

The King George County Board of Supervisors (KGCBS) Meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM by Chairman Richard Granger in the Robert H. Combs Board Room of the Revercomb Building, located at 10459 Courthouse Drive, King George County, Virginia 22485.

Members Present:

**Chairman Richard Granger
Vice Chairman T.C. Collins
Cathy Binder
Ann Cupka
Jeffery Stonehill**

County Administrator:

Christopher Miller

County Attorney:

Kelly Lackey

Staff Present:

**Chris Clarke, Director of Parks and Recreation
Cheyenne Courtney, Senior Administrative Assistant
Jaci Fish, Executive Assistant
Donna Hahn, Director of Finance
Derrick Mestler, Director of Human Resources
Nicholas Minor, Director of ED&T
Amy Southall, Communications & Community Engagement
Coordinator**

Call to Order:

0:00:03.2 Chairman Richard Granger: I call to order this meeting in the King George County Board of Supervisors. We will open with an invocation from Mr. Collins and the Pledge of Allegiance by Mr. Miller. Please rise.

Invocation:

0:00:14.8 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Please rise and bow your heads please in prayer. Dear Lord, we first ask for forgiveness for our sins. As we come forth here, this Board, please allow us to make the decisions that are worthy of you and worthy of our citizens. We ask this in your name, Amen.

Pledge of Allegiance:

0:00:41.2 ALL: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Amendments to the Agenda:

0:00:56.2 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you, Mr. Collins. Thank you Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller, do we have any amendments to the agenda?

0:01:02.1 Chris Miller: No, sir

Public Comment:

0:01:02.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. In that case, we will move on to public comment. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person in order to afford everyone an opportunity to speak. If comments relate to a specific public hearing item, we ask that you offer those comments at the time of the public hearing. And we do, again, have a number of public hearings this evening. When you do come up, please state your name, your address, and then please provide your comments. So, the floor is currently open.

0:01:33.1 Jonathan Farrells: Hello. Good evening. I am Jonathan Farrells. I live at 50006 Podcaster Drive. Thank you for taking the time to hear of me. So basically, the reason why I'm here today is, the other residents in King George County are waiting for All Point Broadband to bring FIOS. I've noticed that they were putting down, me and my neighbors noticed they've been putting down, stuff getting ready for the FIOS, and we also noticed that they actually have skipped our street. When we contacted All Points Broadband in reference to it, we were told because our section was built after 2020, that we would not be included in the fiber program and that we would have to wait until the fiber program ends, which I think is ridiculous because our subdivision is pretty much five houses. And we've been there for over a year now. And like I said, we've been waiting for FIOS. We have kids that go to King George. I have kids that go to King George Elementary and King George Middle School. They do a lot of online work. And this is something that I can't wait. I've been patient and to see them come to my neighborhood service, pretty much everyone around us to prep them and not prep us and to tell us that we're going to have to wait is unacceptable. We've even contacted the FCC and our information is in their data, on their website with the FCC. So, All Points used that as an excuse. Well, it's after 2020 and it's not with the FCC, but I can tell you our addresses do come up when you type them into the FCC database. So, any help that the county can give us, we would appreciate it. Thank you.

0:03:12.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Do we have anyone else for public comment?

0:03:18.1 Ana Maria Lovell: Hi, my name is Ana Maria Lovell. I live in Presidential Lakes. I want to thank all of you for your service. I was hoping that you would make good decisions for the county, but on the 5th of September, you approved the data center. I wish that you had waited a little longer so that we'll have a very idea what the downside of this project will be for the county. Two of you are not running for re-election, but you're still part of this county. Does anyone know what the results of dumping heating water back into the river will be? Mr. Stonehill, you live by the water where Maryland power plant by the bridge used to dump cooling water back into the river. Was there any effect on the river? A data center may use a great deal of electric power. Do we know how this will affect the price of electricity for us? Many people of King George worry about the taxes, the debt. Can you tell the people of King George how much debt really is? It does not seem like you are doing anything about this problem. This problem has been going for a long, long time.

0:04:45.6 Chairman Richard Granger: Mr. Dines, do we have anyone online?

0:05:00.2 Chris Dines: No. Mr. Chairman.

0:05:02.3 Chairman Richard Granger: Did anyone receive correspondence to be entered into the record? Okay, so public comment's just about over. I know we just had one more individual come in. So public comment's still open if there's a desire. Then I'm going to close public comment and move on to reports from Members of the Board. Ms. Binder.

Chairman Granger Closed the Floor for Public Comment.

Reports of Members of the Board:

0:05:32.0 Cathy Binder: Thank you very much. Thank you everybody for coming out and speaking. For the gentleman from All Points Broadband if you've been watching the meetings, I've been on All Points Broadband ever since we signed that. We were supposed to be first and now we're near the last in getting the service and they were supposed to be here today. But my understanding, Mr. Miller, they are not here today. Correct? All Points Broadband?

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

0:05:53.0 Chris Miller: They had requested either a virtual meeting for tonight or to be rescheduled to another night. And in consultation with the Chair, Mr. Granger, it was felt that they need to be in person.

0:06:06.3 Cathy Binder: I would agree with that, but I just wanted the citizens to know I'll be reaching out again. Sir, if you can email me your information, I'll find out. Because I don't have your specific. I'm the Shiloh representative so you can find my email address online. One problem, and it is a concern for me, was they were saying that to you 2020, if your house was built after 2020, because this grant is very specific. And the reason why it can't service everybody in the county is it's only supposed to serve the underserved. And there's some interesting definitions of what is underserved. I was underserved even though no one would come down my road without paying \$50,000 to come down for a line. So, the definition is kind of, I think, wrong of what's served and underserved and who can serve you. And it's kind of a little complicated, but I'll look into that if you just give me your email, because I've been having long conversations with All Points Broadband about, it's not exactly what we signed up for. Maybe there's better solution, but it's the only solution we have now. But I will tell you, if you check your address, Starlink has come into the county, which is Elon Musk's satellite service. And there are some areas that can get Starlink or T-Mobile. So, if anybody is out there, if you can't get All Points Broadband, those are two options. Now, Mr. Roberts is here from George Washington. Boy, sorry. Little off on my game today. I was at a basketball game before this. And so, I was waiting for the results, and I just got it. We had a meeting yesterday for FAMPO, the Fredericksburg Regional Transportation Authority was brought up where the, I forget the acronym for it, but basically it would create a transportation district that would be taxed. And there is talk in the legislature about this year, bringing that up again. It's been on the docket for the last two years. And unfortunately, it's probably going to come up again. So, we will be talking about that when we talk about the GWRC dues, I did ask just to drop that because I've asked for them to come sometime soon, maybe in December or January to give a little overview, especially to new Board members of what this could mean for King George. And the last thing I want to mention is, I know we approved the data center campus, not center last meeting. But one of the things I want to make sure we do before the end of the year in every meeting is to make sure we think of the citizens and not rush into spending money and make sure we have a plan and what our real needs are for this community, not just real needs and have a list. We need to come up with a plan because a lot of this money doesn't come until 2027. So, we want in that window to make sure that we have a good plan and that we're good stewards of the county's money. Thank you.

0:09:00.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you, Mrs. Binder. Mr. Collins.

0:09:04.8 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Good evening and thank you for coming. Jon, I'm sorry, I didn't get your last name. Are you on St. Moriah Church's Road?

0:09:14.9 Jonathan Farrells: I'm on Turkey Acres.

0:09:16.4 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Turkey Acres?

0:09:16.5 Jonathan Farrells: Yes.

0:09:17.8 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Okay. So, when they come down Igo Road, they stopped right at St. Moriah Church Road, whatever that is. And then they picked up on the other side of it. So, that lane is not going to be served. And so, I called them about Moriah Church Road, and they said, after I was on the phone for 90 minutes waiting, they finally said that they weren't going to serve that area. But I

didn't know anything about Turkey Acres. Does the line come down Lambs Creek Church?

0:09:54.2 Jonathan Farrells: Lambs Creek Church moved down to Turkey Acres and then [0:09:56.9 NO AUDIO]¹ Turkey Acres.

0:10:01.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Okay, I'm going to give another call and find out what the deal on that one is. Okay. Ms. Lovell, nice to see you again. When you speak of the price of electricity for data centers, yes, our price of electricity will increase because those things take a lot of electricity, and they have to run lines. And so, the people that pay, Dominion's going to be the one, then Dominion will raise the price for everybody to serve those centers. As far as your comment, Ms. Lovell, in regard to the data centers and the vote, my reasoning for my vote was not because of data centers in general, it was the money involved. So, we've seen, or you all haven't seen, but we've seen all these different incentives and all these other things that dilute this so much. And so, I was more inclined just to do the Birchwood and see how it went, instead of just giving a blanket, rezoning, and changing the comprehensive plan for the whole kit and caboodle without finding out if they're really going to do what they say. And a big company like Amazon, I don't know if they're going to do what they say. And I don't know what leverage we'll have as a small county. I'm concerned, I'm worried. I don't think the revenues are going to be anything close to their predictions. They're the ones that made the revenue projections. So of course, they're going to be as rosy as possible. Dawson Boyd, good to see you here. I've asked you to come 18 times and your father made you come tonight. Thank you, good to see you. Good to see our young people out. And Mr. Chairman, I'd like consensus to move in one of our closed session items in regard to the local incentive package for a major economic development project for discussion to be removed from the closed session and brought into a discussion item in the regular so that folks can hear what these incentives are. I don't think that fits into the closed meeting because if that is indeed Amazon that we're speaking of, is that Amazon we're speaking of?

0:12:44.7 Chairman Richard Granger: It would be to discuss a performance agreement in regard to what strategy we want to take. So, anytime you were to have a public discussion about that, then the people who you are negotiating with also get to hear what you're saying as well. And as you craft your plan. So, that's the motivation for moving into a closed session so they don't get an opportunity to hear it.

0:13:08.7 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Well, the citizens haven't had an opportunity to hear it and I would like to move that to an open meeting so they can hear it. Whether, from my understanding, our negotiating power is zero because we haven't negotiated nothing. So, I don't know what difference that would make in regard to that. So, is there a consensus to do that?

0:13:34.8 Chairman Richard Granger: I am not interpreter of that, but I'll let my colleagues speak as well.

0:13:37.4 Cathy Binder: My concern, I do have a concern about this because we haven't planned for it, but we should be socializing this in public. I mean I will tell you the other counties are negotiating a little harder than we did, and that has always concerned me that we're not pushing back.

0:13:55.9 Ann Cupka: Mr. Chair. I would hesitate to do so because it says the financial interest of the county would be affected and specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice pursuant

¹ During Mr. Farrells responsive public comment, Mr. Farrells was not speaking into the microphone.
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 September 19, 2023
 Meeting Minutes

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711.8. So just that first one matter. We will be receiving legal advice from our council. So, I would not be in favor of having it in the open until we get legal advice. Thank you.

0:14:28.2 Chairman Richard Granger: Mr. Stonehill?

0:14:32.6 Jeffrey Stonehill: No.

0:14:35.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Okay, so you all not interested in having that, the public to know what's going on in this county, so you can put anything you want into a closed session. Almost every single thing that we do, we can put into a closed session. And all that does is people talk about transparency. People that are running for office talk about transparency. But I can tell you that we are not being transparent. I'm telling you that for a fact because I'm up here and I know that. So, I would hope that maybe the public would stand up for these things and come forth in large numbers and stand up for this because transparency does not exist on this Board. Thank you.

0:15:19.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you, Mr. Collins. Mrs. Cupka.

0:15:22.2 Ann Cupka: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to thank everyone for joining us this evening. Sir, with regard to the broadband project, I do believe it is the case that if your neighborhood did not exist when this grant was submitted, they submitted locations, they submitted addresses in the service area. So, if yours was not, if your street was not there at that time, it didn't get submitted, so it likely would not qualify for grant funding. And this is a grant-funded project, so when they finish the grant-funded portion of the project, they may be able to offer you service at a later date, but I would also echo what Ms. Binder stated. I myself don't have service. And about a year and a half ago I signed up with T-Mobile Home Internet, and it's worked very well for me. We live in the woods and it's very affordable. So, I would suggest that you do look into that. Ms. Lovell, thank you as always for coming out and joining us and just have two brief items. On Saturday, September 16th, I attended the Ralph Bunche Alumni Association meeting. They and the advisory committee are hosting a fundraiser, dinner dance on Saturday, September 30th at 6:00 PM at the Citizen Center. You can contact a member if you'd like to purchase a ticket for \$30. All proceeds benefit the Ralph Bunche High School Museum Fund. And last night I attended the Department of Social Services Administrative Board meeting. Thank you Mr. Chair.

0:16:54.0 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you, Mrs. Cupka. Mr. Stonehill.

0:16:57.5 Jeffrey Stonehill: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thanks for everybody that's come up, Jon, I didn't get your last name, but again, it's unfortunate, All Point Broadband has been a great disappointment for a lot of people up here. But we are trying to do what we can. And I will again echo, I have one street over for me. I have friends over there. They have T-Mobile, internet service. They think it's wonderful. It's better than what we have at Breeze Line, so that could be an option for you. Ms. Lovell, thanks for coming out. Hopefully, the approval of what we did will, you know, keep the county going for the next 30, 40 years. It was a very good thing for us, or the as a county to move forward. You need to look down the road to the future, just not right here, close in front of you. So hopefully this will work out just fine. And that's all I have, sir.

0:18:02.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you, Mr. Stonehill. So, I'd like to say thank you to everyone who came out and provided a public comment. Mr. Farrells, if said your name wrong, right? If I was wrong, I apologize, I received your email. I did reply. We were supposed to have Mr. Innes here

tonight. He is obviously not going to be here, so I apologize for that. I'll let you know when he does show up. I have reached out as well. I've asked some questions about whether it'd be possible to have your community, or your road included. At this point, I have not received any correspondence back from them about it. I will ping him them again. It wasn't that I was ignoring you. I just haven't heard back from them yet. So, I'll continue to ask them, and I'll let you know. I can't promise anything, but I will advocate for you. Ms. Lovell, again, thank you for coming here. I always appreciate you coming here and, and providing your comments. I do think this project will be of great benefit to this community in the long run and be able to meet a lot of our needs coming down as we do look at some of those needs in regard to schools and fire and rescue to be able to fund those needs. So, I think this will be something that will help us to do that without putting that burden upon the taxpayers. So, looking to try to address those revenue needs, and especially when it's looking at the landfill and where it's going to be going. I know 19 years, it sounds like a long time, but it will be here real soon. So, trying to address it and provide new revenue streams and allow us to be really picky down the road with other developments that might want to come in so, but I do appreciate your comments, and I do hear what you have to say, so thank you. Other than that, I'd just like to say thank you to Mr. Minor who held the town hall this past Thursday. In regard to the incentive zones. I know he's going to give a short brief on it. And then we're, I think the plan would be to try to advertise for a public hearing, probably for the next meeting but I would just like to say thank you to him and all the citizens who came out to provide feedback and to hear what it was about. So, thank you to all those and that's all I have. So, we move on to approval of the minutes or the consent agenda.

Consent Agenda:

0:20:06.7 Ann Cupka: I move to approve the consent agenda as presented.

0:20:11.2 Jeffrey Stonehill: Second.

0:20:11.7 Chairman Richard Granger: We have a motion properly seconded. Do we have any discussion? All in favor say aye.

0:20:15.0 Cathy Binder: Aye.

0:20:15.2 Ann Cupka: Aye.

0:20:15.5 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

0:20:15.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Aye

Constitutional Officers Reports:

0:20:15.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. We'll move on to constitutional officer reports. I know we have Ms. Hart on the agenda, but she had notified us she would not be able to make it. So, she did provide some information in regard to the revenue for cigarette taxes. And so, I can read it off just so everyone can hear it as well. July 2023 to today, it's a total of \$492,960 in total revenue collected and total packs of cigarettes sold in the month of August is 348,019. So, if anyone has any questions for Ms. Hart, I'm sure we can send those to her by email or ask Staff to, but does anyone particularly like to have Staff reach out to Ms. Hart about?

0:21:00.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. In that case, I know we have Mr. Jones here as well, so we'll move on to Mr. Jones.

0:21:08.6 Mr. Randy Jones (KGC Treasurer): Good evening, Mr. Chairman and colleagues. With our office, we've quickly collected all the taxes for the first half. It's all in the well. Audit was just last week. So that was what was going on. And we're in the process of putting the second half bills out, so the turnaround's really quick. So probably within the next couple of weeks, constituents should be seeing their second half bills. So, I got two reports to give today. First July, the beginning balance for July was \$31,993,150.67. We received \$26,568,129.75, and we dispersed \$29,766,444.26, leaving an ending balance in the general fund of \$28,794,836.16. This figure has not been reconciled to the general ledger just because the audit, well, it has been reconciled to the general ledger, but it has not been closed by, finance, just because the end of the year FY23 hasn't been completed. Now in August, just as I said, the beginning balance now was the ending balance, \$28,794,836.16. County received \$46,042,731.31, dispersed \$34,356,158.44, leaving an ending balance of \$40,481,409.03, in the general fund. And again, this has been reconciled to the general ledger, but has not been closed by the finance yet.

0:23:08.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Really appreciate it. Thank you. Mr. Jones. Mr. Miller, could you make sure those figures get added to the minutes? And then did anyone have any questions for Mr. Jones? Mr. Jones, thank you so much for coming out and providing the information. I hope the audit's gone well. I see that we're supposed to have the Sheriff. Is he online by chance?

0:23:30.3 Sheriff Giles: I am online. Mr. Chairman.

0:23:31.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Awesome. Go for Sheriff Giles.

0:23:33.9 Sheriff Giles: Due to scheduling conflicts, we were not able to do an inspection for the cigarettes, but one is forthcoming here in the next couple weeks.

0:23:47.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you, Sheriff. Did anyone have any questions for the Sheriff while we have him? Okay. Sheriff, I appreciate you being here, and we'll look forward to seeing your brief the next time it comes around.

0:24:00.0 Sheriff Giles: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

0:24:02.3 Chairman Richard Granger: And in that case, we'll guess we'll move on to the County Attorney's report. Ms. Lackey.

County Attorney's Report, Ms. Kelly Lackey, County Attorney:

0:24:08.8 Kelly Lackey: Good evening. I'm reporting back on a discussion item that came up a few months ago, which was with regard to possible, ways to change the reassessment process, due to some lengthy agendas, Mr. Miller and I met with Judy Hart and Regina Puckett in July, but I'm just giving this report now due to the length of some recent agendas as well as the fact that we're not scheduled to have another reassessment just yet. So, we had some discussion about recommendations on the possible scope and composition of a reassessment advisory committee. This concept of a reassessment advisory committee is something that King William County did a few years back. They had a similar, had a lot of large concerns with a reassessment in a, in a given year. And so, they went ahead and established a reassessment advisory committee to get some feedback from some knowledgeable folks and some members of the citizens generally to inform that process. So based on the discussion that we had, we identified some county officers or employees, that we felt might be good candidates to be part of that prospective committee. So, the particular Staff members, that were identified as possible members that would have valuable contributions to that advisory committee would be the communications and community engagement coordinator and a real estate

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

specialist from the commissioner of revenue's office. And then we had some further discussion about qualifications or skills of citizen members that might make good candidates. And the areas of expertise that were discussed were possibly financial or banking experience, real estate or title agency related background and someone with an agricultural background. So that would give you possibly two officers or employees of the county and three citizens with those would kind of be the areas you might be looking for. You might remember from the prior discussion as in King William there was a recommendation that there not be Supervisor members of the Board because of the taxing authority of the Board as well as with possible disputes that might arise from the assessment process. Similarly, you wouldn't want to have a member of the Board of Equalization serving on the Advisory Committee, you'd want to make sure that you had folks doing different roles as part of the process. We also discussed possible duties of the Advisory Committee, stressing it would be advisory only, but potential tasks could include commenting on the draft procurement solicitation for the consulting assessor. Possibly also some level of participation with reviewing and evaluating perspective assessors. Perhaps not the full committee but maybe a designee from within the committee. Also, the Advisory Committee could be tasked with some level of quality control to look in at random to spot-check some of the work of the assessor while that work is in progress just to get a sampling of how that work is going along and also another possible component would be to comment on the actual drafting of public notices and information that's given with regard to the reassessment. Based on the current reassessment schedule, the procurement of a consulting assessor would likely occur next year in 2024. The work would be conducted in 2025 and the effective date of the next real estate assessment would be 2026. So, we're still well ahead of the game should you wish to consider a reassessment Advisory Committee, it was suggested that the committee members serve without pay. That they be appointed after an application or submittal process, and that the Commissioner of Revenue have the opportunity to review and comment on the candidate pool. And then as an alternative possibly to the Reassessment Advisory Committee there was a presentation made to the Orange County Board of Supervisors in May about their reassessment process. I am not familiar with the specific issues that they had with their prior assessments, but they've decided to bring the process in-house. They are projecting to hire between two to four individuals to have an in-house assessor and to move to a two-year reassessment cycle. There are obviously costs associated with that so that's something you could look at possibly should you wish to during your budget cycle if you thought there might be a cost benefit to bring that work in-house and also having a more accelerated reassessment cycle so that people might not be quite as surprised with how values change with a longer cycle. So that's the information that I have for you this evening with regard to the possibilities for a Reassessment Advisory Committee.

0:29:23.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you, Ms. Lackey. I would appreciate the diligence and the thoroughness of the report, if we want to move forward with one of those options, what would be the way forward like for instance if we want to move forward with the committee, what will need to be done in order to step in that direction?

0:29:39.0 Kelly Lackey: So, I could do some drafting, I could also work with Mr. Miller and Ms. Fish on some drafting of applications so if you wanted you could form the committee and then make the appointments to the committee or if you wanted to kind of get an idea of who might be interested before you decided if you wanted to establish the committee you could do it that way as well.

0:30:00.0 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. Does anyone else have any other questions? Go ahead, Mr. Collins?

0:30:04.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Ms. Lackey so the Board of Equalization they can do spots

checks on the assessments legally but how would an advisory panel, would they be able to legally do spot checks?

0:30:23.4 Kelly Lackey: So, there is certain information that's publicly available. Certainly, if it's a revenue generating property like a commercial property, there's probably information that would not be available. But I believe a lot of the complaints that were received by this Board were from residential homeowners and a lot of their information is public information.

0:30:44.4 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So, they wouldn't do anything with commercial or industrial?

0:30:50.1 Kelly Lackey: Probably not unless we had any parties that were willing to share that information but as you mentioned they also have recourse of course to the Board of Equalization, but this would be a way to try and catch errors before the assessments are established.

0:31:14.3 Cathy Binder: I just have a question another County Attorney question so if anybody has any more questions on this topic go first.

0:31:21.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Ms. Binder. Okay.

0:31:27.5 Ann Cupka: Not a question I just would like to see this move forward sooner rather than later.

0:31:33.7 Chairman Richard Granger: So are people amenable with having a draft put together by Ms. Lackey and Mr. Miller to present to the Board. Okay.

0:31:46.0 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: A draft of what are we talking about?

0:31:49.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Codifying to have a committee.

0:31:51.1 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: A draft of what their duties and responsibilities are.

0:31:54.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Of putting it in place, yes.

0:31:58.8 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Not the appointments yet?

0:32:00.0 Chairman Richard Granger: No not yet.

0:32:00.3 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Okay.

0:32:03.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Anyone else have anything about this topic? Oh, okay. Go ahead, Ms. Binder.

0:32:08.4 Cathy Binder: Yes. I just want to clarify because I was reached out to by a citizen. Again, I know we've had a lot in over the summer could you just give us an update on hunting dogs.

0:32:18.6 Kelly Lackey: Yes. So recently, the Virginia Court of Appeals heard a case that had come out of Henrico. That case was a challenge to the statutory right to retrieve hunting dogs from private property. The challenge was that that was a taking of private property, but the Court of Appeals had dismissed that case. So the current status, to my knowledge, is that case is not moving forward unless it's been appealed to the Virginia Supreme Court. But that does limit the recourse to the particular

citizen who is asking the question if the County could adopt a local ordinance. So, no, we cannot adopt anything contrary to state law. And at this point in time, the state law has been upheld.

0:33:01.1 Cathy Binder: Thank you Jess just for that clarification.

0:33:03.6 Ann Cupka: Mr. Chair, may I ask a question? Ma'am, we, earlier in the year, maybe the end of 2022, requested a review of the noise ordinance, and this is separate from the community standards that are part of the zoning ordinance revision that is ongoing right now with the Planning Commission. And if I remember correctly, you formed a working group. Can you give us an update on what the status is of the noise ordinance update, the formal noise ordinance in the administrative code that the Sheriff's office has the authority to enforce?

0:33:43.4 Kelly Lackey: So, I worked at looking at possible changes. And so, you all received a confidential draft of proposed changes, but no, those have not yet been vetted through the Sheriff's department, if that's something that the Board wished me to do.

0:34:00.7 Ann Cupka: Can I ask for consensus of the Board to do so, please? Thank you very much.

0:34:08.3 Chairman Richard Granger: All right. Thank you Ms. Lackey. We'll move on to Mr. Chip Boyles with the GWRC.

GWRC, FY25 Dues, Mr. Chip Boyles:

0:34:24.1 Chip Boyles: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Supervisors, Mr. Miller, I appreciate you having me tonight. Again, I'm Chip Boyles, the Executive Director for the George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC), and I have with me tonight, Kate Gibson, the Deputy Director at GWRC. We've been asked our Board Members, of which your two representatives are Ms. Cupka and Ms. Binder along with the other four jurisdictions that to present to all of the jurisdictions a proposed per capita rate increase that we are recommending for the fiscal year 25(FY25) budget. It seems like we just got through fiscal year 24 (FY24), but anyway, we're already working on FY25, and this year is a little bit unique. I will walk through a few slides, but there's opportunities for additional grant monies that we no longer have the match available to use to pursue those grants. We haven't raised our per capita rates to our local governments since 2009. So, it's been a number of years. We do see increases as the population goes up, but what we're finding as the grant money is available to our region is outpacing those population increases. So, we have slowly kind of spent our way out of having available match money. We receive funding from our local jurisdictions, of course, our member governments or King George County, Caroline County, Stafford, Spotsylvania, and City of Fredericksburg. And by charter and by state law, we receive direct funding from our local governments based on your population. That population changes every year with the Weldon Cooper at University of Virginia, their annual estimates. See if I can stay on track here. As I said, GWRC uses your per capita rates to match the grants that we receive for the region. Every PDC (Planning District Commissions) of which there are 21 across the Commonwealth, they use their match funds and their per capita funds a little bit differently. Some do it to fund specific projects. It's been GWRC's practice for many years to use ours to match additional funds coming from state or federal agencies. If you look at fiscal year 24, we received just over \$250,000 in local funds that generated almost 1.4 million dollars in state and federal grants for those direct match grants. If you look at the grant programs that we administer like the Go Virginia program, which we've been very active with King George County, we receive \$307,000 match money, but generate nearly \$8 million worth of grants through those programs. So, a 26 to one return on investment there. The match money to go after these grants is very important. Twofold, one just for availability, but the second with the per capita funding from our local

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

governments, it allows us to make the commitments at the time the grants become available, rather than the time it would take to go to every local government and get on the agendas and get the match money approved. And then the third thing that happens there is if it's a regional grant, and four jurisdictions approve it and one doesn't, then how do we move it forward when it can't be subdivided among the jurisdictions? So, these are the numbers. This is the impact that these grants have on our region and why it's so important to us to have those available match funds. We've recently received notice, and really why we're here at the last minute before you and we're not asking for a decision, what we are asking you is to just give direction to Ms. Binder and Ms. Cupka, because they will be asked to vote on this rate increase at the GWRC level. It comes back to you when you're considering your FY25 budget. So, it'll be the new Board of Supervisors that'll be considering your approval of our budget. At this point, we have to know what we can ask for by October 23rd. But the importance that we have, and the urgency is VDOT is just telling us now what some of the new grants available to our region will be for FY25. And it's a substantial increase. So much so that if we get the grant increases without the match increases, we won't have enough money to take advantage of the full grants. That's the concerns for us and what we're going to be proposing, I'll show you in just a second, we feel we'll be able to cover those matches and in a fairly equitable and cost-efficient manner, especially for King George County and Caroline County, our two most rural counties. So, jump ahead. This is just to show you this is what our rate increase or our rates have been since 2008. We proposed an increase in 2009, but that was when the nation was in an economic crisis, and we withdrew that request. And so, we've been constant since 2009 at a 64-cent rate, up until FY24. What we're proposing for FY25 is a 15% increase to roughly 74 cents per person. This shows what at that 64-cent rate, our local contributions have been for all five jurisdictions. So, and those increases have been based solely on population increases, not rate increases. What you'll notice is even with a 15% increase to the per capita, the local contributions will not increase from FY24 to FY25. We're doing that by eliminating one of the funding requests that we have submitted to you previously, which was to help the GWRC get into a better financial position and create a reserve or a savings account. We feel like we're in a good enough position right now. We don't need to ask you to keep funding that account. What we'll rely on is good stewardship of your money and any savings at the end of a fiscal year, we can then use that into the reserve account. And if there aren't any savings, then we just continue moving forward as we always have. As you can see from this for King George what this 15% increase would equate to is a \$6 increase in your funding between FY24 and FY25. So, we feel it's pretty fair. The jurisdictions that would see the real increases would be Spotsylvania and Stafford because of their population differences. As I said, the recommendation that our Staff will be making to our Board is to increase our rate from 64 cents to 74 cents. It gives us the chance to increase our match availability. It also allows us to eliminate that fund balance request that we've been making of each of you, and I will say one of the things for me is that it creates more equity. We have years that you all have funded the fund balance, but not everybody else has and by the time the budgets are passed, there's no real way to go back and try to equal that out among the jurisdictions. So, we've just lived with it. We would no longer have that equity problem. Everybody would be paying through the per capita rate. So, I think I've covered most of this already. One of the questions we hear from our members all the time is, well, if our rate is going to be 74 cents, what are the other PDC rates? So, we looked at some of the peers that are close to us in size. I can tell you planning district commissions there are, they're more varied than the local governments are. You were talking about your cigarette tax earlier tonight. The Thomas Jefferson Planning District in Charlottesville runs a regional cigarette tax program. Our annual budget is about \$8 million a year. Their annual budget is \$40 to \$50 million a year. So, everyone's different. The Lynchburg PDC runs a regional landfill. So, everyone is different, which makes our per capita rates different. But you can see even with that, we're one of the lowest ones for PDCs that are near our size. What you will find is the smaller the PDC, usually the higher the per capita rate because they don't have the population within their region. Next, we just ask you to talk to

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Cupka and Ms. Binder if you have any thoughts, we'll be asking them at Monday Night's commission meeting for the approval to be able to submit this rate to you on October 23, 2023, to be considered in your FY25 budget. And I'll be glad to answer questions tonight or come back anytime you'd like. And as Ms. Binder said, we'll be back in December or so when the new Board is in place just to introduce what we do more with GWRC and some of the ongoing programs. But I'll be glad to answer any questions tonight or Cate can certainly answer some if I can't.

0:45:24.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you Mr. Boyles.

0:45:25.9 Chip Boyles: Thank you.

0:45:26.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Anyone have any questions for Mr. Boyles? I'll start with Mr. Stonehill.

0:45:31.8 Jeffrey Stonehill: Thank you, Mr. Boyles, for coming out. Could you just briefly, we all up here know what GWRC is, could you briefly tell the public, we also have some supervisor candidates in the audience as well, just to give them a quick little nutshell about what GWRC does.

0:45:54.5 Chip Boyles: Certainly, and thanks for that opportunity and I'll try my best to make it as quick as possible. The George Washington Regional Commission is one of 21 regional planning commissions in the Commonwealth of Virginia. This is a national effort begun in the late '60s, early '70s to, really it was all PDCs were created to force local governments to begin to plan to use federal money. What I try to explain to people in the simplest of terms is that if King George and Caroline County were not talking to each other about a road improvement project, one of you may be building a road here and the other one here, and they wouldn't touch when you completed them. That's oversimplifying it, but that's still the concept of why PDCs are in place. They were also created to, especially for rural jurisdictions that may not have the resources to have planning Staff, planning equipment, back in those days, it was even having computers, GIS types of services, and so that a regional entity could provide those services for five, six, 12 jurisdictions, rather than each one trying to do it themselves. Today, we provide both those individual services to local governments, but predominantly it's more regional and almost every PDC in Virginia, one of their biggest services is in transportation planning. For us, we help King George and Caroline with smart scale applications for transportation improvements. We work with safety transportation improvements and regional transit improvements. We also work with Mr. Minor very closely. We house the Go Virginia program for our region, so we provide the administration for all of the economic development grants there. Housing and homelessness, we provide planning services. We do a lot of facilitation and cooperative efforts, and we really don't implement hardly anything. We have no powers to pass ordinances, condemn property, pass taxes. We rely on our local government, and it's our Board. Our Board is made up of 10 elected officials, two from each of the five jurisdictions. They give the Staff the direction of what's important, and so we follow that lead, and if they tell us to look for broadband grants or environmental types of grants or transportation, that's what we go after, so we let our Board kind of direct us. I hope that gives it. I could go on for a long time. We do a lot of different areas.

0:48:56.0 Jeffrey Stonehill: Okay, great. You were talking about grants and money and all that kind of stuff, so I just wanted to make sure that that little brief description got out, but thank you, and thank you for the presentation.

0:49:07.2 Chairman Richard Granger: Ms. Cupka, you said you had a question?

0:49:09.1 Ann Cupka: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, Mr. Boyles, thank you very much for coming out this evening and sharing this with us. So even though the per capita contribution would increase from about \$0.64 to \$0.74, the bottom line for our community, our contribution when we added the FY24 per capita contributions and the FY24 other contributions, the total was \$20,454, and now you're asking, you will be asking for FY25, \$20,460.

0:49:48.0 Chip Boyles: Yes, ma'am.

0:49:48.4 Ann Cupka: So, the bottom line is \$6.

0:49:49.9 Chip Boyles: Yes, ma'am.

0:49:52.5 Ann Cupka: Period, not \$6 per person, just so everybody understands.

0:49:54.3 Chip Boyles: \$6.

0:49:54.7 Ann Cupka: Flat \$6.

0:49:56.3 Chip Boyles: Yes, ma'am.

0:49:58.1 Ann Cupka: Thank you very much.

0:50:01.0 Chairman Richard Granger: Ms. Binder.

0:50:02.1 Cathy Binder: Thank you very much for coming and explaining. I thought it was very important. We mentioned this last night, especially since we'll have quite a few new members on the Board so that people understand what GWRC does, but brought up last night at the FAMPO meeting, the VDOT and the costs for transportation improvements, that is one reason why these matching funds are needed because in the future, we might be asked to contribute more to these grants and for the public that doesn't understand is smart scale road improvements, this is where a lot of the money comes from and the ability, we don't have a transportation planner, we're just a small locality, other people do, we don't, so we use GWRC to help us apply for these grants. Could you explain what I was attempting to explain about the Regional Transportation Authority?

0:50:48.9 Chip Boyles: I'll be glad to. If I can back up just because I want to be with both the Board of Supervisors and the public, the per capita rate, you're exactly right, is \$6. One of the additional services we provide is that we are the facilitator for other agencies and the fiscal agent. So, for instance, the Rivanna River Basin Commission is a separate commission that operates through the GWRC. We make requests on their behalf. We make requests for the continuum of care homelessness. That's not the GWRCs request. This is another body. So, while you may see more than the \$6, it's not the GWRC asking for it. I just wanted to make sure that, especially for the Staff, when they see something come in, it may be one of those other entities if that makes.

0:51:46.0 Ann Cupka: So, you just said, though, the per capita rate is \$6. You meant the flat increase is \$6, not the per capita?

0:51:53.9 Chip Boyles: The total per capita.

0:51:54.0 Ann Cupka: Right.

0:51:54.1 Chip Boyles: Not the rate, the total per capita contribution, \$6.

0:51:58.2 Ann Cupka: Thank you.

0:51:58.7 Chip Boyles: Yes, \$6. What Ms. Binder is discussing, is that one of the things that's been smart scale, in my opinion, I've been working with it in Virginia, just a different location, since it's been, in effect, has been a very good move for VDOT, making the funding of transportation improvements a lot more equitable and probably a little bit less politically driven. But what does happen is it's competitive. And so, for a road project in King George, you're competing on a scoring basis with projects within our region as well as if it's a big project throughout the entire Commonwealth. And one of the largest scoring points is how much match you can contribute to a project. If the state has to fund 100% of a big project, you are not going to score well. And a lot more times than not, you will not get that funding. So, having a mechanism in place that you can provide a match to the smart scale projects is really important. Spotsylvania County approved a bond referendum, if I'm not mistaken, or some type of taxing mechanism recently that is designated strictly for transportation improvements so that they can match these smart scale applications. Northern Virginia, Hampton Roads, and Richmond, they all have regional transportation authorities with their own taxing structure that they can take those local dollars and match smart scale and get huge, they'll score very, well on return on investment for the smart scale projects. We don't have that in our region. And so what the FAMPO Board asked to, and also because FAMPO was, is by statute City of Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania, and, Stafford County was to include Caroline and King George and look at a regional transportation authority with its own taxing authority so that funds could be generated and saved and utilized to match larger projects or to have money available for smaller projects and not even have to try to go to Smart Scale to get the additional funding, fund a smaller scale project a hundred percent through that authority. This legislation has been presented to the General Assembly over the last several years. This past year it was one vote in the Senate. From moving forward, we anticipate that it'll go forward again, and it's gone forward without any conversation of the George Washington region or the FAMPO region. Unless some of you tell us you were aware of it, we're not aware of any elected official in our region that knew that legislation was being presented. FAMPO Board last night asked us as a Staff to look at it and try to head that off this year and develop our own concept and what would we think the ideal regional transportation authority look like so that if the General Assembly gets another bill, we have something to say, wait a minute, here's one we've already worked on, and so that's what Staff's moving forward with now is putting that together. Does that tell enough? It's very complicated. General Assembly has to pass, that's the only place it can be passed to create this authority. But right now, we are, as Mr. Ollis (Director of Transportation Planning/FAMPO Administrator) said last night at FAMPO, we're the donut hole. Northern Virginia has one and Richmond has one. And the only thing in between those two transportation authorities is our region. And so, with I 95, that corridor with the corridor running through King George would make a very logical place if the money panned out and it could afford to generate the revenue that would be needed.

0:56:34.5 Cathy Binder: I appreciate you explaining that. Because I wanted the Board in, we do have candidates in the audience because people need to know is we didn't have a say in this legislation being, and if I remember right, Mr. Pike correct?

0:56:45.3 Chip Boyles: Mr. McPike.

0:56:46.0 Cathy Binder: Mr. McPike did it. And he's not even, I think he represents a little bit of

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

Stafford. Correct. And so, they're making these decisions on our behalf, and we didn't even know. So, it is good because it could pass this time.

0:56:58.2 Chip Boyles: It could. And I don't want to say there were some very good elements and our opinion in it, it was not that it was just a terrible piece of legislation, but it didn't fully fit our needs and it just didn't have any of our input at all, good or bad.

0:57:18.9 Ann Cupka: Mr. Chairman. So just to clarify something that you said, we did know this was happening in the General Assembly both years. We were not consulted.

0:57:30.3 Chip Boyles: Okay.

0:57:31.1 Ann Cupka: We were not consulted by either, Delegate Cole a couple years ago from Stafford County who tried to do so in 2020 and Senator McPike who tried to do so last year, we were never consulted about this. It's, to my knowledge, none of the elected officials that are members of GWRC or FAMPO were, but we did track it and we did. The last two years our locality sent a letter in opposition to the General Assembly, but this is not something that we asked them to do for us. And these are people who frankly don't, at least this body here, this community doesn't represent us. So yes, in that regard, you are absolutely correct. Thank you.

0:58:22.3 Chairman Richard Granger: Alright. Appreciate it. Thank you, sir.

0:58:24.2 Chip Boyles: Thank you. Thank you again.

0:58:26.0 Chairman Richard Granger: I believe we have Mr. Chris Clarke to give us an after action on the independence celebration.

After Action on the Independence Celebration and 2024 Discussion, Mr. Chris Clarke, Director of Parks and Recreation:

0:58:44.6 Chris Clarke: They all look the same numbers. Well, good evening, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. Tonight, a rise over two purposes, to discuss the independent celebration. First is to provide the necessary after-action report since it was a TAC funded item. And the second is to start discussion of the 2024 event and seek authorization to submit an RFP so we can secure a fireworks vendor. This year we are at Sealston Sports Complex, again, on Saturday, July 8th, the event ran from 7:00 PM to 10:00 PM. We had over 650 cars on site by estimate. Estimating 3.6 spectators per car gave us a total of somewhere over 2300 people on site. We also learned from the King George Sheriff's Office that Sealston Deli's parking lot was completely full, including the King George Truck and Tire. And there were also cars at Sealston Automotive, the Napa service center. So probably, who knows, could have been almost a thousand cars. So, one of the reasons we got the count of 650 is we marked the grass this year using our painting robot. So, it allows us to have actual spaces, 10-foot spaces, 10 feet by 19 spaces. So, we didn't have to put Staff on the field this year to park cars because it was labeled where to go, just like a parking lot. And we in the end, we not only did we use every space that we marked, but we ended up putting cars on the Sealston left baseball field, which would be on that front side, the Fletcher's Chapel side of the school. I learned that when one of the Staff members came back to the car at the end of the night and he had bases in it and I said, why do you have bases? And he says, because we've had cars on the baseball field. And I'm like, okay, that means it really were a lot of people here. So very good event for us. Our entertainment this year was Glenn Shelton, who is a... He's from Appomattox County. He has hit many, many fairs and festivals and was very well received. American Fireworks Company did an outstanding job as usual. We had a face painter, Bubble and

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

Glow choice for sale and Jazz in the Country was there promoting their event. Marketing wise, we did seven pre-event Facebook posts between my department and community engagement. We had the event listed on Facebook and as an event on Facebook and on Eventbrite, Ms. Southall did a Twitter post for us in advance. And then after the event between the two of us, there were 10 post-event social media posts. And then we, Parks and Recreation started a new newsletter called Gateway to Play. And actually, July was our first issue and that went out the week of the event and included information on it. So, our total pre-event reach was almost 49,000 and post-event almost 4000. This year we were budgeted \$40,000 from the tourism fund. We spent \$31,011.93 from that fund and \$250.48 from the recreation activity fund. Rather than try to code over park, park rec aids that worked the event and the small \$61 that we bought to have drinks, Gatorades Waters for the band and the Staff that were working. Just those were easier just to put through my account. But the rest of it did come through tourism, but our total cost to the event was \$31,262.41. We collected \$475 in revenue. We don't charge a lot. We charge \$100 right now for the food vendors and \$25 for the other vendors by definition. Because it's only a two-hour event, it's hard to go any higher than that I would think, and not drive off vendors, although they all do very well. So, the net cost to the county was \$30,787.41. Dividing that by the 2340 spectators, which is probably a minimum number, costs \$13.5 to go to a movie in Fredericksburg. It's either \$14 or \$15 depending on which side of route three you go to. So pretty good bang for our buck I think. But obviously there are still also places to improve. Our event partners, the King George VFW, Sergeant Nicholas Mason Post 12202 served as they opened the concession stand and did small items. And then county departments and offices, obviously the sheriff's office, fire rescue and emergency services, community development as we get, have to get our, excuse me, the stage approved. Rick actually came out on Saturday morning to inspect the stage. Obviously Ms. Southall and community engagement were a huge help this year, especially as the afternoon looked rainy when I was at the event. And our Staff was at the event working on setup. She was on social media answering all the questions and appeasing everybody that yes, we are still on a scheduled and it doesn't look like it's going to be raining after 7:00 PM. So that was a huge help. Economic Development Tourism is always there to support us. Finance obviously. A couple of the things we pay on site, so we have to get checks cut early and the County Attorney's office for reviewing all of our contracts. Our room to improve looking next year. First of all, the map there, Ms. Southall did that for us and we sent that out both in the newsletter and on a Twitter and Facebook post. And I think was very informative for the public. I'm not sure which program she did that in, but it's not a skill I had. I draw screenshots from GIS. So, the fact that she did that for us was huge. It was a very big help. Going forward into 2024, we are currently seeking that part-time event coordinator that was approved in the budget. If we stay at Sealston, we are going to have to figure out increased parking capacity and where else we can put cars. And in that possibly adding shuttles. It is a long walk if you're all the way out there at Fletcher's Chapel Road on that front soccer field. And whether we try to partner up with some folks or rent two little golf carts or something. Because our vehicle is only two seats so we can get the disabled grandmother, but we can't get the rest of the family who's also very far away and just try to figure out a way to do that better. Obviously, we need additional food vendors. The reaction from everybody is, you know, one of the points was there wasn't enough food and they sold out. Well good for the food vendors. They sold out. They were very happy. Actually, one of the vendors that we acquired wrote me Friday afternoon. He signed his contract Friday night, and I took his payment Friday night. He showed up, he finished after two hours and came up to me and said, I want to be at this event every year. And he had had an event that actually had went canceled on Friday for Saturday. That's why he was available to us. Obviously with kids we need additional craft or entertainment things going on as well. And that's hope. That's the two of the big things that the event coordinator's going to be able to work on for us. And then also sponsorships to try to offset more of the cost so that it is not as much of a burden on the county stores and funds. So, for 2024, we have been looking at some options. We met NSF-Dahlgren, Ms. Hayes, and other folks from her office. They

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

would prefer us if we were to work with them to use July 13th. We were hoping that because we've been the Saturday after the fourth for the last three years, that to be July 6th. So that would be a discussion if we were to do it at Dahlgren. One of the items that they discussed though, is it wouldn't be like it was in 2012 and prior, they would want to hold the entire event on the runway. So, there would not be as many activities there. It would be, there'd be a lot to work out and it wouldn't be the old way if you'd lived here forever and know you started on the parade grounds and there was a concert and then you walked over to their softball field and watched the fireworks. So, it would be very different in that way. There are still the security issues as well. And a lot of that is, I think is partially why they want to push to the 13th is they have Staff working overtime with their own July 4th event, and then would have another event right behind it. Because they do a middle of the day event, not a fireworks event. Another option that we started to talk about was possibly partnering with the Gateway Shopping Center and either launching the fireworks from the base or some other property that the county owns in that region. Mr. Minor and I, have just kind of scratched the surface on that and it would be very different, would put us in an area where we would see some, hopefully see some business aspects on the tourism side, which we don't get up at Sealston because we are in the agricultural section of the county. Or the third option would be to go back to Sealston and do the event there. So, for tonight, I'm looking, really looking for the RFP approval. So, we can go out and start the RFP process because the sooner we get on it, the more likely we are to be able to secure a quality vendor. And fireworks technicians are in high demand. Over the last two years, there have been major localities in our region who have moved their events to other days or had to cancel them all in their entirety. And then we would seek the \$40,000 in tourism funding overall in the budget request for next year.

1:07:50.3 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you. Mr. Clarke, I'm going to ask, so it was approved by the tourism fund \$40,000 and you spent about \$30,000. Can I assume that the other funds were sent back to the tourism fund balance?

1:08:03.2 Chris Clarke: Yes. So, as it, what's different than when like a Jazz in the Country or different or aspects here where we cut, I think, way I understand that kind of cuts them a check for the full amount and they spend it. I actually bill directly to the account numbers.

1:08:15.2 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. So, you were billing straight to the fund balance?

1:08:18.0 Chris Clarke: Yes, I never saw \$40,000. I just submit every check to finance, and they cut it from that account.

1:08:22.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. Mr. Collins?

1:08:25.1 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Yes sir. Mr. Clarke, how much, sales tax was, generated from the vendors and food folks?

1:08:34.6 Chris Clarke: I do not have that number. That would be with the Commissioner of Revenue.

1:08:37.9 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Could you come up, could you find out what that number is?

1:08:40.3 Chris Clarke: Yes, sir. I'll do that and I'll send it to Mr. Miller, and he can forward it to you.

1:08:45.9 Cathy Binder: I do agree with you, especially with the food trucks. I heard maybe one complaint about the amount of costs for fireworks, but everyone I've spoken to loves the event. They

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

just wish we had more food vendors, because there were long lines and it's a great event. I think it makes a lot of people happy in the county and sometimes you need to make people happy, you know what I mean? And it is a beautiful show, but getting some more vendors and, maybe, taking some burden off of the tourism fund would be a good step.

1:09:16.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Any other questions? So, you're also asking for appropriation, but you haven't submitted a TAC application.

1:09:27.7 Chris Clarke: So, I did make this exact same report to TAC, and they did have consensus that we were good to go on their end.

1:09:35.3 Chairman Richard Granger: And I'll just ask Mr. Miller, as, Staff in agreement with that request from, and the recommendation from the TAC.

1:09:48.4 Chris Clarke: Put you on the spot early.

1:09:50.7 Nick Minor: So how you doing chairman? So, I can't remember exactly did they approved, was it \$30,000 from the TAC fund?

1:10:00.0 Chris Clarke: They bounced it around and all they were talking about possibly increasing the show. When we did the 300th Anniversary show, we did a \$30,000 show that was nearly 30 minutes long and I was bored by the end. So, I can only imagine where the five- and six-year-old boys were. So, it was just, it actually to say a firework show could be too long. That was really what it was, it became too long. So, if we stay at the \$25,000 number, I feel very comfortable.

1:10:26.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. So, you're not asking for the full fund at the moment. You're asking for enough from the Tourism fund balance to move forward with the RFP for the show at least?

1:10:37.7 Chris Clarke: Yes.

1:10:38.0 Chairman Richard Granger: And whether that will be at Sealston or at the Gateway Shopping Center or at Dahlgren, that would be the show that would go at one of those locations.

1:10:47.3 Chris Clarke: Correct. Yes, so we just need to be getting on that process, so we have a vendor in hand, and we don't end up with somebody who maybe isn't as qualified.

1:10:57.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Understood. Mr. Collins, do you have another question?

1:11:00.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So, it's \$30,000 from the tourism fund, \$25,000, \$55,000 total?

1:11:07.8 Chris Clarke: No sir. They're, one budget.

1:11:10.8 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: But what's the total, \$40,000?

1:11:15.3 Chairman Richard Granger: That's his request, \$25,000 of it is for the actual firework show, which is what Mr. Clarke is asking for tonight. In order to move forward with the RFP process to secure the firework vendor, he would then come back, and we could, the Board can decide on the rest of the expenses and whether to take that from the tourism fund or how to move forward with that

activity. But his request right now is just to move forward with the RFP, which was \$25,000. It's request from the tourism fund balance.

1:11:44.3 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So, \$25,000. How much did a fireworks vendor cost last year?

1:11:48.0 Chris Clarke: They've been \$25,000 since you shop it kind of you tell them and your amount and then they give you their best show package. They send you a bid with the best thing they can give, and we have to come up with a way to measure those based on how many five-inch shells or four-inch shells, three-inch shells kind of thing. And what's the best bang for your buck? It's different than how you purchase most things.

1:12:09.8 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So, I would, be inclined to keep it at Sealston, not down in Gateway. Seems to be too, confusing down there. It's kind of a one-stop shop Sealston. That would be my suggestion and wish.

1:12:28.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. How does everyone else feel about the RFP request though for the \$25,000 from the tourism fund?

1:12:40.5 Ann Cupka: So, do we have to specify a location at this time or just for your purposes of securing your RFP to secure a vendor?

1:12:53.5 Chris Clarke: So, there will be, there may be like if we were to use the Gateway Shopping Center it would, the show would need to be a little different those ground but that's the more of the thing.

1:13:00.3 Ann Cupka: It would impact.

1:13:00.6 Chris Clarke: But they would have to change. So, we will have to spell out in the RFP that these are the three possibilities unless I can narrow it down further with Ms. Hayes in the Base before then. Because this is a kind of request that not only does the captain here have to reprove but it's got to go all the way up to Washington to the admiralty.

1:13:17.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Go ahead, Ms. Binder.

1:13:21.6 Cathy Binder: Well, I would make suggestion that we approve it with a location since I think a lot of us think about staying at Sealston because that would help you out, correct? Yes. And from my understanding, we've been doing this for three years now. And to find a vendor that's a very safe and reliable vendor, you have to lock them in quite a bit early because they are in high demand because there are very few of them in the world, correct?

1:13:45.3 Chris Clarke: Yes. That's one of the reasons why we are the Saturday after the, our same vendor this year shot Spotsylvania on the Saturday before the fourth shot Fredericksburg on the fourth and shot us then on the eighth. And in addition to doing other shows on the other nights.

1:14:01.3 Chairman Richard Granger: So, I'd be interested in just seeing how it possibly could look like at the Gateway Shopping Center or at Dahlgren. I'm just kind of curious to know what that would be. I do know there are challenges with, obviously, as you brought up with parking and transportation, not that Sealston isn't a good location, but it does have some challenges. And some of those other areas might have more vendor availability just because they're in a more commercial area. So, I'd be

kind of curious to see how it could look but I'll leave it to my colleagues to make that decision.

1:14:31.6 Jeffrey Stonehill: I would be inclined to keep it at Sealston. I've talked to base at great lengths about the fireworks as two too. I think that's going to be just too much for them to handle and also with the security issues they would love to do it but every time we've talked about it, it always, it's probably a no. 301 the Gateway Shopping Center that's a tough place of navigating in a broad daylight and much less at nighttime with a whole bunch of people. So, I just think, you know, it's granted Sealston out in the middle of nowhere but it's very easy. It's very open. You can see it from a lot of different places, from the Sealston Deli, from the truck stop. Me personally, I would be inclined to leave it there.

1:15:18.3 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. It sounds like we have a majority of the Board that would like to see it at Sealston. So, then I'll ask as well about the request for the RFP. So, we would have to give approval or at least that's what Mr. Clarke's asking for, for him to move forward with that. So, it would be I guess a motion to fund \$25,000 request from the tourism fund balance for fireworks RFP.

Motion to approve \$25,000 from the tourism fund balance for the fireworks vendor.

1:15:44.6 Jeffery Stonehill: Alright, Mr. Chair then I have a motion to approve \$25,000 from the tourism fund for the fireworks vendor.

1:15:55.5 Ann Cupka: Set from the fund or the fund balance.

1:16:00.1 Chairman Granger: Ms. Minor.

1:16:01.1 Chris Clarke: We would prefer fund balance.

1:16:02.0 Chairman Richard Granger: Fund balance. Okay.

1:16:03.4 Ann Cupka: Friendly amendment, fund balance.

1:16:08.2 Jeffery Stonehill: Second. Okay. Yes.

1:16:11.8 Cathy Binder: I'll second to make it official.

1:16:13.3 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay, we have a motion probably seconded. And so, it is also included the amendment to be from the fund balance. So, \$25,000 from the tourism fund balance for moving forward with the fireworks RFP. Any further discussion? All in favor say aye.

1:16:28.6 Cathy Binder: Aye.

1:16:30.0 Jeffery Stonehill: Aye.

1:16:30.0 Ann Cupka: Aye.

1:16:30.0 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Aye.

1:16:30.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries.

1:16:32.9 Chris Clarke: Thank you sir.

1:16:33.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you Mr. Clarke. Okay, we do have a couple of public hearings tonight. So, we'll start with the first King George County Board of Supervisors will now hold a public hearing that has been properly advertised. Receipt public input regarding proration of personal property taxes. I'll first ask for the Staff report. I will then open the floor for public comments. Public comments are limited to three minutes per speaker in order to afford everyone an opportunity to speak. Please state your name and address before you comment upon completion of the public comment. I will bring the matter back to the Board for consideration. The Board may or may not take action tonight depending on the information received during the public comment. So, we will start with Ms. Lackey. I believe it's you with the Staff Report.

Public Hearing, Proration of Personal Property Taxes, Ms. Kelly Lackey, County Attorney:

1:17:21.5 Kelly Lackey: Yes. So, this proposed draft ordinance is in substantially the same form as was presented on August 1st. Currently the owners of motor vehicles, trailers, semi-trailers, or boats owe taxes for the calendar year as of January 1. So, if you are the vehicle order owner as of January one, you owe your taxes to King George County. There is an option under state law that you can prorate taxes. So, if somebody moves out of jurisdiction then they only owe taxes for the portion of the year that they had that vehicle garaged in King George County. And then they would owe taxes to the new jurisdiction. So, if somebody were to leave King George mid-year, they would have taxes refunded for the months that they have paid, rounded by half of month. For those months in which they no longer reside in King George County. It would exercise the optional provision that would exclude the proration of boats, vehicles, trailers, and semi-trailers with a gross weight of 10,000 pounds or more used for hire by a motor carrier in engaged of interstate commerce. So that's one way to kind of prevent some of the lost revenue is that those large vehicles and interstate commerce would still have their taxes due as of January 1st in full. And the proposed effective date would be January 1st of 2024.

1:18:54.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Do we have any questions for Ms. Lackey about the presentation? Okay, then I will open the floor for public comment upon this public hearing. So, if anyone would like to provide public comment, the floor is open. Mr. Dines, do you have anyone online?

1:19:24.5 Chris Dines: No, Mr. Chairman.

1:19:25.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Anyone received correspondence to be entered into the record in regard to this public hearing. Okay. And I will close the floor for public comment for this public hearing and I'll bring it back to the Board for discussion and consideration.

Chairman Granger closed the floor for public comment.

1:19:45.4 Ann Cupka: So, Mr. Chair, if I may, just to give a little background, I brought this forward to the Board because currently we do not prorate and we are out of the surrounding localities. I believe the only locality that does not prorate, the code does allow us to do so, but we must adopt a local ordinance in order to do so. So, the benefit here is, well, first of all, if you own a vehicle, if you buy a vehicle after January 1 here in King George, you don't start paying taxes on it until the following calendar year. So, it would allow the locality to collect personal property tax at what one might assume be when the vehicle has a higher value. But, and why I brought this forward is because at the end, when you sell the vehicle, I received a great many number of complaints from constituents who were selling vehicles after January 1, and were still being taxed for the entire calendar year by our

September 19, 2023
King George County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes

locality, even though they no longer own the vehicle. And even though the vehicle is no longer garaged in King George County. So, to me, it seemed like it was a bit unfair for people to be paying for taxes on vehicles that they no longer own, and that King George should not be collecting taxes on vehicles no longer garaged in our County. So that's where I was coming from when I brought this forward to the Board. And I appreciate everyone on the Board's support in bringing it to this point for a public hearing. Thank you very much.

1:21:22.5 Cathy Binder: I only want to add to Ms. Cupka's, if you move out of the state, you're still being taxed for the rest of the calendar year. So that's another thing is to be a little more equitable and fairer to collect the taxes and to not pay the taxes. If you sell the vehicle or move away.

1:21:39.6 Chairman Richard Granger: Any other discussion or comments?

1:21:46.7 Ann Cupka: Mr. Chair, a motion.

1:21:47.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Sure.

1:21:48.5 Ann Cupka: I move adoption of an ordinance to enact a new section in Chapter 14 Taxation Article I of the King George County codes to implement the proration of personal property taxes on motor vehicles. Stand by. Let me rescind that. Ms. Lackey, your advice during the or your comment during the Board report, you said boats are optional.

1:22:22.2 Kelly Lackey: Yes, that's correct.

1:22:23.9 Ann Cupka: But it is included as written here.

1:22:27.8 Kelly Lackey: Yes.

1:22:28.1 Ann Cupka: It is included. Okay. And so, let me just ask, is everyone okay with boats being included before I read the whole thing?

1:22:35.6 Ann Cupka: Yes. Okay. Thank you very much. Thanks for the indulgence. Am I able to revisit the motion or does someone else have to do it?

1:22:45.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Why don't we have someone else do it?

1:22:46.9 Ann Cupka: Thank you.

1:22:48.7 Chairman Richard Granger: If there's a will of the Board.

1:22:52.0 Cathy Binder: Help me a second, which page is on.

1:22:56.0 Chairman Richard Granger: Page 210.

1:22:56.1 Cathy Binder: Page 210.

1:22:57.0 Chairman Richard Granger: Page 210 of the PDF. So, I'll suggest. If someone would like to make a motion to adopt an ordinance to enact a new section in Chapter 14 Taxation, Article I of the King George County Code to implement the proration of personal property taxes on motor vehicles,

September 19, 2023
King George County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes

trailers, semi-trailers, and boats as presented. If someone would like.

1:23:25.5 Cathy Binder: So, moved.

1:23:29.3 Chairman Richard Granger: We have a motion.

1:23:40.6 Cathy Binder: I so move.

1:23:44.2 Jeffrey Stonehill: Second.

1:23:44.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. We have a motion probably seconded. Any further discussion? I apologize for the confusion there. I was just trying to provide the language so that it could just be moved upon. Was there any discussion? All right.

1:24:00.9 Chairman Richard Granger: All in favor say aye.

1:24:01.8 Ann Cupka: Aye.

1:24:02.1 Cathy Binder: Aye.

1:24:02.1 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

1:24:02.1 Vice Chairman Collins: Aye.

1:24:02.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Thank you. Move on to our second public hearing. King George County Board of Supervisors will now hold a public hearing that has been properly advertised to receive public input regarding the repeal of the vehicle license tax. I will first ask for the Staff report. I will then open the floor for public comment. Public comment is limited to three minutes per speaker in order to afford everyone an opportunity to speak. Please state your name and address before you comment. Upon completion of the public comment, I will bring the matter back to the Board for consideration. The Board may or may not take action tonight, depending on the information received during public comment. I believe Ms. Lackey will have the Staff presentation for this again.

Public Hearing to Repeal the Vehicle License Tax, Ms. Kelly Lackey, County Attorney:

1:24:44.3 Kelly Lackey: Yes, I do Mr. Chair. So once again, this is a proposed draft ordinance and substantially the same form as last presented on August 1st. If it is to be implemented, the license tax on vehicles would be repealed as of January 1st, 2024. The county could still pursue overdue license taxes prior to that date. There is a little bit of a quirk in the way the funds are budgeted. The entire years' worth of license tax is budgeted for the second half of fiscal year 2024. So, there would need to be some way to fill in a revenue loss of \$700,000. Also, perhaps a minor point, but the county would still need to actually issue some form of decal for use of convenience centers based on the language in a different part of the county code that provides for decals in section 1330. So that's not an obstacle to adoption. That's just a note that there still would be some kind of decal continued to be issued.

1:25:48.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Do you have any questions for Ms. Lackey? Go ahead, Ms. Binder.

September 19, 2023
King George County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes

1:25:53.1 Cathy Binder: So, with the decal, could we do it the same way we do now? You're not paying a fee, so they would have to be required to go to Commissioner of Revenue and get the decal?

1:26:02.9 Kelly Lackey: Correct. They just have to meet the criteria for having solid waste processed and then they could have a decal issued.

1:26:10.7 Cathy Binder: All right. Thank you.

1:26:14.8 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So, Ms. Lackey, you're saying that the \$25 collected for the vehicles were amounts to \$700,000 in revenue?

1:26:24.7 Kelly Lackey: Yes. That's the information that I receive from finance.

1:26:28.7 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: And so, without that, we'll have \$700,000 to make up every year?

1:26:37.0 Kelly Lackey: Correct it was budgeted for. So, the budget you were adopted is anticipating that revenue.

1:26:45.4 Cathy Binder: Is that budgeted for the whole fiscal year or just half?

1:26:49.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Well perhaps Ms. Hahn can address that as well.

1:26:53.8 Cathy Binder: Because my other question with that too is, so the next budget cycle, we can make sure that we account for that. So, this is just covering that small portion of time.

1:27:04.8 Kelly Lackey: Yes. So, I welcome Mrs. Hahn to interject, but as I understand it, the way the payments fall, they all fall in the second half of the fiscal year. So, there wouldn't be the opportunity to correct that you could address it in future years, but it would all fall in the second half of the current fiscal year.

1:27:25.0 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So, each penny on the tax dollars is what, \$250 some thousand now?

1:27:37.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Real estate believe that each penny is about \$390,000.

1:27:40.7 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: \$390?

1:27:41.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Mm-hmm.

1:27:44.1 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So how much more would have to be made up in the personal property in the tax percent for the \$700,000 for personal property? I'm not sure how much each penny in personal property generates Ms. Hahn, do you know that off the top of your head? I don't recall. I know it's significantly less than real estate.

1:28:02.7 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Significantly more.

1:28:03.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Personal property? Yes. No, each penny of personal property tax generates significantly less than real estate property.

1:28:11.6 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Real estate, personal property is \$3 and some odd cents.

1:28:15.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Yes, but I was saying each penny, that increase, if you're talking about how much we need to be increased, it would be a larger number than if you were looking at from a real estate property tax.

1:28:26.1 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Ms. Hahn, do you know the answer? How much would we have to raise the personal property in order to make up?

1:28:38.9 Ms. Hahn: Good evening. So, I looked at this earlier this evening, and based on the numbers for the current year it would be approximately 25 cents for personal property taxes to be increased in order to make up the \$700,000.

1:28:52.9 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Thank you.

1:28:55.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Ms. Binder. Did you have something else?

1:28:56.1 Cathy Binder: I mean, there are other ways that we can collect the funds, correct? Is you could use maybe; I'm just throwing it out there. Maybe some from the cigarette tax fund.

1:29:08.3 Chairman Richard Granger: You're correct. You could use any revenue stream that is available. Correct. It would be identifying the revenue stream though.

1:29:13.9 Cathy Binder: Because as one of our votes from last week, we understand that rezoning the property, we will get a different revenue stream from the property being rezoned. So that could even be used. I mean, I've heard from a lot of people about repealing this decal fee and that it's an extra tax that needs to leave. So, I think there's a way I don't think we have to raise the personal property tax to make it up just for this fiscal year.

1:29:42.0 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Well, in the future years, you're going to have to raise something in order to fill in the hole. So that \$25, I mean, Mr. Jones, you also make sure people pay tax when they get their sticker, right?

1:29:56.6 Mr. Jones: No, it's not a requirement.

1:29:58.7 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: It's not a requirement.

1:30:00.9 Chairman Richard Granger: It's part of the tax bill. So, when you receive a tax bill, it has the cost, 3.25 per \$100 of assessed value in the vehicle, and then \$23 for every vehicle. It's \$23, correct?

1:30:13.8 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: \$25, right?

1:30:13.9 Ann Cupka: \$23.

1:30:15.9 Chairman Richard Granger: \$23. And so, it is on your bill. So, it would be yes, a matter of figuring out what revenue stream in order to fill that gap. So, either, A, you leave the decal or the fee in place or you backfill it with some other revenue stream. Mr. Jones.

September 19, 2023
King George County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes

1:30:34.5 Mr. Jones: Just really quick I've had some conversations with some of my colleagues. Someone mentioned earlier, and I apologize, I don't remember. But now that proration is on the table we're going to be assessing vehicles at a higher rate in the beginning. So, it stands a reason that the county will receive more income, so to speak.

1:31:00.4 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Would it be \$700,000.

1:31:02.1 Mr. Jones: In a half year, maybe not. But it does stand a reason, and that's according to most of my colleagues that I've talked to at other localities.

1:31:11.2 Chairman Richard Granger: I appreciate it. Thank you. Mr. Jones. Did anyone else...

1:31:13.3 Ann Cupka: So, can I make a suggestion?

1:31:14.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Sure.

1:31:15.5 Ann Cupka: So, I spoke to our County Attorney about this just before the meeting. I would like to go ahead and move forward with the public hearing so that we have met the statutory requirement of having a public hearing. And then if need be, get some firm numbers. If there's a way that the Commissioner's Office could tell us how many vehicles, approximately for the last two years, how many are coming in new to the county every month we'll have some idea of how many new vehicles are coming in that could possibly generate a revenue stream through proration. I don't disagree with you, Mr. Jones. I'm sure you did do your homework and speak to other commissioners and treasurers, and I'm sure that once they start prorating, it is going to make up the difference in the revenue loss for the \$23 per vehicle. But I would like to move forward with the public hearing if that's okay, because it was scheduled. It was advertised, and then we closed it. And if we want to take a little more time to gather some more data, then we don't move on tonight, but we do hold the public hearing like we said we would.

1:32:31.6 Chairman Richard Granger: Agreed. Thank you. I don't think there was ever not going to move to hold the public hearing, but that Yes, that's fair. Were there any other questions before we do open the floor for public comment.

1:32:44.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: I was going to make a statement.

1:32:44.6 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay, go ahead.

1:32:46.1 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So that \$25 equals out to \$700,000. And we have the financial advisors here and we have the school people here, and we have plans for a new preschool. We're not in a really a position, I think to be repealing that. But we'll go to the public hearing and see what happens.

1:33:15.2 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. In that case, I will open the floor now for public comment upon this public hearing. So, if anyone would like to provide comment, the floor is open.

Public Comment:

1:33:27.5 Ana Maria Lovell: Hi, my name is Ana Maria Lovell, and I want to thank you Mrs. Cupka and all of you that agree. \$25, they've been charging forever. If you have one, two, three, four cars, they charge \$25 for each car. And also, in the past when you had this decal, they used to give your paper

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

also, you should save a lot of money because you stop giving those decals. They give you only one decal for one household. But I would like you to give something to the county, \$25. You have just been taking the money out all the time. Taxes for building this building that. It's okay they pay the fire department, the police department, to the schools. But you need to stop spending, the county owes \$100 million. The county wasn't there before. Now how are you going to pay that money? Try to pay that money first. Thank you.

1:34:51.0 Chairman Richard Granger: Mr. Dines, do you have anyone online?

1:34:58.7 Chris Dines: No, Mr. Chairman.

1:35:01.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Did anyone receive correspondence to be entered into the record? Okay, now we'll close the floor for public comment upon this public hearing and bring it back to the Board for discussion.

Chairman Granger closed the floor for public comment.

1:35:13.7 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: What it'll cost for the schools? For this preschool? So instead of going into general fund, we go for that debt payment.

1:35:33.0 Chairman Richard Granger: You are talking about trying to get ahead of, because the financial advisor's going to be here to help us understand what would have to happen in order to finance the new preschool. Is that what you're saying?

1:35:42.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Yes. So, the new preschool was a couple cents raised on tax revenue real estate.

1:35:49.5 Chairman Richard Granger: That's correct.

1:35:50.2 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: And so, I don't know if we can earmark this money for that or not, that was my first question.

1:35:57.5 Chairman Richard Granger: I mean it would be each Board every year's prerogative on how to... I mean, it's not like you could force a future Board to say that money's going to go towards that until you've started. I mean, you have revenue streams, right?

1:36:13.2 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Right. But I think that when Ms. Lovell comes up, speaks of the \$25, \$23 per vehicle. I haven't talked to her, but I think that she would be more inclined if that money was going towards a specific job like preschool. But I can't speak for Ms. Lovell, but I'm speaking for myself.

1:36:39.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay.

1:36:40.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: I would be more inclined for that money to go for that type of project specifically. So, it's not just a tax to tax, it's a tax for a product. Thank you.

1:36:57.0 Cathy Binder: If we still have reservations, I would like to see a more complete of how the revenue can be made up with maybe the increase in some properties on the taxes on it, the cigarette tax. And I'm talking about the rezoned land that now has a higher value. I would like to see the options that are available to make up that tax because I mentioned it in my Board report earlier. We

September 19, 2023
King George County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes

need to plan, and so that gives us time to plan, but just immediately earmarking it for one thing, we need to come up with a plan of what we're spending and what revenue streams we have for each thing that we're spending money on and the debt.

1:37:33.2 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay.

1:37:34.0 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Ms. Binder, the new revenue stream from the data centers, you don't even know what it's going to be. If it isn't even going to be a revenue stream. It's kind of like the cigarette tax. It was told to the Board; I attended these meetings that it was going to be \$7-8 million, and it's never panned out to that. It only panned out to about \$3 million. So, I wouldn't be inclined to even depend on that money until it shows up.

1:38:07.2 Cathy Binder: Now, I was not talking about the personal property tax. I was talking about rezoning the land from Ag to industrial, it has a higher value. That's a given, that's not a not given. If it has been rezoned you'll get more money. That's what I'm talking about. And then for the cigarette tax, some of you might remember way back when I said it's a sin tax. You're not going to get what you think you're getting. But we did pass it, so I'm not surprised we didn't get the revenue because a sin tax is designed to get you to stop using something except for in Philadelphia where they still drink soda.

1:38:39.7 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So, is it a sin to smoke cigarettes?

1:38:42.7 Cathy Binder: I didn't say it was a sin, that's just the title that's always given a sin tax is on something you'd like to discourage people. So, you try to make it a little higher, so they discourage them just like soda.

1:38:54.2 Ann Cupka: Mr. Chair.

1:38:54.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Yes, mam.

1:38:56.2 Ann Cupka: I have a motion and it's not about pop or soda because I'm from Pittsburgh, Ms. Binder. Mr. Chair I move to direct Staff to contact the Commissioner of the Revenues office to request approximately two years of historical data on vehicles moving into the county as well as to direct appropriate Staff as the County Administrator deems whoever appropriate to present some alternative revenue streams that could address the difference in the revenue.

1:39:33.5 Chairman Richard Granger: All right. That's a motion.

1:39:37.7 Cathy Binder: I'll second that.

1:39:38.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Alright, we have a motion properly seconded, do we have any further discussion? All in favor say aye.

1:39:44.5 Ann Cupka: Aye.

1:39:45.1 Cathy Binder: Aye.

1:39:45.2 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

1:39:45.2 Vice Chairman Collins: Aye.

1:39:45.1 Chairman Richard Granger: The opposed chair votes, aye. Motion carries. So, we will bring this back and consider it again at a future date once we have some more information, so thank you. All right. We have our third public hearing. King George County Board of Supervisors will now hold a public hearing that has been properly advertised to receive public input regarding transportation alternative program application. We'll first ask for the Staff report. I will then open the floor for public comment. Public comments are limited to three minutes per speaker in order to afford everyone an opportunity to speak. Please state your name and address before your comment. Upon completion of public comment, I will bring the matter back to the Board for consideration. The Board may or may not take action tonight depending on the information received during public comment. Mr. Clarke.

Public Hearing, Transportation Alternatives Program Application, Mr. Chris Clarke, Director of Parks and Recreation:

1:40:27.9 Chris Clarke: Good evening again. As mentioned earlier, GWRC has assisted us with. This year we screened in for the pre-application for tourism or our transportation alternatives program funding. It's an 80-20 federal match program. Funding is allocated initially by size of jurisdiction, so we fall into the second category. Then any additional fundings that they have they spread out amongst the Commonwealth, and most allocations are around \$700,000 you can only maximum receive \$1 million per year and \$2 million total per project but they're focused on community-based pedestrian and bicycle improvements. Multimodal improvements. It's not funds that we can use for traditional roadways or anything like that. Everything runs through the commonwealth transportation Board, and we must have logical termini and independent utility so although we have a five stage five phase plan each phase has to have its own make sense by itself. So, as I said we got through the pre-application submitted in June. We're screened in as of August 9th. Tonight, is our public hearing. I also so we've closed the public hearing here tonight, but the community still has 10 days to respond, and I'll have that information at the end, so September 29th is actually the end of the public comment period and then our full application is due into the smart portal by October 2nd. Just for development the King George Trailways Feasibility Study that we worked on in 2018 and the Board approved in 2021. The Greenway Feasibility Plan which was part of GWRC. The New Courthouse Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan that Ms. Eaves presented to you all earlier in the year and then the Ready Set Go Project all helped develop this project. So initially it was four phases across from Presidential Lakes to Tinsbloom Mill Lane just beyond social services. Now we've added RK&K who is the consultant with VDOT recommended we start with a fifth phase which is this sidewalk project. So, I'm going to show it and tell everybody what we've got here. So, you can see there's a light gray line there. Is there a pointer on here Chris? All right, so he's a little bit so there above the parking spaces would be the start of the sidewalk which is where the ADA crossing is for the school. It would come across and come down Dahlgren Road to the end there at the intersection at Route 3. There would be improvements to all three crosswalks there and Mr. Beale and I discussed this this afternoon and we're not both neither one of us is sure how that's going to look but it would be an adjustment of the stop bars and most likely the ladder crosswalk that Ms. Eaves described in our bicycle pedestrian plan for the area which would be safer. There is no right-of-way that needs to be acquired according to our preliminary things. Part of it there is on the school property, and I did not look today, and I meant to whether who is the actual listed owner of that property whether it's the county or it's the School Board but either way I think that getting that permission will be rather easy and then the rest of it there is actually on public right-of-way already. There would be minimal changes to utilities with it looks like that will be those right of the way there would maybe an upgrade to the signal and as I said the crosswalk and I just turned it off. So, these numbers VDOT has submitted to me late yesterday an updated cost estimate which is the worst-case scenario because as

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

I talked to Mr. Beale, and I talked to Ms. Lord who's in the Fredericksburg office of VDOT who oversees these programs we don't want to be short in what we submit. So while these numbers look huge it should be closer to what was actually that actually shows in the Board packet that's our hope because it's 400 feet of sidewalk, there is no right-of-way to acquire they're very minimal utility issues that a lot of these things should be smaller but the high end with inflation factor would be one million dollars for the project which they don't think is anywhere near what it will cost but we want to make sure we submit to get the right amount of funding and then so if it were that hot the base dollar amount of \$671,000 our match would be \$134,300 but every penny it comes down then obviously our match comes down. Our steps are tonight in your packet is a resolution of support that the Board of Supervisors if they if you don't enact I stop the process of submission we have to have that and then on Monday night after we have that it will go in front of GWRC for that Board's stamp of approval. As I said, the full applications due October 2, 2023. Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) will then screen the applications and pick select those in the spring and it will become part of VDOT six-year plan starting in June. We would either be funded in federal FY25 or FY26 so that would start October 1, FY24 or FY25 and it has a four they have a four-year policy over these, so we have to have 50% plan review and the preliminary design done within two calendar years right of way acquisition and final plan review in three and construction started within four. That is because of the scope of the project that I think we would be much further along by the time we got to year four possibly already done. So as the public comes up they can also speak tonight they can submit mail to me here at the Revercomb Building, 10459 Courthouse Drive, Suite 200 or they can email me at director@kgparks.org that's my simple address much easier than the typical county address so if you have anybody who reaches out to you director@kgparks.org would be the email.

Public Comment:

1:46:29.5 Chairman Richard Granger: So, we have any questions for Mr. Clarke before we open the floor for public comment. Okay, Mr. Clarke I appreciate the brief, but we will now open the floor for public comment upon this public hearing. Mr. Dines do we have anyone online?

1:47:01.2 Chris Dines: No, Mr. Chairman.

1:47:02.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Anyone received correspondence in regard to this public hearing to be entered into the record. Okay. Then I will close the public hearing and I will bring it back to the Board for discussion and consideration. Mr. Clarke, I'm going to ask you. There is a local match to execute the project.

Chairman Granger Closed the Floor for Public Comment.

1:47:28.3 Chris Clarke: Yes, sir.

1:47:30.2 Chairman Richard Granger: At this point, if we move forward with this, does this obligate the county to obligate those dollars now or is it something that the county would consider at a future date whether to move forward or not?

1:47:44.4 Chris Clarke: The quick discussion with Ms. Hahn makes it sound like we believe we could actually budget the dollars later.

1:47:49.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. I'll ask my colleagues if they have any other questions.

1:48:00.7 Cathy Binder: No, but I just want to make a statement because I drive there, and my daughter is in eighth grade. I go to the middle school every day. And the amount of citizens, young

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

and old and people that are at the high school going over to get a snack before the football game, whatever. It is a dangerous area, and we should improve it because if somebody got hurt and eventually in that statistics show that could happen, that this at least would try to alleviate that. So, it's important.

1:48:29.0 Chris Clarke: Yes, I did capture some pictures the other day after this was presentation was already done, of students crossing or preparing to cross as they're on their way to sheets to get a snack, I guess before games or band practice or whatever, so those will go in with our submission.

1:48:45.2 Cathy Binder: I even see students going there in the morning believe it or not, middle school students coming maybe from presidential lakes or over there, they walk and go.

1:48:55.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Do you have any other discussion or questions?

1:48:57.4 Ann Cupka: Yes, Mr. Chair. So, I agree with Ms. Binder and it's not just high schoolers, it's middle schoolers who are jumping over to Sheets to get a bite to eat before a later game or whatever, and it's amazing we haven't had a child fatality, a child pedestrian fatality there at that intersection at this point. I would also note this is similar to how we do revenue sharing, where we don't obligate the match. We obligated in future CIP (Capital Improvement Plans) and revenue sharing, frankly, is 50/50 match, if I'm not mistaken. And we've got the second phase of the turn lane project out there right now for the middle school. So, I wouldn't have a problem moving forward with this. I just wanted to have it heard here at Board level because it was brought to us, to Ms. Binder and me, at the last GWRC meeting. And they were ready to give us a resolution of support and everything. And I spoke up and said "No, we need to have our Board have input because there is a local match required." But I'm willing to move forward with it knowing that we don't obligate any funding right now, thank you.

1:50:13.2 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay any other discussion?

1:50:20.2 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay.

1:50:37.4 Cathy Binder: I'll take a stab at the motion. I make a motion to improve the go ahead to submit the application for the transportation alternative program, proposed sidewalk from King George Middle School to the intersection of Kings Highway Route 3 in Dahlgren Road, Route 206. Does that cover?

1:50:57.2 Chairman Richard Granger: So, I don't know if it's to submit, I think it's to approve the resolution and support of the project.

1:51:00.6 Chris Clarke: Correct, sir.

1:51:01.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Friendly amendment, I'm not trying to be critical.

1:51:09.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay, so there's a motion to approve the resolution and support of the project as presented so there's a motion.

1:51:16.5 Ann Cupka: So, I will second that.

1:51:18.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay, there's a second, that is a motion to approve the resolution and support of the project as presented and it's been properly seconded. Any further

discussion? All in favor say aye.

1:51:32.2 Cathy Binder: Aye.

1:51:32.7 Ann Cupka: Aye.

1:51:33.2 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

1:51:33.2 Vice Chairman Collins: Aye.

1:51:33.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Nay? Opposed? Chair votes Aye motion carries. Thank you Mr. Clarke.

1:51:38.1 Chris Clarke: Thank you very much, I'll be back in the spring with good news.

1:51:39.3 Chairman Richard Granger: Always like good news. Alright, just give me a moment. I believe we have King George County Schools re-appropriation of budget for FY 22-23, no, yes. Dr. Boyd.

King George County Schools, Reappropriation of Budget for FY 22-23, Dr. Jesse Boyd, Superintendent for KGCS:

1:51:58.8 Dr. Jesse Boyd: Good morning Chairman Granger, good morning, good afternoon. Goodness gracious. Good evening Members of Board, I provided you a handout this evening. I believe this is the last request for a re-appropriation for FY23. If you draw your attention to that handout you'll see a summary section, just quickly, King George County Schools request a re-appropriation of \$213,889.57 from the technology and instruction administration categories to the category of operation and maintenance, listed above or listed in the following handouts for year-end reconciliation. This request is being made to cover the utility bills in excess of anticipated amounts that have been received to reconcile the budget for fund 250 for the King George County School general operating budget transfers are completed to ensure that no expenditure category is overspent prior to the annual or the final annual audit and compilation of the annual comprehensive financial report. So, I asked this evening for a motion to approve that reconciliation.

1:53:03.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you, Dr. Boyd. I'm just going to ask so do you know what the genesis of those increases were? Like what caused it to be a higher cost for the schools. You said it was electricity.

1:53:15.7 Dr. Boyd: It's just increased, yes electricity costs.

1:53:17.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay, has that been captured in this current year's budget properly or do you anticipate there's going to be an overrun on that again this year?

1:53:23.4 Dr. Boyd: I believe so, but as we've noticed even in our household budgets the cost of utilities is going up. But I believe we've captured it as best we can in this upcoming budget cycle.

1:53:32.0 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. Mr. Collins, did you have a question?

1:53:34.4 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Yes sir. Dr. Boyd, I discussed this briefly with you before the meeting. The performance agreement with Honeywell was supposed to, that they would be on the

hook to pay any differences or that we would not be in a negative category, could you check that out before we reappropriate or reappropriate with, I don't know.

1:54:00.6 Chairman Richard Granger: So that has to deal with the at the preschool only?

1:54:05.1 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Nope, whole place.

1:54:06.6 Dr. Boyd: No, it's with the whole division I don't know about the details of whether or not the utility costs would be level through the remainder of that contract, I can certainly look into it.

1:54:17.0 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Well, the contract was that the school division would not take on any more increased bills that Honeywell will take up that from their profits according to the agreement was to be a 25-year agreement on that, so that was one of the big deals.

1:54:42.1 Chairman Richard Granger: I remember that if and I don't remember the exact language and if whether it would qualify or not, but I wouldn't mind if we did go back to look just to verify?

1:54:54.5 Dr. Boyd: I certainly can.

1:54:55.3 Cathy Binder: I just have a quick question. How does that affect your audit since this has to be reconciled?

1:55:00.2 Dr. Boyd: So that might be a Donna question, I believe we're kind of in crunch time for that, correct?

1:55:08.7 Ms. Hahn: Good evening again. So, our audit our auditors were on site last week. And they've completed most of their fieldwork and we're trying to wrap up some of the items. As you all know, our financial system, we cannot close out last fiscal year until that audit is complete, so this is one thing that could hold that up. But also, the electric bills have already been paid, so we could look into the performance agreement with Honeywell and if that is the case, we could have a refund from them and then that would come back into the general fund balance.

1:55:49.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. So, you're asking to still move it from one account to the other to cover the Audit purposes and then we will continue to pull the thread to see if they would refund and provide that back.

1:56:02.7 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So, when would we have that information.

1:56:06.8 Ms. Hahn: So, we can go back because I don't have that performance agreement. It's probably in the, I'm not sure if I can finance.

1:56:13.3 Dr. Boyd: I can take a look at it as early as tomorrow and I'll reach out to Honeywell and see if we can get with Joyce from Honeywell and figure out that agreement. Then provide that information.

1:56:22.6 Ms. Hahn: Yes, if you need our assistance we can.

1:56:26.0 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: We'll have an answer.

1:56:26.3 Ms. Hahn: Can get with Dr. Boyd.

1:56:27.4 Chris Miller: Within seven days or so?

1:56:31.4 Dr. Boyd: I certainly hope so. I'll work in that fashion, I work with Honeywell, and they've been pretty responsive to me up to this point, so certainly do what I can to make sure that we follow that timeline.

1:56:40.9 Vice Chairman Collins: That'd be great, but can we get a complex answer in other words, not a no or yes.

1:56:54.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Well, if it's yes, do you need a complex? If it's yes, they're going to get the money back, are you fine with them just saying "Yes we'll do it."

1:56:57.4 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: I won't be that complex.

1:57:00.1 Chairman Richard Granger: If it's a no though you want to understand that the reason.

1:57:02.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: No, Honeywell it's going to be a no ever before it is a yes.

1:57:05.0 Chris Miller: Mr. Chair. May I ask Ms. Hahn if it was found out that Honeywell was responsible for that, would the Board need to take action to get the rebate or the get the refund?

1:57:22.8 Dr. Boyd: The School Board likely.

1:57:22.9 Ms. Hahn: More than likely the School Board, but it depends on what the performance agreement says, if it's in that agreement we wouldn't have to act. We just need to tell them that they need to refund the fund money.

1:57:35.8 Chris Miller: We can have a report back to you for sure, if Dr. Boyd gets information, he can forward it to me and we can then forward it on to you or if it's something that needs to have a report at the next Board meeting, then we could have that as well.

1:57:51.2 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. So, we can continue to pull that thread and get that information. But I think it's probably still behooved us to move forward with from an auditing perspective just to make sure that we have our ducks in a row and hopefully we'll get that money back.

1:58:03.7 Dr. Boyd: Sounds good.

1:58:06.6 Ann Cupka: Mr. Chair, I have a motion.

1:58:07.3 Chairman Richard Granger: Yes.

1:58:08.5 Ann Cupka: I move to approve the King George County School Board's request to re-appropriate a total of \$213,889.57 from the technology 68100 department code and instruction category 61100 department code to the operations/maintenance department code 64200 as identified in the presentation.

1:58:43.5 Cathy Binder: Second.

1:58:46.3 Chairman Richard Granger: We have a motion properly seconded; do we have any further discussion? All in favor say aye.

1:58:48.4 Cathy Binder: Aye.

1:58:49.1 Ann Cupka: Aye.

1:58:49.3 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

1:58:49.3 Vice Chairman Collins: Aye.

1:58:49.3 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed? Chair votes aye, motion carries. Thank you, Dr. Boyd.

1:58:55.1 Dr. Boyd: Thank you.

1:58:57.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Alright. We'll move on to the County Attorney resolution for school and fire financing, Ms. Lackey.

Resolution for School and Fire Financing, Ms. Kelly Lackey, County Attorney:

1:59:01.6 Kelly Lackey: And so I'll kick this one off, but we have both bond council and financial advisors here available to answer any subject matter expert questions, but you will recall that there was a presentation about bond financing for the preschool and fire station projects at the August 1st meeting by Davenport and Company, there's a proposed resolution in your agenda packet that would authorize a bond issuance by the EDA, so the EDA would actually be the issuer, not the county. And the amount of \$22.5 million, there was a change to the resolution, so you'll notice your Board packet. In the Board report it says a bond issuance of \$21 million, but the final amount is expected to be \$22.5 million. If you have any questions, you can direct that to the folks who are more knowledgeable on that than I am. In order to proceed with this, the EDA will conduct a public hearing on October 12, 2023. If financing is recommended by the EDA and approved by this Board, the county would pledge its moral obligation to repay the funds secured by the bonds. And I defer to the bond council and financial advisors if there are additional substantive questions.

1:59:18.0 Chairman Richard Granger: Gentlemen, did you have anything else further to present or, okay. I appreciate you being here though for answering questions, does anyone have any questions? We'll start with Ms. Binder.

1:59:20.3 Cathy Binder: I do have questions. First off, this is not for the full amount correct? For either a fire station or a preschool.

1:59:22.5 Chairman Richard Granger: I think we'd cover the cost of one of them at least, and part of the, another is that a correct assessment? You guys can come up.

1:59:24.6 Cathy Binder: Well, my question is we haven't even seen the finalized Preschool Study, so Mr. Miller, where is it?

1:59:26.7 Chairman Richard Granger: Great.

2:01:00.7 Chris Miller: So, its Davenport's presentation back in, August it was the recommendation that they had was that you break this up over two cycles and, they felt that was the best for the debt structure of the county, we are still waiting on the report from Mosley, it is supposed to be towards the end of this month. So, I would anticipate at any time we'll know a better idea of what the cost of the preschool will be. But I don't know that that limits you from going forward, ultimately they'll need that information obviously but at this point, I think to keep on track and to keep this project moving, which is at the urging of the Board I think you all agreed to this timeline.

2:01:24.7 Cathy Binder: Well, my concern is we don't know what the final cost is. So, the other concern is there possibly could be another option of looking at that property is very unique. I've walked that property, I walked it with one of the School Board Members, I walked it with our County Engineer. We need to make sure that we can fit everything that we want to put on that. And so, my concern is rushing this without looking at everything. I know it is important to get the preschool students out, there could be another option. We maybe could lease this space for a little while, so that we could do the proper planning so that we take the taxpayers money and use it wisely, and that's the taxpayers that'll be in the preschool also because they will be hopefully future taxpayers. But I want to make sure that, if we do this fund, that if there's another option we could use that, the fund that doesn't lock you into one plan.

2:01:38.3 David Rose: So again, I'm David Rose with Davenport and my colleague is Austin Sachs, Kyle Laux works with us as well. To your question, I think this hopefully will give you some comfort. We talked about an overall expectation of about \$42 million over two parts, we also discussed the fact that we really don't know if we may be getting some grants or some other dollars. So as a result, the way in which we're anticipating borrowing this first tranche of money, if you would, is it's very flexible. It can go to one project, it can go to both projects, but it doesn't necessarily speak to being on a certain plot of land, so from that perspective, think of it this way, we are basically borrowing money with your blessing. We're going to reinvest that money as we spend it down equal to the cost of the money. So, we will not have any, if you would, carrying costs while we're waiting to actually put those monies to work. That's important. So, to your point what we really want to do now is borrow some of that money while interest rates are very favorable. The Federal Reserve is talking about raising rates maybe not tomorrow, but over the next period of time they may lower rates, and so if they do, let's say the point is we want to lock in money while it's favorable, but if rates go down over the next year or two, that second tranche of money, then ideally we'll borrow that money at lower rates. No matter what we do, we're going to have the ability to refinance this, not immediately, but over time, and I have been in front of you before where we've literally refinanced, if not everything close to everything we've ever borrowed in King George County goes over time you just basically see rates either come down, you get a shorter period to refinance. So, there's a lot of points here that make sense. But I did want to hear your point whether it's on this side or something like that, that's not going to be in any way constraining for the money that we borrow.

2:03:38.3 Cathy Binder: So maybe I can look at it as, for the service authority, the amount of money we had in reserve, I think was it \$15.9? It could be we get the money and then it could be paid down in a certain fashion correct or spent in a certain fashion.

2:03:39.3 David Rose: Yes, that's correct.

2:03:41.3 Cathy Binder: So, it is not technically earmarked for an exact plan.

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

2:03:44.3 David Rose: It will not be earmarked for an exact plan, that's why Mr. Bausch is here as bond counsel, but it will be basically set up in such a way that those two projects are, or those multiple projects are contemplated in a basket if you would, of capital needs. Would you agree with that, Jesse?

2:05:38.3 Jesse Bausch, Sands Anderson: Jesse Bausch, Sands Anderson, if you look at the resolution, what it that does is identifies those two projects, but what it says is one or more county or school capital projects, including but not limited to those projects, so if there's some other way or some other way that we want to use that money, we have that flexibility as long as it's a county or school capital project.

2:05:58.0 Cathy Binder: And why do I ask that? Say it came back with a plan and we were able to put the school Board office on top, it would not limit that correct?

2:06:05.2 Jesse Bausch: Correct.

2:06:06.7 Cathy Binder: Okay. Thank you.

2:06:10.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Mr. Collins.

2:06:11.4 Vice Chairman Collins: So, I have two things. First, why is it another million dollars?

2:06:17.4 David Rose: Oh, okay. So what we asked for is what we call a not to exceed amount, Mr. Collins, so when you go into the world of bond financing, what we're going to is make sure that we have \$21 million of what we call proceeds, hard dollars to be invested or reinvested, that may be a little larger size issue, it may actually be less than \$21 million because the way bonds are done, we're going to put this out, we call it public sale, we've done this before with you, some people want to buy a bond at a discount, which means basically we would actually borrow some more money going to that \$22 or so, some people want to buy bonds at a premium, which means they'll give us more than \$21 million, so ultimately it doesn't matter to us as long as the resolution allows it, all we care about for you is that we end up having at the end of the closing \$21 million to be invested or to be again spent for multiple projects, that's the way it works.

2:07:30.4 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Okay, the second thing is Ms. Binder to slow the project down too, it's been pretty slow, it's been 30 years, so I think that's slow enough. I am concerned about the 21 million since it is the most favorable probably than we'll have in another five years for rates, I would think that it would be more advantageous to get the larger amount. Because we know it's going to cost in the range of \$40 million, so the \$21 million I know will get it started. But if we're going to do it, we need to do it all the way, people need to know. I'm not a big guy on raising taxes, but I'm in on this one, and we need to do the whole project, the fire station and the preschool, no matter where it's going to be, we need to get that financing set and go ahead and move forward.

2:08:31.9 David Rose: Again, I understand that we don't have a crystal ball. I have no sense if rates are going to go up or down, and even if I had a Nobel Prize in economics, as you could tell, I do not, they still make mistakes, they don't really know. So, our thinking is, we know with certainty that we absolutely need at least \$21 million, a lot more than that. So, our thinking is why don't we lock in what we know at the very minimum is a start, 50% thereabout, we don't want to over borrow. Yes, we could pay it back, but there's some penalties to that, if we went up to those \$40, \$41, \$42 million amounts, we know there may be some other offsetting dollars. The other thing though and Mr. Bausch can

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

chime in here, it has to do with being able to borrow on a tax-exempt basis. So, and you correct me because you're the expert, but I've been doing this for 40 plus years with your partners. We have to have reasonable expectations that the money we borrow, we'll spend 85% of that effectively, all of that in three years, 36 months. I'm not sure we can meet that, that if you want to call it that criteria, yes, there are some waivers to move it longer. But I just think it's better cashflow wise if we kind of put it into sort of two parts, if you would, now if rates go down markedly a year from now, or six months from now, could we come back and say, "Look, it's especially attractive." We might do that, Mr. Collins. At the same time, if rates go up considerably between now and that time, we need the next amount. It's possible we borrow that a little differently. We may borrow that on a short-term basis so that we have the money, but we don't lock into long term if rates pop up and we hopefully don't see that happening. So that's really, there's no right or wrong here, but as you said we know there's going to be an equivalent tax impact. We showed that the last time, that was that two, two and two strategies. And so, from our perspective this is the closest to sort of doing that if we find that. We have also estimated the interest rate for both the \$21 million and the second \$21 million is higher than it is at the moment. So hopefully we'll get that benefit, but that, again, can go away from us. So, I hear you. We'll do whatever this Board ultimately decides. But we just would like to see if it may be broken into two parts, it's not absolute science.

2:11:26.6 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Well, I thank you for that financial advice. So, for the \$21 million, \$7 million for the fire station approximately, and the other \$14 (million) for the school, which is basically engineering and so forth. So, at the end of that period and it gets engineered and so forth, the fire station is going to get built. And then how about a Board that decides not to go forward with the plan? So that's why I'm talking about locking it in. So, they basically have to go forward with the plan.

2:12:02.0 David Rose: I think maybe I'll defer to the County Administrator for that.

2:12:05.3 Chris Miller: So, I believe that the fire station estimate at this time is around 14 million, the fire station is. And I think what the hope was is that the other amount there, whatever was left over after the fire station, I know that they tried to get a grant and they did not get that grant. I think I reported that. But you would begin the process, as you mentioned, of working with the engineers, doing the design for the pre-school and then that other tranche would come along and fund the rest of it. I mean that's the intent as to my understanding. And I believe there's also a reason for breaking it up because of the way it would lay across the financials and what our current debt load is. And so, the larger the debt that you take out is going to impact the borrowing ability of the county immediately.

2:13:01.3 David Rose: Yes sir, that's right.

2:13:02.1 Chris Miller: And I think that's why you guys are recommending that.

2:13:05.6 David Rose: That's right, so we have as you know resented the last time, we have certain financial policies. And we've always been within those white lines. And that would be, again, keeping us in that mode that's our thinking as well, Mr. Collins. But again, financially we just think this is the prudent course of action, just because you, let's say were to do the opposite, you borrowed all \$42 million right now, put that aside for the moment. What Mr. Miller said, the reality is you could always stop a project. I mean, that's just because the money's been borrowed doesn't mean you have to go forward with that project. I mean, that's something that a Board can do, it would look particularly good. It might have some other ramifications, but just make no mistake, and then the flip side is if you

borrow this \$21 million is, as you said, Mr. Miller, most of that's going to go to the fire station, the other gets going on the pre-school, and then if you decide not to move forward again, we've got still got to pay that back. So, there's no right or wrong to any of this, this is really y'all's choice, but I think with Mr. Miller, we spent a lot of time what I think you need to know though is, the way we've set this up, nobody will see the projects being delayed in terms of actual construction and then opening. That's important to point out, we're not slowing down the timetable of getting these projects done. I think that's important to point out, we know what that is.

2:14:46.1 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: I wouldn't want to see the \$21 million and get the preschool engineered and then it takes another 30 years to build it because we've been waiting a long time, so that's just my opinion and my viewpoint.

2:15:05.4 David Rose: Understood.

2:15:06.3 Ann Cupka: Mr. Chair, may I ask a question of Council? Thank you. Ms. Lackey, if I'm reading the resolution correctly, the only motion required is adoption of said resolution because all of the other documents are incorporated by reference in the resolution.

2:15:24.9 Kelly Lackey: That's correct, so the resolution designates a designee to sign the other documents as they become finalized through the issuance process.

2:15:33.4 Ann Cupka: Thank you. Mr. Chair. I have a motion. I move adoption of the resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the county of King George Virginia approving public facility revenue, bond, issuance, offer and sale for school and public safety facilities as presented.

2:15:46.9 Jeffrey Stonehill: Second.

2:15:52.6 Chairman Richard Granger: We have a motion properly Seconded. Do we have any further discussion? All in favor say aye.

2:15:53.1 Cathy Binder: Aye.

2:15:53.6 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

2:15:53.6 Ann Cupka: Aye.

2:15:55.6 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Aye.

2:15:56.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed? Chair votes aye, motion carries. Thank you gentlemen. All right. We have Mr. Minor for the Defense and Technology Zone, Incentive Ordinances.

Request to Advertise for a Public Hearing for Economic Incentive Ordinances, Mr. Nick Minor, Director of ED&T:

2:16:13.9 Mr. Minor: Yes sir.

2:16:15.1 Chairman Richard Granger: You brought them to us a couple times and I think at this point we're looking to advertise in public hearing because we've held a town hall. I apologize, I'll let you present.

September 19, 2023
King George County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes

2:16:22.6 Mr. Minor: No, that's perfectly fine. Good evening, Chairman Granger, members of the Board, this is the same presentation that I gave at the last meeting. I do have an update. I did provide a presentation. Yes sir.

2:16:40.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Do you mind if we take a five-minute recess before we move on? I apologize.

2:16:45.4 Mr. Minor: Fair enough.

2:16:45.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay We'll take a five-minute recess. We'll come back.

It was the consensus of the Board to take a five-minute recess and re-adjourn thereafter.

2:23:00.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you. Mr. Dines, are we? We're good. We're good. All right, then we are back from recess. I appreciate everyone's patience. And again, Mr. Minor.

2:23:13.9 Mr. Minor: Yes, sir. Thank you, Chairman Granger. So just to report back, I did conduct a town hall last Thursday. It was pretty well attended. There wasn't much feedback. I did get email correspondence from a resident that recommended, one of them made the recommendation to remove data centers from the tech ordinance. But I'm happy to go through the presentation. The Board has seen this presentation at least twice. But I'm happy to go through it again, whether for the public benefit or for the Board benefit. But just wanted to report back on that town hall.

2:23:44.4 Chairman Richard Granger: So, I'll ask my colleagues, do you want Mr. Minor to provide the brief again? Okay. I think we've had it three times.

2:23:53.5 Mr. Minor: Yes.

2:23:54.3 Chairman Richard Granger: And so, then I think the fourth was the town hall. I'm just asking. So okay.

2:24:02.1 Mr. Minor: Happy to take any questions from the Board.

2:24:02.2 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay, we'll start with Ms. Binder.

2:24:03.8 Cathy Binder: And I apologize for not being at the meeting last week. My daughter got hurt at the basketball game. So, I did not leave the basketball game because of that.

2:24:10.5 Mr. Minor: Understood.

2:24:12.3 Cathy Binder: But one of the things I would like to remove data center from the ordinance and it's because we haven't even seen the ones we have in plan A. And I don't want to incentivize more to come before we make sure that we have everything in place. And I say that from listening to developers on the state committees, the one thing they like is certainty. So, I don't want to advertise something if a Board or a future Board is not going to have want to consider it in these other areas that you have a map. And it might be good if we at least just put the map up so people can see what we're referencing.

2:24:43.7 Mr. Minor: Of course, I have to click all the way through this. So just to point this out, these

September 19, 2023
 King George County Board of Supervisors
 Meeting Minutes

are all the settlement areas within the county. The only ones that we're targeting is the Dahlgren district. Thanks, Chris (Dines). The Cleydael properties three and 301. The in the route three West settlement area. So, Ms. Binder, if I can just make a comment really quickly. So, I completely understand it. And this is just to advise the Board. Data centers cannot just go anywhere. They're going to have to follow major power lines in order to get power. So, there's only, in my opinion, at this at this time, I'm not sure what future Boards will do or what other Economic Developer Directors will do. But the only property that I would advise or properties that I would advise a data center to go towards is obviously the Taylor Farm, which I believe is under contract and there's a proposal for it. And then the Cleydael property where the 230 KV line that feeds Dahlgren goes through. The other properties within the county are not necessarily suitable. And I don't think I would advise a developer to chase those properties without Board approval.

2:25:58.8 Cathy Binder: I just want to be consistent so that we have consistency because I definitely do not know the area where the industrial park is, is the Edge Hill office area. I have a concern with the area where the businesses are because there is that big tension line.

2:26:14.1 Mr. Minor: Understood.

2:26:16.9 Cathy Binder: That area pretty well. So that's why I'm concerned about that.

2:26:22.4 Mr. Minor: Can you zoom in for me?

2:26:24.6 Cathy Binder: It's more public feedback especially for the residents that live in that area.

2:26:27.1 Mr. Minor: So, your 230 KV, ma'am. I'm just going to draw like a little quick line here. It goes basically like this and then it splits down this way. So, I don't think that I don't think that any of that 230 KV really falls within any of the settlement areas except for these two properties here.

2:26:43.2 Cathy Binder: No, it's right there on Edge Hill because I know because my house is in that area and it's, the power line comes right in the front.

2:26:51.5 Mr. Minor: Comes right here and then it splits down that way. Okay. Understood.

2:26:55.8 Cathy Binder: And then it crosses the road near the Cleydael property.

2:26:56.7 Mr. Minor: Understood.

2:26:58.4 Cathy Binder: That's where my heartburn comes in that area. And then one other, looking at all the ordinances, I think it's page four where it talks about the economic incentives and, I think that's page four. No, no, no, wait a minute. Whichever page had the \$1 million, is that too small of an amount to kick in for incentives? Because I'm thinking of something like Amazon, that's awfully a small number.

2:27:22.0 Mr. Minor: So correct. So, if we're going to attract data centers, \$1 million is not a good starting point. So, I think the point I'm trying to make with this is that I'm not interested in necessarily attracting data centers with this ordinance, so to speak. I'm trying to open it up to all industries, data centers included, but the threshold is set more so for your small to medium sized tech and defense contractor businesses.

September 19, 2023
King George County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes

2:27:49.1 Mr. Minor: So, \$1 million to a data center is nothing. They'll spend that week on sitework. But for your small businesses that want to expand in an office park or expand on a C2 parcel, \$500 grand or \$1 million is a lot of money. So, for that threshold, because it's a qualifying ordinance, just because we've drawn these boundaries doesn't mean that they automatically get it as soon as they start investing money. It's a discretionary incentive, which means that it has to go before the Board for approval before any incentive is provided to them. The process is, if they're inside of the zone, they apply to my department for review and analysis, and then I bring that before the Board for final approval with a recommendation for incentives based off of the amount of jobs they're going to create and the amount of investment they're going to bring to the community. So, they have to qualify first by being within. They have to qualify again with the capital investment that they'll make, that \$500,000 to \$1 million, and then they have to get final approval from the Board.

2:28:55.5 Cathy Binder: And I appreciate you explaining that. It's just, I still have heartburn about the data center part being in there. And the other question I have is with the area that already is going to have a data campus, does that add extra incentives onto that?

2:29:07.4 Mr. Minor: No, ma'am. This is not a layered incentive. Honestly, it's a qualifier. So, they can't get whatever agreement that we have, they're not going to get additional incentives just because they're within it. It just, it would qualify the next business that's within the industrial park. So, let's say Greenchip were to expand in the future, and they fell under that. Let's say they were going to expand because they won a government contract. And so, they would fall under the defense production zone. This would be more geared towards them than Amazon or Google or Microsoft. Those deals are so massive, they have to be negotiated on the whole another level rather than.

2:29:45.6 Cathy Binder: Well, I appreciate you clarifying that. I just still, I would like to take data center out.

2:29:51.3 Mr. Minor: Understood. Yes.

2:29:51.5 Cathy Binder: My opinion.

2:29:51.7 Mr. Minor: It's the pleasure of Board.

2:29:54.3 Chairman Richard Granger: Do we have any other discussion or questions? Mr. Collins.

2:29:57.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Let's go to public hearing. Correct?

2:30:01.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Correct. This would be us directing Staff to advertise for a public hearing. Either the third or, yes, the 17th.

2:30:09.6 Mr. Minor: 17th.

2:30:09.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Or something like that.

2:30:12.4 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Hopefully, The 17th. I will be in the same realm as Ms. Binder to remove the data centers, but we'll let the public weigh in on that.

2:30:21.8 Ann Cupka: Mr. Chair motion.

2:30:24.6 Chairman Richard Granger: Go ahead.

2:30:26.0 Ann Cupka: I move to direct Staff to advertise the required public hearings for the economic incentive ordinances.

2:30:34.9 Chairman Richard Granger: What date would we like to look for that? I'm going to ask if we could push it to the second meeting in October, if everyone is amenable to that. Okay. Mr. Stonehill?

2:30:45.4 Jeffrey Stonehill: I was just going to second.

2:30:46.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Oh, okay. I apologize. So, we have a motion properly seconded. And we are looking forward to the second meeting in October, which would be the 17th. Okay. We have a motion properly seconded. Do we have any further discussion?

2:31:01.0 Cathy Binder: The only thing I wanted to say, I want to make a statement that I'm going to vote, aye for this, but I would like data centers removed. So, I'm voting Aye, to make it, to let it go to public hearing so that the public can weigh in also.

2:31:14.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you, Mrs. Binder. Any other comments or discussions?

2:31:19.4 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: I'm just going to have the same call.

2:31:22.8 Chairman Richard Granger: That's fine.

2:31:23.4 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Thank you.

2:31:23.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Fair enough. Thank you. Okay. All in favor say aye.

2:31:29.0 Ann Cupka: Aye.

2:31:29.0 Cathy Binder: Aye.

2:31:29.0 Vice Chairman Collins: Aye.

2:31:29.9 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

2:31:30.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Thank you, Mr. Minor.

2:31:34.4 Mr. Minor: Thank you.

Change Order for the Pneumatic Tubing Station in New Courthouse, Mr. Vic Mason, Clerk of Circuit Court:

2:31:34.9 Chairman Richard Granger: All right. We have a change order for the pneumatic tube station, not included in the CMAR for the new courthouse. Mr. Mason?

2:31:49.3 Mr. Vic Mason, Clerk of Circuit Court: Good evening.

2:31:49.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Good evening.

2:31:50.3 Mr. Mason: We do have a change order request. We're hoping that we'd get through the whole project without one, but we haven't. We included in the original project tubes going from the courtrooms to the offices on each floor. What we didn't think about, and I think it's probably because we're all on the first floor now, where we are, is getting them from the offices of the courtroom down to the Sheriff's Office for the transportation through. And we're requesting that \$60,000 be transferred from the contingency to the construction project. And I'd be glad to try to answer any questions. I can't tell you I will, but I'll give it a try.

2:32:31.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Mr. Mason, I appreciate you being here, and I appreciate. My first question is going to be, obviously as a CMAR, the only things that would be, change orders would be things that we didn't include. So, I was going to ask why this might have occurred. And so, I appreciate you getting ahead of that and providing that information about the current setup. And obviously that's not the desired way to go, but it's where we're at this moment. And so let me ask this then. What kind of impact would it have if it were not in place?

2:33:01.8 Mr. Mason: Then we would have to carry papers from the third floor or the second floor down to the basement physically, and it would increase a lot of Staff time. I think in the long run it's going to be a very good investment because of the efficiency it will create.

2:33:16.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. I appreciate that information. I'll let my colleagues ask any of the questions they might have though. Mr. Stonehill.

2:33:26.1 Jeffrey Stonehill: Thank you for coming out, Mr. Mason.

2:33:28.1 Mr. Mason: It's always a pleasure.

2:33:29.4 Jeffrey Stonehill: It's too bad you hadn't had better news for us, but so this is going to be just, you said to the Sheriff's Office is actually going from the courthouse to the Sheriff's Office or just downstairs?

2:33:40.4 Mr. Mason: Downstairs.

2:33:40.9 Jeffrey Stonehill: Okay. So, it's going to stay inside of the building.

2:33:43.0 Mr. Mason: Yes, it's a tube that will remain in that building. It'll be additional one. It won't be, we didn't remember the tubes. We didn't remember to think about the ones that we didn't have that we would need when we went from one floor to three stories.

2:33:56.4 Jeffrey Stonehill: Hopefully, it'll work better than the one at the Sheriff's Office now, but yes. So, it's just going to go throughout the building. So, you didn't plan on any of that in the beginning?

2:34:07.4 Mr. Mason: We planned on the, from the courtroom to the offices in each court, juvenile, general district, and circuit. But we did not consider how we were going to get the paper from those offices of those courtrooms down to the Sheriff Office for transportation back to Rappahannock Regional Jail, or wherever they were going. Because again, right now we just walked out the office right around the corner and handed it to them.

September 19, 2023
King George County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes

2:34:35.0 Jeffrey Stonehill: Thank you.

2:34:39.3 Chairman Richard Granger: Any other questions? Okay.

2:34:41.4 Mr. Mason: Thank you.

2:34:41.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Thank you, Mr. Mason.

2:34:46.4 Ann Cupka: Mr. Chair. I moved to authorize the County Administrator to transfer \$60,000 from the project contingency to project construction for the new courthouse.

2:34:56.4 Cathy Binder: Second.

2:34:56.9 Jeffrey Stonehill: Second.

2:34:57.4 Chairman Richard Granger: All right. We have a motion properly seconded. Do we have any other discussion? All in favor say aye.

2:35:03.5 Ann Cupka: Aye.

2:35:03.9 Cathy Binder: Aye.

2:35:04.4 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

2:35:04.4 Vice Chairman Collins: Aye.

2:35:04.8 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Thank you, Mr. Mason. All right. I think that was last of our action items. So, we'll move on to County Administration report. Mr. Miller.

County Administrator's Report:

2:35:15.9 Chris Miller: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, we're pulling that up. There are a couple items on here. One, that I will just tell you. Capital projects update for the to-do list. There are no real updates, so, you do have them at your desk, I believe, but there's really no change in some of these. The other items on here are, first of all, a reminder that you have a Board of Directors meeting, a joint meeting with the board of directors on the 21st. That's Thursday here in the Boardroom. Also, a reminder that next Tuesday you have a joint meeting with the Planning Commission on the second the second meeting with the Berkeley Group on your zoning overhaul. And I believe that's at six as well. Is that correct, Ms. Fish? Okay. There are two other items with actual, yes, I'm going to add another item, but one is, employee anniversaries, which is on the very back page, and you can see the various employees and their levels of service to the county. And the next item that we have is we have Ms. Southall here and she's going to give you an update on the branding effort that she's coordinating.

Communications & Community Engagement Coordinator, Ms. Amy Southall:

2:36:50.2 Ms. Southall: Good evening Members of the Board. So, you'll find in your agenda packet a brief update on where we are in the process. The main purpose of which is to update you that we will be sending two logo concepts and two tagline options for public vote starting tomorrow. And we'll be ending on October 1st, and I'll come back to present everything that we've gone through for this entire process during the October 3rd meeting. So, I open this to any questions that you have about

the process.

2:37:19.1 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So, I don't want to really talk about the process, but I do want to talk about the logo concept one and two. So King George is known for its colors, dark blue and yellow. These two things don't show me King George to be recognized when I would pull up a piece of paper that says King George. Everybody recognizes our colors. So, I'm not in favor of either one of these for that reason. If you could change all that stuff to our colors, it would be much more appetizing.

2:38:01.6 Ms. Southall: Truly noted. These are just concepts right now. I haven't been able to have my own hands on them yet. Basically, everything is inspired from the survey, didn't think of the word for a second inspired by the survey we sent out in May. And this is what the public did respond with, that we are nature based. So, I can give you options once I have hands on it for you guys to see what it looks like. But we did play around with those colors and having the traditional colors you see behind you on the seal with this new concept with nature-based that basically is what the public responded with. It does look quite different to what you would think your eyes would want to see for nature. But I am open if that is a consensus of the Board to give you that option when I present the branding part. So next time we'll just be adopting the concept and I can come back with whatever direction you guys have for that concept or whatever consensus you would like to see with options from the branding side.

2:39:05.5 Cathy Binder: Ms. Southall, understanding this is, a lot of localities are doing this, this is our traditional look and it's very official. So, this is a different way to put King George out there and just have the official seal be used for official documents. Is that correct? So, it could look different because of that?

2:39:24.2 Ms. Southall: Yes, correct. And in my presentation for the next meeting, I will go over other entities that we are familiar with that you see day-to-day that do have logos in seals and how different those look in those colors and options. And how that is different to the eye and why those are in place for different organizations.

2:39:43.0 Cathy Binder: Because I have to disagree with Mr. Collins. I like these, but I could see how the KGVA, maybe the VA could have the traditional colors in it since it's just blue. It could have those built in. But I like the land between two rivers, because That's what people remember. Thank you.

2:39:58.9 Ann Cupka: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Southall, thank you very much for your work on this. And I was going to ask you, but Ms. Binder brought it out just now that there is a difference between a seal and a logo. And you mentioned that in your Board Report here. So, we would still continue to use the official seal for Board resolutions, any official documents that require Board action, but then this is more of a marketing tool.

2:40:31.5 Ms. Southall: Correct. That is correct. So, the purpose of a seal is to commemorate your past, where you were founded, your foundation, and to continue to use that on things like you mentioned resolutions, legal documents. So that will continue to be used if that is the consensus of the Board as well to be continued to be used on agenda items and minutes, if that's considered what you guys want to be the official. But what the logo will be for the identity of who we are today. And the way that our community identifies ourselves, which was the purpose of the survey in May, was to get that overview of how everybody feels about who King George is today. And so that's what inspired the logo concepts as well as the taglines. And I'll go into depth and provide you with all of the information that we had from that survey. The survey results, the overview is available online on our

website right now, and the link is in the memo. But the exact responses that were provided from everybody will be in the overview that I have on October 3, 2023.

2:41:28.9 Ann Cupka: I agree with Ms. Binder. I really like what's been developed here. I'm not sure which one I favor more right now, one or two, but I like the direction while we still honor our history and maintain use of the official seal for official documents, I think this is a fresh path forward. Yes, thank you.

2:41:52.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: I wasn't talking about the seal whatsoever, so I don't even know how that got into the discussion. I'm talking about the logo. So, I'm still on board with what I said about the logo. The seal is going to stay the same no matter what. I'm just talking about the logo. Thank you.

2:42:12.6 Chairman Richard Granger: Do you have any other questions for Ms. Southall? All right. Thank you so much for coming out and briefing us on the concepts.

2:42:19.6 Ms. Southall: Of Course, I'll see you guys again on October 3, 2023.

2:42:21.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Sounds Good. Thank you.

CPMT Appointments by the Board of Supervisors:

2:42:22.5 Chris Miller: I Just have two more items. Well, actually three excuse me. You need to, we need to nominate or approve of the nomination of Natasha Cheek to be appointed to the King George CPMT as an alternate representative for the Court Services Unit. And this is from Ms. Kabuchi, so I would need a motion to nominate.

2:42:47.5 Cathy Binder: So, moved.

2:42:49.2 Ann Cupka: Second.

2:42:49.3 Chairman Richard Granger: We have a motion properly seconded. Do we have any discussion on this nomination or appointment? I'm sorry. All those in favor say aye.

2:42:58.0 Cathy Binder: Aye.

2:43:01.1 Ann Cupka: Aye.

2:43:01.2 Vice Chairman Collins: Aye.

2:43:01.2 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

2:43:01.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed? Chair votes. Aye. Motion carries.

2:43:05.3 Chris Miller: And then I have a second request from Ms. Kabuchi to nominate Ms. Melissa Ware to be appointed as an alternate representative to the King George Schools as an alternate CPMT.

2:43:20.9 Ann Cupka: So, moved.

2:43:22.6 Cathy Binder: Second.

2:43:23.1 Chairman Richard Granger: We have a motion properly seconded. Any discussion? All in favor say aye.

2:43:26.3 Cathy Binder: Aye.

2:43:26.3 Ann Cupka: Aye.

2:43:26.4 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

2:43:26.4 Vice Chairman Collins: Aye.

2:43:26.4 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries.

2:43:32.4 Chris Miller: The only other item I would ask is Mr. Mestler to, he didn't know this, but just to give us an update on where we are with the community development director search. As you know we've had that open and also let you know that there has been some turnover or there will be some complete turnover here this Friday. We lost one permit tech and then we're losing another one on Friday. Both situations are kind of lifestyle changes, and I don't know that there was much we could do to help keep them there. One is leaving this Friday and is going back to Kansas where she has family and where she has lived most of her life. And then the other employee, Ms. Colley was commuting in over an hour one way and now had an opportunity to work for the city of Tappahannock or the town of Tappahannock. And so, he is closer and so Derrick's crew is moving very quickly to fill those positions so that we can continue services. But I'll let you update them on the director search.

Director of Human Resources, Mr. Derrick Mestler:

2:44:51.9 Mr. Derrick Mestler: Yes. And the permit techs should be filled hopefully by, excuse me, filled by the end of this week. So, we've had some good interviews on that and hopefully get that filled. The Director's search has been going on since mid-July and we've been advertising it throughout the state. LinkedIn gets a national audience on it. We've had some response to that. Response have not been overwhelming, which is not unlike a search of this for a director role. We do have one internal applicant from our current Community Development office currently. But we are still trying to push the information out to see if we can't get a better applicant pool. Currently the applicant pool does not have experience and expertise plus leadership skills that we're looking for that role. So, it is something that we're diligently working on and trying to create a better applicant pool so that we can have some potential options for that role.

2:46:00.0 Chairman Richard Granger: Does anyone have any questions for questions for Mr. Messler? Okay. Thank you sir. Okay. Mr. Miller. Mr. Collins I think has a question. I think that was your last item.

2:46:16.9 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: No, it wasn't a question. I need to make a motion for an appointment.

2:46:20.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Oh, just to make sure. Mr. Miller, did you have anything else?

2:46:24.5 Chris Miller: That is, it.

2:46:25.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay, Mr. Collins.

2:46:26.9 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: I'd like to make a motion to appoint Roger Knicely to the Planning Commission for the James Monroe District.

2:46:34.6 Cathy Binder: I'll second.

2:46:35.4 Chairman Richard Granger: We have a motion properly seconded. Do we have any discussion? All those in favor say aye.

2:46:41.5 Cathy Binder: Aye.

2:46:42.0 Ann Cupka: Aye.

2:46:42.0 Jeffery Stonehill: Aye.

2:46:42.5 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Aye.

2:46:42.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Mr. Collins, did you have anything else?

2:46:48.4 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: No. Mr. Miller could reach out to Mr. Knicely. I don't have his contact information. Ms. Binder might?

2:46:55.9 Chris Miller: Yes sir. We will take care of that.

2:47:00.1 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Thank you.

2:47:00.8 Cathy Binder: And Mr. Miller, he's on the Parks and Rec Advisory council so you can get that from Mr. Clarke?

2:47:04.4 Chris Miller: Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

2:47:08.5 Chairman Richard Granger: Okay. In that case, I do believe we have a closed session.

Closed Session:

2:47:28.0 Cathy Binder: I move that the King George County Board of Supervisors convene to Closed Session for:

1. Proposed local incentive package for major economic development project pursuant to Va. Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(6) for discussion and consideration of investment of public funds where competition or bargaining is involved, where if made public initially, the financial interest of the County would be affected and specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice pursuant to Va. Code Section 2.2-3711(8), and
2. Consultation and briefing with legal counsel pertaining to actual or probable litigation and other legal consultation related to status of landfill host agreement negotiations pursuant to Va. Code Sections 2.2-3711(7) and 2.2-3711(8), and
3. Closed Session pursuant to State Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) for the discussion and consideration of the performance and compensation of the County Administrator.

September 19, 2023
King George County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes

I invite the County Administrator, County Attorney, Director of Solid Waste & Recycling, and Director of Economic Development & Tourism as needed, because they are deemed necessary and/or their presence will reasonably aid the Board in its consideration of one or more of the topics to be discussed, pursuant to Va. Code Section 2.2-3712(F).

2:48:50.1 Ann Cupka: Second.

2:48:50.9 Chairman Richard Granger: We have motion properly seconded. Do we have any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

2:48:55.9 Ann Cupka: Aye.

2:48:56.1 Cathy Binder: Aye.

2:48:56.5 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

2:48:56.9 Chairman Richard Granger: Any opposed?

2:48:57.9 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Nay.

2:49:00.1 Chairman Richard Granger: Chair votes aye. Motion carries. We are in closed session.

Return to Public Meeting:

4:27:36 Cathy Binder: I move that the King George County Board of Supervisors return to Public Meeting and certify by vote that only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law, and only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered during the Closed Meeting.

4:27:54 Ann Cupka: Second

4:27:55 Chairman Richard Granger: We have motion properly seconded. Do we have any further discussion? We will certify by roll call. Ms. Binder.

4:27:56 Cathy Binder: So, Certify.

4:27:59 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: So, Certify.

4:28:00 Ann Cupka: So, Certify.

4:28:03 Jeffrey Stonehill: So, Certify.

4:28:05 Chairman Richard Granger: Chair so certifies. We are in open session. Is there any other business that needs to go in front of the Board. If not, I will entertain a motion to adjourn until Thursday, September 21, 2023, at 6:00 PM in the Board Room.

KGCBOS Adjournment:

King George County Board of Supervisors
September 19, 2023
Meeting Minutes

September 19, 2023
King George County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes

4:28:20 Jeffery Stonehill: I will make a motion to adjourn to Thursday, September 21, 2023, at 6:00 PM in the Robert Combs Board Room.

4:27:54 Ann Cupka: Second

4:27:55 Chairman Richard Granger: We have motion properly seconded. Do we have any further discussion? All in favor say, aye.

4:28:30 Cathy Binder: Aye.

4:28:31 Vice Chairman T.C. Collins: Aye.

4:28:32 Ann Cupka: Aye.

4:28:33 Jeffrey Stonehill: Aye.

4:28:34 Chairman Richard Granger: Any Opposed? Chair votes aye, motion carries. We are adjourned.