



Gmail

Bryan Wilson <bwilson@burnetcountytexas.org>

Fwd: Howdy, Please consider what I have composed for the next meeting. Agenda item 13

1 message

Jason Christopher <saintjcp@gmail.com>
 To: Bryan Wilson <bwilson@burnetcountytexas.org>

Mon, Sep 29, 2025 at 10:25 PM

Hey Judge Wilson, I thought I would share the message I sent to Damon to you to see if it would help to add it to any of the written comments, or if it should be considered in the defense of my position that we should not be spending on these unnecessary things.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jason Christopher <saintjcp@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Sep 29, 2025 at 10:18 PM

Subject: Re: Howdy, Please consider what I have composed for the next meeting. Agenda item 13

To: Damon Beierle <dbeierle@burnetcountytexas.org>

Hey Mr. Beierle, thanks for replying. I shared some thoughts below in blue.

Good morning,

Email or phone calls are always good ways to communicate.

Nice, I appreciate that. And I want to say based on the few videos of the commissioners meetings I have watched, you seem to be putting in the most effort and you are the most caring out of the commissioners. And the way you handled the situation when we were judgeless I think you did a great job. I am curious who's initiative it was to start doing the live stream of the meetings?

1. Chamber contracts and marketing contracts are funded by the property owners via Hotel/Motel tax. These are highly restricted funds to marketing and putting more heads in beds. No taxpayer funds are used.

A dollar the government collects in HOT is a dollar the county taxpayer is relieved from paying. To treat it as disposable marketing money is to admit the county sees taxes not as a duty to citizens, but as a slush fund for private contracts.

2. I believe the tire trailer is a 48' box trailer. They charge a flat rate instead of per tire which saves us a lot of money, we fill it up completely.

Thank you for clarifying on the trailer size and flat rate, but I think the larger issues remain unanswered:

- Are there any criminal charges or civil actions being pursued against this company regarding the catastrophic tire fire?
- Shouldn't they have a legal and moral debt to service for the damage they caused to public health, property values, and the environment? Groundwater contamination is inevitable, and even just driving by on 29 exposes people to known carcinogens.
- Why is the county outsourcing this at all? Doesn't the county already own trailers? Couldn't the Community Service Division schedule collection days and use participants to help with offloading?
- The contract says the trailer will only be there from Friday to Monday. Will citizens be invited to drop off their tires during that window to fill it up?

3. For many years the SO has been working towards having enough deputies to cover the precincts more equitably, including the rural parts. As a Commissioner whose precinct is mostly rural, I've been a supporter of this initiative and very glad we were able to accomplish this.

Commissioner, I'm not questioning the importance of public safety, but your comment raises serious concerns.

You're essentially saying the Sheriff's Office has been lobbying for years to get more deputies — but lobbying based on what unmet need? My girlfriend and her nurse colleagues don't get to lobby taxpayers to hire more nurses, even though they work alongside deputies in many situations. If they don't agree this expenditure is necessary, why should taxpayers consider it pressing?

The way you seemed so motivated to shift funds — cutting here, cutting there to make room — is exactly how the *entire* budget should be handled. If something can be eliminated because it isn't absolutely necessary, then we need to remove it.

We're talking about spending \$400,000 of taxpayer money for something that may shave a minute or two off response times that are already reasonable. What crimes actually require that marginal improvement? This isn't Chicago. Violent, life-or-death emergencies are rare here.

And I don't want to hear that SB-22 will cover a portion. State or federal, it's still taxpayer money.

Organizations naturally tend toward overreach, as history shows. The chief himself said, "*we fly our drones almost every single day.*" How does that square with needing more boots on the ground? If drones are flying daily, it looks less like a manpower shortage and more like mission creep — an obsession with surveillance and authority at taxpayers' expense.

It's hard not to see this as dystopian. The Founding Fathers would never have greenlit government drones buzzing over citizens' private property.

This appears to be overreach: lobbying for more deputies not because there's a demonstrated crisis but because expanding bodies and gadgets increases the agency's footprint and sense of authority.

Meanwhile, people doing selfless work — like nursing aides taking care of the elderly — get nothing but an outrageous property tax bill to pay for "tourism marketing" and other nonessential spending.

Our county is beautiful; it doesn't need taxpayer money to advertise. That's something the private sector already does for free. Beauty sells itself. The last thing we should do is invite gentrification by marketing to a higher-earning demographic.

That is not the kind of priority or stewardship I expect from county government.

Sincerely, JC

On Fri, Sep 26, 2025 at 7:21 AM Damon Beierle <dbeierle@burnetcountytexas.org> wrote:

Good morning,

Email or phone calls are always good ways to communicate.

1. Chamber contracts and marketing contracts are funded by the property owners via Hotel/Motel tax. These are highly restricted funds to marketing and putting more heads in beds. No taxpayer funds are used.

2. I believe the tire trailer is a 48' box trailer. They charge a flat rate instead of per tire which saves us a lot of money, we fill it up completely.

3. For many years the SO has been working towards having enough deputies to cover the precincts more equitably including the rural parts.
As a Commissioner whose precinct is mostly rural, I've been a supporter of this initiative and very glad we were able to accomplish this.

Feel free to call anytime to learn more and discuss any issues you have.

512-715-2611

Damon Beierle
Burnet County Commissioner Pct. 2
512-715-2611 cell
www.burnetcountytexas.org

9/30/25, 7:42 AM

Burnet County Mail - Fwd Howdy, Please consider what I have composed for the next meeting. Agenda item 13

Typos courtesy of my iPhone

On Thu, Sep 25, 2025 at 6:16 PM Jason Christopher <saintjcp@gmail.com> wrote:

Howdy,

I am unsure if this is the proper method of communicating, but please consider what I have composed in the attached pdfs. I have spent the last 3 hours drafting my case and I hope to have my case considered in the next meeting. If you find any holes in my case please let me know. I'll be happy to hear your thoughts!

I am eager to shine the light on fraud, waste and abuse that runs rampant within the government. I believe in "One Nation under God", and I thank you for your time gentlemen.

Sincerely,

JC



Madeline Parker <mjparker@burnetcountytexas.org>

Howdy, Please consider what I have composed for the next meeting. Agenda item 13

Jason Christopher <saintjcp@gmail.com>

Thu, Sep 25, 2025 at 6:16 PM

To: countyjudge@burnetcountytexas.org, commissionerpct1@burnetcountytexas.org, dbeierle@burnetcountytexas.org, commissionerpct3@burnetcountytexas.org, jdockery@burnetcountytexas.org

Howdy,

I am unsure if this is the proper method of communicating, but please consider what I have composed in the attached pdfs. I have spent the last 3 hours drafting my case and I hope to have my case considered in the next meeting. If you find any holes in my case please let me know. I'll be happy to hear your thoughts!

I am eager to shine the light on fraud, waste and abuse that runs rampant within the government. I believe in "One Nation under God", and I thank you for your time gentlemen.

Sincerely,

JC

2 attachments



Proposed Action for Agenda Item 13 (1).pdf
116K



Proposed Objection Regarding Sheriff Hiring and Lobbying Influence.pdf
51K

Proposed Action for Agenda Item 13

Subject: Objection to Contracts, Agreements, and Grants Listed for Approval/Ratification

Recommended Action: I propose that the appropriate action regarding the following contracts (listed below) is to **repeal every single one of them**. (except line item "I")

A–E: Chamber of Commerce Lodging Promotion Agreements (\$45,000)

- **\$10,000 – Bertram Chamber of Commerce**
- **\$5,000 – Buchanan Dam Chamber of Commerce**
- **\$10,000 – Burnet Chamber of Commerce**
- **\$10,000 – Kingsland Chamber of Commerce**
- **\$10,000 – Marble Falls/Highland Lakes Area Chamber of Commerce**

Rationale:

1. Services already offered freely by private platforms.

- In 2025, travelers use platforms like Google Maps, Yelp, TripAdvisor, Airbnb, and VRBO to find lodging.
- These platforms provide:
 - Detailed property information, photos, and reviews.
 - Direct updates by property owners themselves.
 - Free access for the public without taxpayer funding.

2. No Public Benefit:

- Taxpayer dollars are subsidizing private vacation rentals.

- These agreements primarily benefit real estate investors and the Chambers' marketing firms, not residents.
- Promoting private properties contributes to gentrification pressures and indirectly increases costs and potential crime risks.

3. Inefficiency and Waste:

- These funds do not improve public services or safety.

Recommendation:

- Repeal all the above service agreements.
- Property promotion should be funded by property owners if they choose.
- This will save taxpayers tens of thousands annually without reducing public access to lodging information.

F: Household Hazardous Waste Tire Collection – Reliable Tire (\$2,500)

Concerns:

- Contract lacks transparency and specificity:
 - Trailer size is not stated.
 - Cost inclusions for tire disposal are unclear.
 - Handling of recycled material is unspecified.
- Potential for **wasteful spending** and misuse of taxpayer funds.

Additional Note:

- If these are the parties that sparked the horrific ecological disaster, they should be **legally and morally obligated** to remedy any damage and should not be changing the county until a restituted amount is assigned. It is incalculable considering how much cancer will be resulting from the carcinogens expelled.

G: FY26 Pest Control Services – Circle S Pest Control, Inc. (\$11,968)

Concerns:

- Routine chemical spraying, glue boards, rodent baiting, and fire ant treatments pose **health risks** to employees, visitors, and the environment.
- Contract contains financially abusive provisions:
 - 1-hour minimum labor charge.
 - 10% markup on chemical products.
- A safer, cost-effective alternative exists: hiring a qualified handyman (such as myself) to inspect properties and apply **preventive sealants**.

Recommendation:

- Eliminate the contract.
 - Replace with a **preventive maintenance program** using structural sealing and practical measures to prevent pest entry.
-

H: Burnet County Tourism and Marketing FY26 Agreement – Victory Media Marketing (\$42,000)

Concerns:

- Services are **not necessary** for county operations.
- Benefits are limited to:
 - Individuals and companies receiving guaranteed payments for minimal work.
 - Private lodging and vacation rental owners, whose businesses are subsidized by taxpayers.
- This practice shifts money **upward from residents to private businesses**, not tourism development.

Recommendation:

- Repeal this agreement.
- Stop subsidizing private profits with public funds.

Conclusion:

All listed contracts and agreements represent **redundant, unnecessary, or potentially hazardous expenditures**. Public benefit is negligible or non-existent. Eliminating these agreements would:

- Reduce wasteful spending.
- Protect public health.
- Ensure taxpayer funds serve the **interests of residents, not private investors**.

Total amount of funds proposed to be saved = \$101,468

Proposed Objection Regarding Sheriff Hiring and Lobbying Influence

Issue: Approval of hiring four new sheriff deputies.

Objection / Rationale:

1. **No demonstrated public necessity:** Current response times are acceptable. Additional deputies will not meaningfully improve public safety or emergency response.
2. **Excessive influence of lobbying:** The decision appears driven by lobbying efforts rather than demonstrated need. Public testimony at meetings is not necessarily representative of the county's residents; it is heavily influenced by organized lobbying interests seeking political leverage.
3. **Privacy and surveillance concerns:** Increased law enforcement presence is coupled with expanded drone surveillance and use of infrared and LiDAR technologies. These measures risk intrusive mapping and monitoring of private residences, raising serious civil liberties concerns.
4. **Fiscal responsibility:** Hiring additional deputies increases payroll and benefits costs, ultimately raising property taxes. Funding should prioritize proven public needs rather than political objectives or marginal gains in response time.

Recommendation:

- Repeal or reconsider approval of hiring four new deputies.
- Require any expansion of law enforcement personnel to be based on clear, quantifiable public safety needs and transparent public input, not lobbying pressure.

Conclusion:

The decision to expand the sheriff's office in this manner is not aligned with fiscal prudence, public necessity, or civil liberties protection. It should be rescinded or reviewed with full transparency and accountability.