

I am Joe Grzeika, first thank-you for inviting me and thanks for hosting this forum. A little about who I am - my wife and best friend Anita, have been married for over 35 years and have raised two charming daughters together. Both of whom attended and graduated from the King George public school system, our oldest attended and graduated from the University of Virginia and our youngest attended and graduated from Clemson University. They have blessed us with four grandchildren who we adore. In 1977 I was assigned to NSWC Dahlgren, and was the first enlisted sailor assigned to the Aegis project; we fell in love with the county and made it our home. Since settling in King George I have volunteered in the school system serving in several committees as well as the PTA. I was appointed to the King George Planning Commission on which I served three and a half years, three years as the chairman, I was a certified Planning Commissioner in Virginia. I am currently in my 12th year as supervisor for the James Madison District, elected for three terms by my constituents.

I hold a Bachelors Degree from Mary Washington. I was one of 6 individuals who built a business that exceeded \$30 million in revenue before we were acquired. Today I am an independent consultant assisting a small business to establish it's presence in the Dahlgren market place. I also am supporting a client in the DC arena and helping them to build their company. I bring a "real world" understanding of business to this position. I am engaged in the community both from a governmental and a business perspective.

I want to take a moment to explain my votes tonight, the questions presented are very relevant to the position of Board of Supervisor's member, and unfortunately they are very broad and require more specific information and circumstances to yield a simple yes or no answer.

If my answer has the yes or no card in a straight up an down fashion then I am answering directly yes or no as signified, however, if my cards are both presented and they are sideways it indicates that the question is to broad or not enough information is provided to make an informed and appropriate yes/no decision. If allowed I would be happy to expand on the issue and what data would be required to provide a yes no answer. Again I want to thank-you for sponsoring this event.

1. Should proffers be the primary source for financing of new infrastructure?

Given that proffers are legally a voluntary commitments made by a developer when pursuing a project, and almost always apply only when a rezoning for increased density is involved, the developer can offer to finance all new infrastructure required for the proposed development. As it relates to sewer and water infrastructure any new development proposed should fund 100% of the water and sewer facilities needed to service the project. In fact, this has been our policy in King George for nearly 10 years, and we also require such facilities to be turned over to the Service Authority upon completion. As for the other pieces of infrastructure such as schools, libraries, fire and rescue and public safety proffers should provide for a fair share of the projects impacts on these. In King George we do calculate annually using formulas dictated by the Code of Virginia proffer amounts based upon our Capital Improvements Plan. These proffer guideline amounts are developed using a sophisticated model for use by the development community to better understand the cost impact of their developments. The needs of the county for schools, libraries, fire and rescue and public safety are budgeted based on the existing zoning and the by right growth we can anticipate using the growth projections, facility age and life expectancy and needs identified in our Capital Improvements Plan. We are not reliant on or do we depend on proffers as part of our business model, they are evaluated as part of any rezoning - if we feel the rezoning fits within the county then we try to ensure that cash proffers offered are enough to cover the impact that would arise if the project were approved.

2. Would you endorse the use of TIF's? CDAs? Special Tax Ditriacts?

Community Development Authority for Construction projects, Tax Increment Financing which relies upon the additional revenue of the growth to pay the financing off.

It would depend on the project, its need and ability to be successful and not have an impact on the county taxpayer or the county's credit. Let me underscore that last point: Any use of a special tax district, no matter what it is called, would have to be targeted to a specific and explicitly defined area and purpose, whose facilities would be used by a specific group of residents who themselves, and them alone, would be liable for the repayment of any fees or assessments. I would support nothing that poses either a direct or indirect threat to King George taxpayers at large and our and hard won credit rating.

3. Currently, BPOL tax is assessed on growth business receipts without regard to whether a company makes a profit. Does this tax hurt the business environment of your jurisdiction?

The structure of the BPOL tax is provided to us by the commonwealth; it certainly is open to debate as to its structure and reliance on Gross Receipts rather another metric. I would be open to a repeal of the BPOL, but I would then also have to ask you exactly how we would replace those lost revenues? Pushing that burden back onto our property owners isn't acceptable, so in my mind discussing a repeal of the BPOL is really more of an academic exercise unless you tell me how that revenue would be replaced without increasing our local property taxes. We court businesses to our county for jobs of course, but also to diversify and broaden our tax base. We value our businesses but like our citizens they also share in the costs of the services the county provides. It would be unfair to not tax our corporate citizens at the expense of the residents. I believe it is well understood by all companies that a part of the business expense is tax and as long as all of the competitors are treated the same it does not impact the business from a competitiveness basis. I do not believe that because we employ the BPOL tax that we are losing businesses or creating an unhealthy business environment. If we look at our neighbors most have BPOL, Stafford being the exception - but are costs in King George are still less when all factors are considered.

4. Do you support set asides for affordable and workforce housing in new developments.

Yes, as long as they are offered voluntarily by the developer, I would not mandate or set a ratio that would be required. Developers need to be able to propose developments that will be successful and if the affordable/workforce component fits all the better. A large question is the definition and meaning of affordable or workforce housing.

5. Do you support the reduction or elimination of proffers for affordable or workforce housing?

Since proffers are voluntary by definition - each developer must make the decision on what will be proffered. I would submit that the terms affordable/workforce housing needs to be defined I know of no agreed to or codified definition. These terms all sound good on paper and each person has a very different idea on what they mean. The bottom line is what the developer means by them. As to the premise of the question I fail to see how offering a given type of unit diminishes the stress on the county infrastructure and I personally would be swayed very little by these types of offers. What I would look for is legal, enforceable and unchangeable conditions that would guarantee that the developer would really provide what was offered. Too often we have been told about what the development would be in the proposal stage of the process but then what is actually built is not quite the same as was proposed.

6. Do you support density bonuses for affordable/workforce housing.

As I stated in the previous question it is the developer's decision on what type of development works from a business perspective. I do not see any logic in providing a density bonus when in fact the impacts to the infrastructure need to be addressed regardless of types of units and then to add density just compounds these impacts. The idea that a development gets a density bonus bringing more units and increased cost is not something I would embrace, I feel it is unfair to the folks who live here now and they would be subsidizing these increases in density through their property taxes.

7. If a proposed mixed use development contains 10% workforce housing & commercial development, is that acceptable?

This question is so ambiguous it is difficult to answer without specifics. For instance, where would this project be in the county, would it fit with the community that it is being proposed for. What type of commercial development? How large a development is it and what does 10% mean in terms of number of units? Why not 20%? Why not 30%? Where does your 10% threshold come from? Does size or revenues form the commercial component? Is the commercial component purely speculative or is there an identified business that has agreed to be part of the proposed development? Then I would have to see the notional plan for the development to gain an understanding of just what was being proposed. Part of the problem we face as supervisors is that there are folks who believe cookie cutter formulas or hard percentage of given attributes make a plan acceptable and approval is all but guaranteed. I appreciate the cost in building the developer's proposal, but that cost is an overhead that each developer must be able to sustain even if some projects are not approved. At the end of the day one of the functions we supervisor's are entrusted with by the citizens who elect us is to maintain the character and vitality of our county, we make our best judgment each time we look at a request to strike that balance.

8. Would you support down zoning outside of a primary settlement area?

Once again with out specifics it is difficult to provide a yes no answer. I would have to see where the proposed down zoning is proposed, if it is an agricultural area that would reduce residential density I might, if it were in an area we are targeting commercial and industrial I might not. I would need all of the rational and reasons for the request to make an educated and informed decision.

9. Would you compensate property for any down zoning?

Currently I know of no provision in the code of Virginia to provide compensation in a down zoning, it is not clear if the down zoning was requested or pursued by the county or what the reasons were.

10. Would you support a regional comprehensive plan?

What exactly do you mean by a "Regional Comprehensive Plan"? Here again is a question with no definition or background on what this "Regional Comprehensive Plan" is, who develops and approves it, what is the region is PDC 16 or is it the region that is comprised of counties/towns and cities that share a common border? On its face I do not believe I would support a regional comprehensive plan. In my experience one size rarely fits all when it comes to local planning policies. I support regional cooperation but I was elected by the citizens of King George and my duty is to them. When you start down the path of a regional comprehensive plan the overall force embodied in the plan would need to be understood, would some regional entity not elected by the

residents of the region be able to have conditions in the regional plan that would impact how the localities could govern their community. Who would pay for the development of such a plan, would the cost be shared equally or on a pro rata basis for the member of the region or would this regional group somehow tax the region? In today's world our local comprehensive plans are shaped and used to guide us in the development of the county, our local plan is not proscriptive but rather provides a long view of where the community would like to see itself and is used by both the planning commission and the board of supervisors to aid them in evaluating projects and plans to see how they fit with this community's vision for the future. A regional comprehensive plan sounds good but in reality each locality is unique and wants to stay unique, they cherish their community and its character and they are not likely to cede their desires to a regional plan that may or may not align with their visions.

**11. Would you increase the urban service area if the criterion is for build out at 80%? 70%
60%**

We don't have an Urban Service area in King George, so this is a question that really doesn't apply to our local circumstances, and actually highlights for instance why I would have reservations about a Regional Comprehensive Plan.

12. Would you support up-zoning in the primary settlement area?

Again not enough information to answer the question, would need all of the specifics to understand and evaluate the resulting impacts.

13. Would you support the use of eminent domain in the case of private property taken for public use (such as schools, roads, utilities, etc?)

Yes, but only as a last resort taken ONLY after all measures to acquire the property were exhausted before condemnation.

14. Would you support the use of eminent domain to transfer private property to another private property holder (such as Kelo vs New London, CT)?

No I would not, unlike my opponent who has said in public on several occasions that King George should condemn the trail property and give it to adjacent landowners. Remember, land taken by eminent domain – for any purpose – must be paid for – property owners must be compensated for the action.