferred transportation when i had to work in dc we keep having this conversation though we keep having just same with revenue sharing and other things we keep having this conversation and yes i am going to mention this i know that it might be kind of tiring to hear but if we're going to say all these things we keep having conversations on this is one we've talked about we've talked about it in finance and budget we've had this

[07:30:31] conversation you know nothing is changing but we are going to have to look if we're going to do a dedicated revenue stream then we have to commit to that we are going to absolutely have to commit to that and we haven't shown the willingness to do that so that is my one eighth is there anything else i know we've done a lot of cuts i know supervisor bailey wants to talk about additions i am reticent to have any additions but this is part of the process so do people have things that they and again real quickly again dave i'm sorry no you just gave it to us if you can give us where

[07:31:08] we are right now in this moment at 137 then we can talk about what we might want to add okay fiscal 27's balance is 17.3 million fiscal 28's balance is 1.3 million so we've done well all right we cut a lot is there anything that supervisor vega if i may chair i uh i do want to report out

[07:31:42] in fiscal 31 the fifth year there's a positive balance but only four hundred thousand dollars this is for say that again fiscal year 31 oh fiscal 31 that's the low point of the board's available balance at this point of four hundred thousand dollars i didn't want the board to think that you had 1.3 million dollars beginning in fy28 that was recurring that is not the case only 400k

[07:32:12] is recurring all right i'm looking at the recap document i know supervisor um bailey's talking about the revitalization fund of supervisor vega i'm sorry you're in the queue yep yeah um i made some recommendations to make sure that we had a little bit of breathing room for the request for the um animal shelter position again i will go with what the board majority decides but that's the only thing that i would like for us to consider in terms of additions how many positions

[07:32:46] is that it's just one just one for animal shelter one full time what is the cost i can find out but i agree with you madam chair in terms of adding additional spending i think that we've done a great job at getting ourselves back into the green for fy 27 and fy 28 and i just want to side and be cautious about adding more spending?

[07:33:10] Listen, my dear sweet waffles came from the animal shelter. She's the queen of the house, as all cats should be. My only concern, I think that is a great addition, is balancing out over the long term.

[07:33:26] And we're already really, FY31 is really already kind of shaky. So I know your supervisor, and we can everyone add what they want and then we'll talk about it. Supervisor Bailey, what would you like?

[07:33:42] Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to circle back to the redevelopment and assemblage program. I think that we need that across the county, not just in my district and Janie's district, but we need it across the county.

[07:34:02] And the reason why I'm harping on it, just to let my colleagues know, is because we just did, this is in my district specifically, I'm advocating for this because we just did an investigation where we were successful over where those bad hotels are in my district, and this will give me an opportunity to make it better for the citizens.

[07:34:24] And so that's just Potomac, but I know we need this across the county, so that's why I'm advocating for it. Madam Chair, can I ask Supervisor Bailey a question? Yes. That's not reoccurring, though. That would be a one-time? One time, yes. Okay, and I think that was your recommendation, Madam Chair, to not add, right?

[07:34:42] If we were going to add something, I was hoping it would just be one-time expenses. Okay, and this is one time. And how much did you want? Well, it's two points. The projection that I, and I'll, should I refer to you, county exec? Because on my budget, it's \$2.5 to \$5 million.

[07:35:00] That's the recommendation I got from Christina. So I don't want to give. So. A million. A million. Mr. So you may recall that when this came up as part of the budget recap presentation, we had a range, and that was because.

[07:35:17] So \$2.5 million one-time expense. Does anyone else have anything else that they want to add? I have the number for the.

[07:35:34] Okay, what's your number? So for the one position for the animal shelter, I know that they wanted three, but again, we're making adjustments. Folks are not getting everything that they want. The one position is \$75K. Okay, 75K, and what does that look like?

[07:35:50] Oh, what does that look like over? I'm not second-guessing, Supervisor Vegas. 75K just seems low, given salaries, benefits, taxes that county has to.

[07:36:13] And that was the adoption coordinator. What I see here is that the three total to 225K. On the budget recap, page 15, the three animal shelter were \$3.13.

[07:36:32] Yes, so that, yes, Supervisor Vega, you're correct. That is what was presented during public comment time. But after OMB staff worked with the police department, we don't believe those numbers included benefits, taxes, technology that has to be incorporated in those positions.

[07:36:54] So what is our estimate for the one position? 104. Okay. Again, you know, if we're okay with one, that's fine. But the majority speaks. And if the response is no, then it's no. So right now for additions, we have the one animal shelter full-time position at roughly 104.333, correct? How would that look five years out? I mean, I know it's back of the napkin math. It would be a recurring cost throughout the five years.

[07:37:32] that's that's a good solid annual cost and then redevelopment we have 2.5 for 1 million so let's go around I'm sorry and supervisor LaCroix if we have the money Dave and I'm relying on you because I'm getting a little foggy at this point in time of the night but I would like to raise that redevelopment up to five if we have the money because the blighted communities I mean I know she'll need all that 2.5, and there's some other to share.

[07:38:08] So if we have the money, I'd like to up it to the \$5 million. Madam Chair. Supervisor Bailey and then Gordy. Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and Supervisor LaCroix. I'm getting foggy, too.

[07:38:25] Thank you for it. That was the original ask, \$5 million, and we do have it in 27. So that was the original ask, so I appreciate that. All right, Supervisor Gordy. I'm sorry, I'm trying to look to see.

[07:38:43] Was there anything baked in the budget for the PDR program? There was nothing. That would have to be an addition. That was an item of board and community interest during the budget recap presentation.

[07:39:02] Oh, there it is. It's sitting here right in front of me. I lost it. Sorry. It's late, guys. Yeah, so for FY27, only \$1 million. So you said PDR program?

[07:39:20] Correct. \$1 million, one time. Anything else to add? Because Supervisor Vega? Yeah, I know that we have a range, right? And while I appreciate Supervisor LaCroix's ask to consider \$5 million, could we potentially, if there is a need, have revisit this at a later time?

[07:39:49] instead of doing the 5 mil, 2.5? Supervisor Bailey, did you? Yes, I just punched my thing. I would like to do the entire 5 million because this is something that will help us in terms of land use and how we are utilizing land use.

[07:40:14] It's not just for that particular problem, but across the county we can use it. Okay, so if we do the 5 million, the 1 million for PDR, And the 104, what does that do for our FY27 and FY28 numbers, Dave?

[07:40:31] So in FY27, we would have an available balance of \$11.2 million in fiscal 28, an available balance of \$1.2 million.

[07:40:56] All right, let's see what the majority does. All right, so we've got three things to discuss. Animal shelter, one position, one full-time redevelopment fund, one time \$5 million.

[07:41:12] in pdr one time one million dollars so um i have supervisor la croix and then i'm just going to go down to see where people are five million for redevelopment one million for pdr now one oh four three three three for animal shelter full-time i'm for all three wait hold on i guess you're all three hold on all right do you have anything else all right what you what you got we just you just

[07:41:47] did the directive on that right so we haven't came back with anything right so i'll put it down We can let people vote maternal. That's \$1 million. Madam Chair, I just think Supervisor Bailey, that's one that can wait.

[07:42:04] I do too, but will of the board. I think we should wait until we get the directive back so that we can see where we're at. Because, again, we're- You promise. Will of the board. I mean- Scout's honor. Okay, we can take that off then? I just want to, you know, because we- And that's why I brought it forward, because we did do the directive, and I was just trying to be proactive with it.

[07:42:26] All right. So let's go ahead. I'm going to, I don't know if this is too confusing. I can do it. If not, be with us, Madden. One, ask people, one full-time employee for animal shelter, redevelopment, PDR. So those are the three things. Animal shelter, full-time employee, redevelopment, \$5 million, one-time expense, PDR, \$1 million, one-time expense. So you got it?

[07:42:55] do you mind if i do you want me to do all three of them go yeah all three everyone and i think that that's hopefully it fingers crossed supervisor angry i'm good with all three uh supervisor bode yes i went to bode i'm sorry supervisor bode yes all three supervisor bailey me yes okay yes all three thank you good all three supervisor la croix yes all three

[07:43:30] supervisor vega yes to all three supervisor stewart yes to all three supervisor gordy yes to all three yes to all three you vote unanimous on all three all right folks it's late i was going to say people want to have it's early if additional time to say anything else but i think people are pretty dang tired unless someone's really dying let's go ahead and did you have something under you because you keep motioning because i was like yeah i was gonna say like do

[07:44:06] a motion to adjourn motion to adjourn manager before i second that i just want to say thank you yeah thank you thank you everyone thank you thank you to my colleagues and thank you to the county executive i would say more but i know we want to go home all right i second the motion to adjourn yes all right we're gonna go ahead and take the vote all right there we go did you have

[07:44:43] something just can i just get i'm sorry i'm really sorry okay there's 11.2 million dollars on the bottom line in fiscal 27 um leave it leave it on the bottom line is everyone comfortable leaving it we already have this one please lunara no no no okay no madam chair i think we should leave it just as a recommendation leave it on the bottom line because we do have some directives that we need to address at a later time okay that 11.2 million will not be budgeted

[07:45:20] not yet I and madam chair this could help us with our fund balances in terms of reserves as well I 100% I'm there I'm that's you know we can quit I mean we already have something a motion on the floor so that we voted on so leave it thank you thank you everyone



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com