BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 17, 2021

CALL TO ORDER – A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Crystal Vanuch, Chairman, at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 17, 2021 in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

ROLL CALL – The following members were present: Crystal Vanuch, Chairman; Cindy C. Lamb, Vice Chairman; Meg Bohmke; Thomas C. Coen; L. Mark Dudenhefer; and Gary F. Snellings. Absent: Tinesa O. Allen.

Also in attendance were Frederick J. Presley, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Cheryl Giles, Deputy Clerk; Julia Homes, Assistant Deputy Clerk; various staff members; and other interested parties.

Ms. Vanuch stated that they were seeing a rise in COVID case numbers in the Rappahannock Area Health District in Stafford County. She said that the County urges people to get vaccinated, and she thanked them for doing their part in eradicating the virus.

Ms. Vanuch announced that Stafford County was the recipient of the Virginia Association of Counties (VACO) 2021 achievement awards. She explained that the County had previously received national recognition for their wastewater plant facility virtual field trip for children, and they were now being recognized on the state level. She said that the VACO awards were very competitive, and this was indeed a true honor. Ms. Vanuch stated that the virtual field trip was in response to COVID, and they were pleased the program could be used as a blueprint for other localities to do something similar.

Ms. Vanuch reported that a terrible storm had hit the South Stafford area a few weeks before, and thanked staff and residents on behalf of the entire Board for dropping everything to assist the aftermath. She said that there were no major injuries or loss of life from the storm, luckily, but a few individuals did lose their homes.

PRESENTATIONS - Ms. Vanuch presented a proclamation for International Assistance Dog Week and said that the FRK9 organization and several dogs and their handlers from public safety were present at the meeting.

Ms. Vanuch stated that FRK9 is a local nonprofit that provides purpose-bred service dogs to first responders that have incurred life-altering injuries. She said that the organization gives the dogs free of cost, and she introduced Director of Training James Kennedy and President and CEO Allison Cutright, as well as the FRK9 dog, Medic. She also introduced Master Deputy Bo Truslow and his dog Rip, who was waiting in the car; and Deputy Baris Demirci, whose dog Titan was also in the car. She introduced Jeffrey Stocker, a technician from fire and rescue, and the dog Larry, who was donated by FRK9 in June. Ms. Vanuch also recognized Duchess, who belonged to Mr. Gouldman.

Ms. Vanuch said that Stafford has supported FRK9 and their support dogs, including Larry, who was donated to them—and there is a video available on the Stafford website that features the dogs and the programs. Ms. Vanuch read a proclamation into the record that recognized FRK9 and honored the role of service dogs in aiding individuals with disabilities.

Ms. Allison Cutright addressed the Board and stated that FRK9 is a local nonprofit that trains service dogs and peer support dogs for departments such as law enforcement and fire. She said that Medic was the newest FRK9 recruit and would be an ambassador for the organization, with other new recruits going on to be service and peer support dogs.

Mr. Jeffrey Stocker introduced Larry, stating that he is a fire department canine and is used for peer support, working in their health and wellness programs.

Deputy Fire Marshal Ben Gouldman introduced Duchess and stated that she is used for arson investigations, searching for the presence of ignitable liquids that start fires.

Master Deputy Bo Truslow introduced Rip and stated that he is a patrol explosives canine and is a Belgian Malinois.

Mr. Baris Demirci introduced Titan and said that he is a three-year-old shepherd who is also an explosives patrol dog.

Ms. Vanuch thanked them for attending and for all they do for the community.

Next, Ms. Vanuch recognized Deputy Chief Andrew Milliken, who has served as chair of the Virginia Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Subcommittee—reviewing and coordinating over 1,000 amendment proposals to the statewide fire prevention code in 2020. She stated that as part of his efforts, he was awarded the Excellence in Virginia Community Risk Reduction Award as part of the Governor's Fire Service Awards. Ms. Vanuch read a proclamation recognizing Chief Milliken into the record.

Chief Milliken thanked the Board for the recognition, stating that community risk reduction is much more than just codes and standards, rules and regulation: It is education, engineering, enforcement, investigations, inspections, and everything that that the Fire Marshal's Office does every day to keep Stafford a safe place for living, working, and playing.

ADDITIONS – DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA - Mr. Presley informed the Board that there were no additions or deletions to the agenda.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Lamb, to adopt the regular agenda as presented.
The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, Dudenhefer, Lamb, Snellings, Vanuch
Nay:	(0)	
Absent:	(1)	Allen

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC – Ms. Vanuch read the protocol for presentations by the public.

1. Ms. Karen Alexander, 45 Morningmist Drive, (Hartwood District) addressed the Board and said that she was frustrated that the discussion on Critical Race Theory had already been tabled twice, and she felt that Stafford residents deserved answers on what was being taught in schools. She said that her daughter graduated from Colonial Forge High School, and she was very concerned about the direction that education was going in the County. She stated that she was a political science and history student in college and studied Marxist revolutions during that time; one of the things they all had in common was dividing people—either through economic class, race, or ethnic group—and every time in history, it has ended horribly. Ms. Alexander urged the Board to not allow any funding to go to Critical Race Theory in schools, as it is divisive and abusive to children, as it tells them they do not have the agency to make changes in their own lives, and that they are hobbled with system racism, which she does not believe is true.

2. Ms. Julia Schweiter, 6 Regal Court, (Aquia District) stated that she has three Brookpoint High School students, all of whom have been asked their pronouns in class, and her neighbors' kindergarteners were asked by their teachers whether they were a boy or girl once they were away from their parents. She stated that the "subversive approach" that the CRT that NEA appears to be taking includes teachers using the bully pulpit in their classrooms to present and perpetuate their personal views on racial inequality. Ms. Schweider said that in the past 12 months, two out of her three children have been engaged

in Spanish and English classes to participate in direct discussions about racial inequality that specifically cited persons of color as the victims and whites as the aggressors. She said that in both instances, the topics discussed were of now direct relationship to the course materials being taught—and both were being presented with a specific political perspective, which forced the children to either not participate or to take an opposing view to the teacher's very obvious position.

Ms. Schweiter said that in both instances, she and her husband have addressed this with the teacher and administrators, but the VEA has instructed teachers that they're not allowed to tell parents their child's pronoun. She stated that the VEA also will not differentiate between sexes during overnight trips, which means girls can be put with boys on the school trip. She said that the VEA also wants to get rid of advanced classes in the name of "equity and outcomes," which are all advanced components of CRT. She stated that the NEA has announced it has backed the teaching of CRT and the 1619 project, which is a reframing of history that puts agendas over accuracy, in all 50 states and 14,000 local school districts. Ms. Schweider said that the NEA has joined with Black Lives Matter to create a national day of action on George Floyd's birthday and have created an early childhood curriculum to teach transgenderism. She stated that these policies don't belong in schools, and you cannot separate CRT and BLM, as they are tied together in the NEA through the ZIN project. She emphasized that anything that promotes equity of outcomes over opportunity and outcomes based on individual performance and character doesn't belong in the schools or in America.

3. Ms. Maureen Sickmen (Aquia District) addressed the Board and said that CRT is a hot button, media-fed issue that has parents concerned. She said that many parents had the opportunity to ridge shotgun to their children's education over the past year, and some had a glimpse of things that raise concern. She stated that parents have brought these to teachers, school administration, and the County, and they were told that it's not happening. Ms. Sickmen said that she has had the opportunity to interact with other families, and she has learned that one tenet of CRT is focused on teaching honest history, and no one has a problem with that, as they don't want a Disney or dishonest version of history. She said that another tenet of CRT is the concept of intrinsic or inherent bias—and no one wants their children to be taught that they are inherently biased against another person for any other reason.

   Ms. Sickmen stated that she had teachers who were concerned that they were going to have to start teaching this because they had received professional development on their own inherent biases and how to recognize them in others. She mentioned that they were also being taught that their biases were contributing to the "weaknesses" in their own schools—

either attendance issues, violence issues, or test scores. Ms. Sickmen said that the professional development is being provided by the County through advocates who are available at every school level and conduct this training to the school population. She stated that these advocates are paid a stipend of $1,500 or a minimum of $45,000 annually for the 30 K-12 buildings. She said that it may not sound like much, but the teacher mentors are paid $100, in contrast—and she would like to know what that says about their priorities.

Ms. Sickmen emphasized that if people have a problem with Family Life curriculum, parents can opt out; they may also choose not to opt in African American history. She stated that this is also in contrast to the CRT curriculum, whereby parents are told those things are not even happening. She said that families paid $85 for their 2020 yearbooks and found BLM protest photos and teachers protesting, with the phrase, "We can not all matter until each of us individually matters." Ms. Sickmen emphasized that the last thing parents wanted was surprises; they want to know where kids are getting off the school bus and want a level of trust. She stated that she was disappointed that Dr. Kisner was not permitted to attend this meeting, and she felt that an open and honest discussion was important.

4. Mr. David Andresco (Garrisonville District) addressed the Board and stated that based on the CRT, a few members shouldn't even be on the Board—and half of them only are there because they are white males. Mr. Andresko stated that each and every one was there because they were elected, not because of the color of their skin or gender, and they were there because of their policies. He emphasized that the "race industry" was a billion-dollar industry, and it was very lucrative to keep people divided. He said that if they are divided, they can't see the actual people causing problems because they're too busy fighting with their neighbors. Mr. Andresko said that he has a friend whose company hit hard times during the COVID year 2020 and decided to go down the diversity and inclusion path—and they had the most profitable quarter in the company's history, because corporations pay thousands of dollars to come in and talk about white male status, women of color, race and gender theory, toxic masculinity, etc. He stated that red ants and black ants won't fight with each other until someone comes along and shakes up the jar, and he asked that they "not shake the jar."

REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS - Board members spoke on related topics and asked that items as identified be removed from the Consent Agenda for discussion and separate vote:

Ms. Bohmke welcomed everyone back from summer recess and said it was good to see her colleagues. She stated that the Board worked in the summer even though no one saw them, as there was never a dull moment in Stafford County. Ms. Bohmke said that she would share information about Virginia Career Works – Bay Consortium. She explained that she sits on this committee and was in Warsaw for a meeting, and the general manager of Carry-on Trailers said that they had all these trailers but had no workers to put the tires on. She said that she came back to Fredericksburg and did some digging, and she surmised that the reason for worker shortages was that people were continuing to collect unemployment.

She said that Jane Yaun, executive director of the Rappahannock Community Services Board, an important partner in Planning District 16, indicated that they have 122 openings out of 561 positions. Ms. Bohmke said that some positions are entry level, some are direct-support professionals in group homes, some are therapists, etc. She stated that they are offering $1,000 bonuses for new hires and bonuses of $500, $750, and $1,000 for people already in the system. She said that if an employee left for over six months, they are trying to hire you back with a $1,000 bonus. She stated that they are giving a $500 referral bonus to people also.

Ms. Bohmke stated that she was mentioning this because of Virginia Career Works, a one-stop shop for employment located in the old Capital One building in Massaponax behind Lees Hill Medical Center. She said that she had received an email from LifePort transport that thanked her for sharing the information, stating that they had picked up some great employees who had come through Virginia Career Works. She encouraged people to direct job seekers to the organization, which is set up all online, as they will help from start to finish. Ms. Bohmke stated that she prayed the President did not extend unemployment, because it was really hurting companies.

Mr. Coen stated that Ms. Allen had communicated to staff and the Board that she had asked staff to look into what could be done to assist with residents of the rural area, particularly Widewater, to get the power back on in a timelier manner.

Mr. Coen said that he volunteers with the schools to help students find their buses, but when he went out a week ago, there were no buses in the bus loop—only cars up and down Courthouse Road. He said that he has been voluntarily going out to help and keep traffic off of Courthouse Road and then out as safely as possible. Mr. Coen stated that in listening to families, parents and students are frustrated that a basic fundamental bond in terms of getting student to and from school has been destroyed in the last week. He said that many of them are looking at alternatives to the public school system, which is very disappointing. He reported that some students had missed every first period for the first week of school; transfer students have missed classes or have been stranded at other schools.

Mr. Coen emphasized that members of this Board have been strongly pressing the schools to compensate bus drivers more reasonably, and they also forced and pressed that other pay for personnel, which ended up being people standing out in the road dealing with the cars, would get a worthwhile compensation. He praised the bus drivers for their work, noting that they drove around their routes the weeks before school started to get to know them—and many drivers have had additional routes thrown at them at the last minute, which some having three, four, and five routes given to them in the span of less than a week. Yet, he said, they are still coming back. He stated that he appreciated what they were trying to do to get children to and from school safely.

Mr. Coen said that on a good day if you look outside, you will see school employees directing traffic and will also see people almost run them over because they don't pay attention to employees blowing whistles and yelling at them to stop. He stated that those employees also were not paid a lot but continued to come in, and additional employees were staying later than their normal work hours to be in the cafeteria to help students—with one school having more than 500 children waiting for buses after 3:45 p.m., when school gets out at 3:30. He also commended school resource officers the previous Monday for helping to manage the unfolding chaos and went out to help, and they got on their walkie-talkies to call the sheriff and get more assistance. He stated that the Board is not in charge of things in the school division and can only use the bully pulpit, but they need to do what they can.

Mr. Dudenhefer deferred his remarks.

Ms. Lamb reported that the Board had continued to meet throughout the recess, particularly on all the transportation committees. She stated that at their FAMPO meeting the previous night, they looked at their new list of Smart Scale projects for funding, and she urged them all to get more involved in transportation. She said that if you Google "FAMPO," the results would bring you to all the project submissions, not just Stafford but also Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania. She stated that why this is important is because every one of these projects is integrated. She said that they have to deal with Route 1 as well as I-95.

Ms. Lamb also stated that she would like to pull Item 5 from the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Snellings thanked all of the fire and rescue first responders and all the staff who helped with the July 29th storm, as it was pretty horrific in his district—with Truslow Road almost wiped out, heavy damage to Sanford Drive, and a lot of people losing homes. He stated that they would discuss Critical Race Theory later in their agenda, but someone had made a comment that the Board was "postponing it again," and he was the one who had added it to the agenda, but the reason they were postponing it was because the School Board asked Dr. Kizner not to attend this meeting so that the School Board could be briefed first. Mr. Snellings stated that the School Board would be briefed on August 24, then the item would come back to the Board on September 7.

Ms. Vanuch said that regardless of constituents' political perspective, she felt the need to address the situation in Afghanistan, as the area has a significant population of military, former military, and civilian residents who have served in the Middle East and other places. She said that in their real estate tax records, they provide $9 million in relief to service-connected veterans, and their military and civilian men and women who have served there have done so in great sacrifice—both to their families and themselves. She said that many still struggle with the aftermath of war, and as the wife of a Marine who served in the Middle East, she has seen how tough this week has been, and some may have a harder time than others. Ms. Vanuch asked the community to support and pray for these veterans, who accomplished their mission and did so valiantly. She said that in addition to military, she would be remiss in not acknowledging the sadness and fear that Afghani residents are feeling right now. She stated that many have helped troops with translation or intel, or even fought alongside soldiers, and they are terrified for their family and friends who have been left there. Ms. Vanuch said we can do nothing over here except pray for their healing.

Ms. Vanuch stated that her second comment was related to transportation at the schools, and she wanted to share an issue that happened in her district. She explained that on Thursday, she had a young 6th grade girl dropped 3.1 miles away from home at a 7-Eleven and was told to walk home on the west end of Route 610, where there is no sidewalk and where it is one of the top 10 most dangerous stretches of road in the County. She said that fortunately, this girl had a cell phone and called her mother instead of taking the advice to walk home. Ms. Vanuch emphasized that the Board and residents deserve answers. She stated that the Board fully funded the schools this year and they have been told numerous times at the School Board meeting that this situation was not the result of funding, so Supervisors and parents want and deserve an answer—and they deserve to make sure this never happens again.

Ms. Vanuch said that she believes there needs to be a special independent investigation done, with results reported back to the Board and the public given full transparency. She stated that whether there was one thing that went wrong or 10, they need answers, and she said that she would be pursuing it and bringing it back to the Board on the September 7 agenda for a vote.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY – Ms. McClendon deferred her remarks.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR – Mr. Presley reported that he had provided the Board with the list of expenditures over $100,000 and would continue to do that on a monthly basis. He said that for the remainder of his time, he would refer to Budget and Management Director Andrea Light, who would provide the Board and citizens with a new system for budget documents, which is a step forward for Stafford that provides information in a usable format for the public.

REVIEW OF THE ONLINE BUDGET BOOK – Ms. Andrea Light stated that this has been about a two-month process that has involved many departments and has much support from community engagement. She recognized Renee Rosales, Diana Green, Kim Herman, Ariane Cooper, and Donna Olsen, the members of the Budget and Management team who have put a lot into this over the summer. She noted that nothing would be possible in Stafford County without them.

Ms. Light presented the online budget book, stating that it could be found once Community Engagement posts the update, available on the Stafford County website through the adopted budget or the Budget and Management areas. She stated that there are three main sections—Introductory, General Fund, and Other Funds—and the book looks a lot like the printed books previously done. She said that they wanted to ease the transition so they can still tell where they are in the book, and there is still a lot of information such as the budget message from the County Administrator, policies and goals, and all the resolutions that support this budget. She noted that under the General Fund section, the presentation of the revenue projections looks a bit different, and it starts at the top with all the General Fund revenues and a pie chart, and that can be changed so the viewer can look at the information in whatever way makes sense to them. She stated that there are four years of data, including two years of actuals and two years of adopted budget.

Ms. Light stated that you can use the graph to access other information, and in choosing "property tax," it brings up all the other categories; you can always reset to go back to the original. She said that all revenues and expenditures have a graph and an Excel sheet, and you can expand in those categories to drill down as to what is in each. She said that at the bottom of every page, there is a link back to the table of contents, as well as mission and purpose, the table and interactive graph, with funded positions, notable changes, and performance metrics. Ms. Light said that the CIP and school funding budget items were not put in this year, because of the amount of time and work involved, but all the information is linked and accessible.

Ms. Light said that staff is very excited about this budget tool's capacity for data inclusion, communication, and collaboration.

Ms. Lamb stated that she did not see the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), which is an audit containing a 10-year rolling analysis of expenditures, and she asked when that might be available online.

Ms. Light responded that the budget starts the year, and the annual financial report shows how things transpired in an audited sense. She said that they don't include the CAFR in the budget book, but if you look at revenues and expenditures, the numbers presented for 2019 and 2020 tie back to the financial reports.

Ms. Lamb confirmed with Ms. Light that you still have to go back to the CAFR to get the 10-year rolling work. Ms. Lamb asked how long after they pass a resolution to change something they would actually see something reflected in this tool.

Ms. Light responded that staff is working on the transparency portal, which will allow them to have data pulled in from the financial system into this tool, so they will be able to provide information that is updated nightly and available the next day. She added that this was probably a larger project, and they were starting with the operating budget and the CIP and starting to get those in, so they can get the 2023 budget in.

Ms. Lamb thanked her and commented that this was an excellent tool for constituents to use so they can see how the County is spending the money they've been entrusted to do.

Ms. Bohmke expressed her appreciation for this tool and its functionality.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Lamb, to adopt the Consent Agenda, to exclude Item 5, pulled by Ms. Lamb.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, Dudenhefer, Lamb, Snellings, Vanuch
Nay:	(0)	
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Item 1. County Administration; Approve Minutes of the July 6, 2021 Board Meeting.

Item 2. County Administration; Approve Minutes of the July 6, 2021 American Rescue Plan Act Funding Strategies Work Session Minutes.

Item 3. County Administration; Appoint Mr. Henry Scharpenberg to Represent the Aquia District on the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee.

Item 4. County Administration; Authorize the Appointment of George Hummer to the Rappahannock Area Youth Services and Group Home Commission.

Item 5. Budget and Management; A Resolution to Amend the Capital Improvement Program Development Policy. - Ms. Lamb stated that they discussed Item 5 in the Finance and Budget Committee meeting earlier that day, and this relates to the weights and values by which they

evaluate projects. She said that the committee had asked department staff to come back with information on where there would be an impact if they changed some of those values. She thanked them for their phenomenal work and said that they played with some of the values in the FAB meeting. Ms. Lamb asked Ms. Light to bring up her presentation.
Ms. Vanuch reminded Ms. Lamb that they were going to defer this to the September 7 Board meeting because there was so much uncertainty within the committee.

Ms. Lamb acknowledged the oversight and motioned to defer this item and bring it back to their next meeting, September 7, 2021. Ms. Bohmke seconded the motion.

Ms. Vanuch realized that it had to be their September 21, 2021 meeting because FAB is on that day, and she asked Ms. Lamb to amend her motion.

Ms. Lamb amended her motion, seconded by Ms. Bohmke.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, Dudenhefer, Lamb, Snellings, Vanuch
Nay:	(0)	
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Item 6. Budget and Management; A Resolution to Budget and Appropriate FY2021 Tourism Funds.

Resolution R21-283 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FY2021 TOURISM FUNDS

WHEREAS, two percent (2%) of five percent (5%) Transient Occupancy Tax collected in the Tourism Fund is transferred to the General Fund; and

WHEREAS, transfers between funds are considered an expenditure and require appropriation; and

WHEREAS, monies collected and/or projected to be collected for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2021 exceed the amount previously budgeted;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that transient occupancy tax funds be and they hereby are budgeted and appropriated as follows:

Fund	Purpose	Amount
Tourism Fund	Transfer to the General Fund	$190,000

Item 7. Budget and Management; A Resolution to Appropriate American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Funding in FY2022 for Staff Salaries for Grant Administration.

Resolution R21-289 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO APPROPRIATE AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) FUNDING IN FY2022 FOR STAFF SALARIES FOR GRANT ADMINISTRATION

WHEREAS, on March 11, 2021, the Federal Government approved funding to localities and school districts through the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA); and

WHEREAS, Stafford County is anticipated to receive $29,695,536 in total, paid in two tranches with the first tranche in the amount of $14,847,768 being received in May 2021 and the second within one-year of the ARPA being signed into law; and

WHEREAS, the Department of the Treasury allows the use of ARPA funds for grant administration purposes;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that ARPA funds for staff salaries for grant administration be and they hereby are budgeted and appropriated as follows:

Fund	Department	Amount
ARPA Grant Fund	Non-Departmental	$100,000

Item 8. Budget and Management; A Resolution to Appropriate Code Revenues in Excess of Expenditures for Renovations and Security Upgrades.

Resolution R21-310 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE RESTRICTED DEVELOPMENT SERVICES PRIOR YEAREND FUND BALANCE

WHEREAS, in Fiscal Years (FY) 2018 through 2020, Development Services revenues exceeded expenditures, which are restricted to development services use only, and have been held in fund balance for future use; and

WHEREAS, the Board approved the Development Services Renovation and Security Upgrades project (Project) with the FY2021 Capital Improvement Program in the amount of 293,000 for the purpose of renovation and security upgrades for the Department of Development Services; and

WHEREAS, One Hundred Fifty-Three Thousand Dollars ($153,000) remains to be appropriated in support of this project;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that prior yearend fund balance be and it hereby is budgeted and appropriated to the General Fund for the Development Services Renovation and Securities Upgrade project as follows:

Department	Amount
Development Services	$153,000

Item 9. Capital Construction; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Execute a Contract Amendment for Additional Force Main Design, Easement Plats, and Construction Phase Services for the Claiborne Run Force Main Project.

Resolution R21-251 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT AMENDMENT FOR ADDITIONAL FORCE MAIN DESIGN, EASEMENT PLATS, AND LIMITED CONSTRUCTION PHASE SERVICES FOR THE CLAIBORNE RUN FORCE MAIN PROJECT (PHASE 1B)

WHEREAS, on May 18, 2017, the County contracted with Sullivan, Donahoe and Ingalls, a Professional Corporation (Engineer), pursuant to Contract #16-4111-P102-SDI, to provide design services for the parallel Claiborne Run Force Main Project (Project), located within the George Washington Election District, in the amount of $318,795; and

WHEREAS, the Project was divided into two segments, Phase 1A and Phase 1B, recognizing significant differences in the design complexity of the two segments; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolutions R20-25 and R21-15, the Board approved Contract amendments #1 and #2 totaling $196,325; and

WHEREAS, an extension of the bypass connection to the Claiborne Run Pump Station has to be designed and associated easements acquired; and

WHEREAS, the County has requested the Engineer to provide limited construction phase engineering associated with these changes; and

WHEREAS, staff reviewed the Engineer's proposal in the amount of $25,940, dated June 17, 2021, and determined it to be reasonable for the additional services proposed and performed to date; and

WHEREAS, funds are available in the Utilities Capital Improvement Program Fund for the Project;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract amendment with Sullivan, Donahoe and Ingalls, a Professional Corporation, for additional engineering and easement plat services related to the Claiborne Run Force Main Project, in an amount not to exceed Twenty-Five Thousand Nine Hundred Forty Dollars ($25,940), for a total contract amount of $541,060, unless modified by a duly-authorized contract amendment.

Item 10. Capital Construction; A Resolution to Budget and Appropriate Funds and Authorize the County Administrator to Execute a Work Order with Hitt Contracting Inc. for Sluice Gate Repairs at Abel Lake.

Resolution R21-273 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS AND AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A WORK ORDER WITH HITT CONTRACTING, INC. FOR SLUICE GATE REPAIRS AT THE ABEL LAKE DAM

WHEREAS, operations and recent inspections of the Abel Lake Control Structure have determined the four sluice gates at Abel Lake require repair due to their age, past failures, and to ensure the health and safety of the public; and

WHEREAS, the work can be procured through the County's Job Order Contract with HITT Contracting, Inc., Contract #20-1210-SP134.5HIT; and

WHEREAS, HITT Contracting, Inc. submitted a work order package in the amount of $473,762, which is reasonable for the scope of work proposed; and

WHEREAS, $300,000 was budgeted and appropriated in the Utilities Fund for these improvements; and

WHEREAS, an additional $245,000 needs to be budgeted and appropriated to fund the work order as submitted plus 15% contingency;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August 2021, that Utilities Fund cash reserves be and they hereby are appropriated as follows for the repair of the Abel Lake sluice gates:

Fund	Department	Amount
Utilities	Capital Projects	$245,000

; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to execute Work Order #SC-GC-HT-011.0 with HITT Contracting, Inc. in an amount not to exceed Four Hundred Seventy-Three Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty-Two Dollars ($473,762) for the repair of sluice gates at the Abel Lake Dam, unless modified by a duly-executed change order.

Item 11. Capital Construction; A Resolution Appropriating Utilities Capital Improvement Program Funds for the 24-inch 342-15 Water Transmission Main Project.

Resolution R21-274 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION APPROPRIATING UTILITIES CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) FUNDS FOR THE 24-INCH 342-15 WATER TRANSMISSION MAIN PROJECT

WHEREAS, the 24-inch 342-15 Water Transmission Main project (Project) is included in the Utilities Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and it is conceived to be routed from Enon Road Water Storage Tank (construction scheduled 2022) and Centreport Parkway; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Project is to satisfy increasing water demands in the Centreport area, and provide a segment of water main toward a stronger water conveyance system between the County's two water treatment facilities; and

WHEREAS, $375,000 was budgeted in the Utilities Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 CIP under the line titled "342-15 24" Main from Enon Road Tank to Centreport Parkway;" and

WHEREAS, several potential water main routes should be considered, each with distinct advantages and disadvantages, and each with a unique estimated design and construction costs; and

WHEREAS, Rummell, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K) has submitted a proposal in the amount of $39,415 to review the various watermain routes and identify a preferred route, which is acceptable for the scope of work desired; and

WHEREAS, to engage the services of RK&K, funds need to be appropriated within the Utilities CIP; and

WHEREAS, there is a probability that minor unforeseen expenses will be incurred during this project to provide additional resources to RK&K, or to extend the study in a given area;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August 2021, that Utilities CIP funds be and they hereby are appropriated for preliminary engineering associated with the 24-inch 342-15 Water Transmission Main project, as follows:

Fund	Department	Amount
Utilities Fund	Capital Projects	$50,000

Item 12. Capital Construction; Budget and Appropriate Reserve Funds Held in the General Fund and Authorize the County Administrator to Execute a Contract with Moseley Architects P.C., for the Design of Renovations to the Courthouse and Chichester House.

Resolution R21-281 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION BUDGETING AND APPROPRIATING RESERVE FUNDS HELD IN THE GENERAL FUND AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH MOSELEY ARCHITECTS P.C. FOR THE DESIGN OF RENOVATIONS TO THE COURTHOUSE AND CHICHESTER HOUSE

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Courthouse has experienced severe space constraints for a number of years; and

WHEREAS, the existing Stafford Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court, Courtroom B does not meet the Courthouse Facility Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic expanded the need for additional space; and

WHEREAS, a conceptual design has been created by Moseley Architects with input from County staff and Courthouse stakeholders to meet the needs of the Courts; and

WHEREAS, Moseley Architects P.C. has provided a proposal for architectural and engineering services for a schematic design, construction documents, bid phase services, and construction phase services; and

WHEREAS, staff finds this proposal reasonable and the most efficient and expedient way to proceed with this project;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August 2021, cash reserves held in the General Fund be and they hereby are budgeted and appropriated as follows, to be transferred to the Capital Projects Fund for the design of renovations to the Courthouse and Chichester house:

Fund	Purpose	Amount
General Fund	Transfer to Capital Projects Fund	$377,100
Capital Projects Fund	Design and renovation of Courthouse and Chichester House	$377,100

; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to execute a contract with Moseley Architects P.C. in an amount not to exceed Two Hundred Fifty-five Thousand Six Hundred Dollars ($255,600) for the design of renovations to the Courthouse and Chichester house, unless modified by a duly-authorized change order.

Item 13. Capital Construction; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Execute a Contract with Instrumentation and Control Systems Engineering, Inc. for the Replacement of Equipment at the Smith Lake Water Treatment Facility.

Resolution R21-299 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH INSTRUMENTATION AND CONTROL

SYSTEMS ENGINEERING, INC. FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF EQUIPMENT AT THE SMITH LAKE WATER TREATMENT FACILITY

WHEREAS, the existing Motor Control Center (MCC) that operates Water Treatment Train 2 (MCC Train 2) at the Smith Lake Water Treatment Facility, located within the Griffis-Widewater Election District, is reaching the end of its useful service life; and

WHEREAS, the County solicited competitively sealed bids pursuant to Invitation for Bid #22-002-5010SB to provide a replacement MCC Train 2 at Smith Lake Water Treatment Facility (Project); and

WHEREAS, Instrumentation and Control Systems Engineering, Inc. was determined to be the lowest responsive and responsible bidder; and

WHEREAS, funds for the Project are available in the Utilities Fund;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract with Instrumentation and Control Systems Engineering, Inc. to replace the Motor Control Center for Water Treatment Train 2 at Smith Lake Water Treatment Facility in an amount not to exceed Two Hundred Thirty-Eight Thousand Three Hundred Ninety-Six Dollars ($238,396), unless modified by a duly-executed change order.

Item 14. Commonwealth's Attorney; Budget and Appropriate Asset Forfeiture Program Funds to the Commonwealth's Attorney's Office.

Resolution R21-275 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE ASSET FORFEITURE PROGRAM FUNDS TO THE STAFFORD COUNTY COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

WHEREAS, through the state, the Department of Criminal Justice Services Asset Forfeiture Program provides funding to localities based on the submission of assets obtained through criminal prosecution; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth's Attorney's Office requests Asset Forfeiture Funds for Fiscal Year 2022 in the amount of $10,000; and

WHEREAS, these funds are classified as restricted revenue and may only be used by the Commonwealth's Attorney's Office in accordance with the guidance of the Department of Criminal Justice Services Asset Forfeiture Program;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000) in the Asset Forfeiture Program funds be and they hereby are budgeted and appropriated to the Commonwealth's Attorney's Office to be used in accordance with Department of Criminal Justice Services Asset Forfeiture Program requirements.

Item 15. Community Engagement; A Proclamation to Recognize and Honor Stafford County Schools Superintendent Dr. Scott Kizner.

Proclamation P21-22 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING AND HONORING DR. SCOTT KIZNER ON HIS SERVICE TO STAFFORD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS AS SUPERINTENDENT

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors recognizes and honors Dr. Scott Kizner for his three years of service to Stafford County Public Schools (SCPS) as Superintendent; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kizner distinguished himself as an incredibly dedicated and tireless advocate for both his employees and the children he was responsible for educating; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kizner was very accommodating to the Board of Supervisors in appearing to answer any questions and kept a close relationship with County Administration, meeting on a monthly basis; and

WHEREAS, under Dr. Kizner's leadership, a welcomed transparency through the budget and Capital Improvement Program process; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kizner implemented a class and compensation study to improve pay to all employees to help retain valuable human resources; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kizner was unwavering in his leadership during COVID, solving tough problems and finding ways to educate children in a very difficult, unprecedented environment, while simultaneously finding a way to protect the health of both students and Schools employees. He also instituted a county-wide feeding plan to ensure all children and their families had food who needed it; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kizner's stewardship of the Stafford County Public Schools leaves it in a strong position with room to build upon for the future;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that it be and hereby does recognize Dr. Scott Kizner for his tireless and dedicated service to Stafford County Public Schools.

Item. 16. Economic Development & Tourism; Authorize the County Administrator to Execute a Contract with the Center for Innovative Technology (CIT) for Task Orders Related to the Smart Community Testbed Projects.

Resolution R21-245 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH THE CENTER FOR INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY (CIT) SERVICES RELATED TO THE SMART STAFFORD TEST BED

WHEREAS, CIT has invested in Stafford County with technology implementation, demonstrations, evaluations and exercises (Pilot Projects) held in and around County property, including the Stafford County Government Center (Smart Stafford Test Bed) pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding between the County and CIT; and

WHEREAS, to date, all Pilot Projects have been funded through CIT or other state, private, and federal sources and this will continue for many future Pilot Projects, but from time to time, the Board may desire to financially contribute to specific Pilot Projects that have direct application in and benefits to Stafford County; and

WHEREAS, the Board and CIT desire to continue to collaborate on the Smart Stafford Test Bed with Stafford providing oversight of work efforts and, in some instances, funding, and CIT providing contractual management and direction to all CIT personnel or subcontractors; and

WHEREAS, the Board and CIT desire to enter into a contract that will establish the terms under which the County shall provide funding for certain Pilot Projects;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17h day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract with the Virginia Center for Innovative Technology with a term ending June 30, 2023 with three optional one-year renewal terms.

Item 17. Finance; Authorize the Advertisement of a Public Hearing to Consider the Issuance of FY2022 Virginia Public School Authority General Obligation Debt.

Resolution R21-311 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF FY2021 VIRGINIA PUBLIC SCHOOL AUTHORITY GENERAL OBLIGATION DEBT

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 15.2-2506 requires and the Board desires to hold a public hearing to consider the issuance of FY2022 Virginia Public School Authority general obligation debt and at which hearing any citizen of the county shall have the right to attend and state his/her views;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to publish notice and advertise a public hearing to consider the issuance of Virginia Public School Authority general obligation debt.

Item 18. Fire and Rescue; A Resolution to Authorize the County Administrator to Execute a Contract Amendment with Stryker Sales Corporation for the Annual Inspection, Maintenance, and Repair of Stryker Power Load COT Systems.

Resolution R21-285 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT AMENDMENT WITH STRYKER SALES CORPORATION FOR THE ANNUAL INSPECTIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR OF STRYKER POWER LOAD COT SYSTEMS

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Fire and Rescue Department (Department) is currently standardized to all Stryker Sales Corporation (Stryker) Emergency Medical Services (EMS) ambulance power cots and stair chairs; and

WHEREAS, the County currently has an agreement, Contract #19-3645-SS011B, in place with Stryker for annual inspection, maintenance, and repair of the Department's power load cot systems through August 9, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the Department has added an additional 14 load systems and 12 power cots since the contract was initiated that need to be added to the maintenance agreement; and

WHEREAS, the use of other vendor support equipment would be incompatible, potentially damaging to the Stryker EMS equipment, and also would void all warranties with Stryker; and

WHEREAS, staff reviewed the proposal and determined that it is reasonable for the scope of services required; and

WHEREAS, funds are available in the Department's fiscal year 2022 operating budget for this purpose;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract amendment with Stryker Sales Corporation in an annual amount not to exceed Forty-One Thousand Eight Hundred Sixty-Six Thousand Dollars ($41,866) for a total remaining contract spend of $167,464, unless amended by a duly-executed contract amendment.

Item 19. Fire and Rescue; A Resolution to Budget and Appropriate Funds for the Purchase of a Utility Vehicle for Stafford Volunteer Fire Department.

Resolution R21-286 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR THE PURCHASE OF A UTILITY VEHICLE FOR STAFFORD VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, the County's Department of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services (Department) operates utility vehicles as a part of its all-hazards approach to emergency response; and

WHEREAS, the Stafford Volunteer Fire Department desires to purchase a Ford F-350 utility truck; and

WHEREAS, the Stafford Volunteer Fire Department purchases are subject to the County procurement policies and procedures; and

WHEREAS, Stafford Volunteer Fire Department has provided the funds to purchase the vehicle to the County for the purpose of processing the purchase through the County's Department of Finance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that Thirty-Seven Thousand Eight Hundred Eighty-Eight Dollars ($37,888) received from the Stafford Volunteer Fire Department be and it hereby is budgeted and appropriated for the purchase of a utility vehicle for the Stafford Volunteer Fire Department.

Item 20. Fire and Rescue; A Resolution to Authorize the County Administrator to Approve Additional Spend with Witmer Public Safety Group, Inc. for the Purchase of Uniforms, Personal Protective Gear, Hoses and Equipment for Fire and Rescue Personnel.

Resolution R21-287 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE ADDITIONAL PURCHASES WITH WITMER PUBLIC SAFETY GROUP, INC. FOR THE PURCHASE OF UNIFORMS, PERSONAL PROTECTIVE GEAR, HOSE AND EQUIPMENT FOR FIRE AND RESCUE PERSONNEL

WHEREAS, the Department of Fire Rescue and Emergency Services (Department) desires to purchase uniforms, personal protective equipment, hose and tools on an as-needed basis for its recruits, and career and volunteer fire fighters; and

WHEREAS, in 2017, Witmer Public Safety Group Inc. was awarded a contract pursuant to Stafford County Invitation For Bid #28173, Contract # 17-3240-B110-WITM, for one year with four optional one-year renewals through September 30, 2021; and

WHEREAS, Contract #17-3240-B110-WITM is an indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contract, wherein the Department has spent $286,007 on uniforms and equipment, as needed, since the contract's execution through FY2021; and

WHEREAS, the Department expects to expend $125,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2022 during the remainder of the contract term; and

WHEREAS, funds are available through the Department's FY2022 operating budget for this purpose;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to approve the additional purchase of uniforms, personal protective equipment, hoses and tools on an as-needed basis for the Department of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services pursuant to

Contract #17-3240-B110-WITM with Witmer Public Safety Group, Inc. in an amount not to exceed One Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars ($125,000) in FY2022, for a total contract value of Four Hundred Eleven Thousand Seven Dollars ($411,007), unless amended by a duly-executed contract amendment.

Item 21. Information Technology; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Execute a Contract Renewal with Xerox Corporation.

Resolution R21-269 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT RENEWAL WITH XEROX CORPORATION

WHEREAS, Xerox Corporation supports most of the Xerox printers and devices used by Stafford County departments; and

WHEREAS, the County cooperative procures these maintenance services through the Virginia Information Technology Agency (VITA), VITA Contract #VA-191121-XERX; and

WHEREAS, the initial term of the VITA contract expires on November 11, 2022, and may be renewed for three additional one-year terms; and

WHEREAS, the contract will not exceed the amount of $210,000 the first renewal year, with a total four-year spend not to exceed $965,000; and

WHEREAS, funds are available in the General Fund and Utilities Fund for the first renewal year and subsequent renewal years are subject to annual Board budget and appropriation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute contract amendments to exercise four one-year renewals of the contract with Xerox Corporation for the maintenance of all Xerox printers and devices for Stafford County departments in an amount not to exceed Two Hundred Ten Thousand Dollars ($210,000) the first renewal year, for a total four-year spend not to exceed $965,000, unless amended by another duly executed contract amendment.

Item 22. Transportation; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Advertise a Public Hearing to Consider the Condemnation and Exercise of Quick-Take Powers in Connection with the Route 1 and Telegraph Road/Woodstock Lane Safety Improvement Project.

Resolution R21-278 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE CONDEMNATION AND EXERCISE OF QUICK-TAKE POWERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ROUTE 1 AT TELEGRAPH ROAD AND WOODSTOCK LANE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, LOCATED WITHIN THE GRIFFIS-WIDEWATER ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the Board identified completion of safety improvements on Route 1 at Telegraph Road and Woodstock Lane (Project) as a critical part of the County's road improvement plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board approved the acquisition of the land and easements necessary for the completion of the Project, and staff has acquired some necessary portions of land for right-of-way, and temporary and permanent easements; and

WHEREAS, Tax Map Parcel No. 21-66 consists of approximately 4.9374 acres of land owned by L.C. Taylor Enterprises, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, due to the design of the Project, the Board must acquire 1,809 square feet of fee simple right-of-way, 4,068 square feet of permanent drainage easement, 3,346 square feet of permanent traffic signal easement to be conveyed to the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), 12,543 square feet of permanent utility easement to be conveyed to Dominion Energy Virginia (Dominion), Verizon South Inc. (Verizon), Columbia Gas of Virginia, Inc. (Columbia Gas), and VDOT, 4,612 square feet of temporary construction easement for entrances and parking lots, and 478 square feet of temporary construction easement on Tax Map Parcel No. 21-66; and

WHEREAS, the fair market value for the required areas of Tax Map Parcel No. 21-66, together with damages, if any, to the remainder of the parcel is Fifty-Eight Thousand Seven Hundred Dollars ($58,700), based upon the 2021 appraisal conducted by a licensed appraiser; and

WHEREAS, Tax Map Parcel No. 21-69B consists of approximately 2.0608 acres of land owned by Mark A. Stephens, LTD.; and

WHEREAS, due to the design of the Project, the Board must acquire 4,360 square feet of fee simple right-of-way, 1,813 square feet of permanent drainage easement, 15,418 square feet of permanent utility easement to be conveyed to Dominion, Verizon, and VDOT, 18,107 square feet of temporary construction easement for slopes, and 16,907 square feet of temporary construction easement for entrances and parking lots on Tax Map Parcel No. 21-69B; and

WHEREAS, the fair market value for the required areas of Tax Map Parcel No. 21-69B, together with damages, if any, to the remainder of the Parcel is One Hundred Forty-Four Thousand Four Hundred Dollars ($144,400), based upon the 2021 appraisal conducted by a licensed appraiser; and

WHEREAS, Tax Map Parcel No. 21-70 consists of approximately 10.4100 acres of land owned by Manassas Ice and Fuel Company, Incorporated; and

WHEREAS, due to the design of the Project, the Board must acquire 7,542 square feet of fee simple right-of-way, 8,665 square feet of permanent drainage easement, 7,663 square feet of permanent utility easement to be conveyed to Dominion and VDOT, 6,632 square feet of temporary construction easement for slopes, 3,922 square feet of temporary construction easement for entrances and parking lots, and 465 square feet of temporary construction easement for utility relocations on Tax Map Parcel No. 21-70; and

WHEREAS, the fair market value for the required areas of Tax Map Parcel No. 21-70, together with damages, if any, to the remainder of the Parcel is One Hundred Ten Thousand Dollars ($110,000), based upon the 2021 appraisal conducted by a licensed appraiser; and

WHEREAS, Tax Map Parcel No. 21-69 consists of approximately 0.5342 acres of land owned by Mohibi Properties, LLC; and

WHEREAS, due to the design of the Project, the Board must acquire 349 square feet of permanent utility easement to be conveyed to VDOT on Tax Map Parcel No. 21-69; and

WHEREAS, the fair market value for the required areas of Tax Map Parcel No. 21-69, together with damages, if any, to the remainder of the Parcel is Three Thousand Seven Hundred Dollars ($3,700), based upon the 2020 tax assessment land value; and

WHEREAS, the Board, through its acquisition consultant, made bona fide but ineffectual efforts to purchase the affected areas of the above-listed parcels by offering said fair market value on behalf of the County to the respective property owners; and

WHEREAS, the terms of purchase cannot be agreed upon, and the County's acquisition consultant was unsuccessful in negotiating a final settlement with the property owners, but will continue to work with the property owners to attempt to reach an acceptable settlement; and

WHEREAS, to determine the necessity for condemnation and exercise of its quick-take powers to acquire the land and easements for the construction of the safety improvements on Route 1 at Telegraph Road and Woodstock Lane, the Board desires and is required to hold a public hearing, pursuant to Virginia Code §§ 15.2-1903(B) and 15.2-1905(C);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to advertise public hearings to consider the condemnation and use of the County's quick-take powers to acquire fee simple right-of-way, permanent drainage easements, permanent traffic signal easement to be conveyed to the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), permanent utility easements to be conveyed to Virginia Electric and Power Company, doing business as Dominion Energy Virginia, Verizon South Inc., Columbia Gas of Virginia, Inc., and VDOT, temporary construction easements for entrances and parking lots, temporary construction easements for slopes, and temporary construction easements for utility relocations, on the properties of L.C. Taylor Enterprises, Inc, Tax Map Parcel No. 21-66; Mark A. Stephens, LTD., Tax Map Parcel No. 21-69B; Manassas Ice and Fuel Company, Incorporated, also known of record as Manassas Ice & Fuel Company, Incorporated, Tax Map Parcel No. 21-70; and Mohibi Properties, LLC, Tax Map Parcel No. 21-69; all in connection with the safety improvements on Route 1 at Telegraph Road and Woodstock Road, under Virginia Code §§ 15.2-1903(B) and 15.2-1905(C).

Item 23. Transportation; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Advertise a Public Hearing to Consider the Condemnation and Exercise of Quick-Take Powers in Connection with the Berea Church Road Improvement Project, Located within the Falmouth, George Washington, and Hartwood Election Districts.

Resolution R21-294 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE CONDEMNATION AND EXERCISE OF QUICK-TAKE POWERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE BEREA CHURCH ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, LOCATED WITHIN THE FALMOUTH, GEORGE WASHINGTON, AND HARTWOOD ELECTION DISTRICTS

WHEREAS, the Board identified the completion of road improvements on Berea Church Road (SR-654) (Project), as a critical part of Stafford County's road improvement plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board approved the acquisition of the land and easements necessary for the completion of the Project, and staff has acquired some necessary portions of land for right-of-way, and temporary and permanent easements; and

WHEREAS, Tax Map Parcel No. 44-72 (Property) consists of approximately 0.5000 acres of land owned by the Jeffrey Scott Buchanan and Christina Marie Buchanan (Property Owners); and

WHEREAS, due to the design of the Project, the Board must acquire 1,924 square feet of fee simple right-of-way, 289 square feet of permanent drainage easements, 990 square feet of temporary construction easement, and 2,126 square feet of permanent utility easement to be conveyed to Dominion Energy Virginia on the Property; and

WHEREAS, the fair market value for the required areas of the Property, together with damages, if any, to the remainder of the parcel is Five Thousand Six Hundred Dollars ($5,600) based upon 2020 tax assessment values; and

WHEREAS, the Board, through its consultant, made bona fide and effectual efforts to purchase the affected areas of the Property by offering said fair market value on behalf of the County to the Property Owners; and

WHEREAS, the terms of purchase were agreed upon, and the County's consultant was successful in negotiating a final settlement with the Property Owners, but the County is unable to obtain the necessary mortgage lender releases due to outstanding liens against the Property; and

WHEREAS, to determine the necessity for condemnation and exercise of its quick-take powers to acquire the land and easements for the construction of the Berea Church Road Improvement Project, the Board desires and is required to hold a public hearing, pursuant to Virginia Code §§ 15.2-1903(B) and 15.2-1905(C);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he here by is authorized to advertise public hearings to consider the condemnation and use of the County's quick-take powers to acquire fee simple right-of-way, permanent drainage easements, temporary construction easement, and permanent utility easement to be conveyed to Virginia Electric and Power Company, doing business as Dominion Energy Virginia, on the property of Jeffrey Scott Buchanan and Christina Marie Buchanan, Tax Map Parcel No. 44-72; all in connection with the Berea Church Road Improvement Project, under Virginia Code §§ 15.2-1903(B) and 15.2-1905(C).

Item 24. Transportation; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Advertise a Public Hearing to Consider Amending and Reordaining Stafford County Code Sec. 15.4.1 (C)

Entitled "Maximum Speed Limits in Certain Residence Districts; Penalty" to add Van Horn Lane (SR-671)

Resolution R21-295 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 15-4.1(C), "MAXIMUM SPEED LIMITS IN CERTAIN RESIDENCE DISTRICTS; PENALTY"

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 46.2-878.2 authorizes a $200 fine for persons exceeding the maximum speed limit in designated residence districts; and

WHEREAS, on September 9, 1997, the Board adopted Ordinance O97-29(R), which approved criteria for the establishment of residence districts where an additional fine could be levied; and

WHEREAS, the County received a petition from residents along Van Horn Lane (SR-671) to establish a residence district along the roadway; and

WHEREAS, County staff conducted a traffic study and determined, with VDOT's concurrence, that a portion of Van Horn Lane, between the intersections with Rock Hill Church Road (SR-644) and Lakeview Drive (SR-1728) met the criteria to establish a residence district; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to consider designating Van Horn Lane (SR-671) between Rock Hill Church Road and Lakeview Drive as a residence district;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to advertise a public hearing to consider amending Stafford County Code Sec. 15-4.1(c), by designating Van Horn Lane (SR-671) from Rock Hill Church Road (SR-644) to its intersection with Lakeview Drive (SR-1728) as a residence district.

Item 25. Transportation; A Resolution Authorizing the Installation and Maintenance of One "Watch for Children" Sign on Green Leaf Terrace (SR-1248).

Resolution R21-296 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ONE "WATCH FOR CHILDREN" SIGN ON GREEN LEAF

TERRACE (SR-1248), LOCATED WITHIN THE ROCK HILL ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the Board is concerned with transportation safety on residential streets; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution R08-90, the Board adopted the Residential Traffic Management Plan (RTMP) to provide Stafford County citizens with various programs to address traffic-related concerns; and

WHEREAS, the installation of "Watch for Children" signs is authorized pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.2-251; and

WHEREAS, the residents along Green Leaf Terrace requested the installation of a "Watch for Children" sign along the road; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) policy permits the installation of this sign along Green Leaf Terrace; and

WHEREAS, the proposed location on Green Leaf Terrace meets the essential criteria for the installation as it is a residential local road, based on the current RTMP, "Watch for Children" Sign Program; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that installing this sign promotes the health, safety, and welfare of the County and its citizens;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that it be and hereby does approve the purchase and installation of a "Watch for Children" sign approximately 200 feet past the posted speed limit sign on Green Leaf Terrace (SR- 1248); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, shall transmit a copy of this Resolution to VDOT.

<u>Item 26. Transportation; A Resolution Authorizing the Installation and Maintenance of One "Watch for Children" Sign on Jett Street (SR-1019).</u>

<u>Resolution R21-297 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ONE "WATCH FOR CHILDREN" SIGN ON JETT STREET (SR-1019), LOCATED WITHIN THE FALMOUTH ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the Board is concerned with transportation safety on residential streets; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution R08-90, the Board adopted the Residential Traffic Management Plan (RTMP) to provide Stafford County citizens with various programs to address traffic-related concerns; and

WHEREAS, the installation of "Watch for Children" signs is authorized pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.2-251; and

WHEREAS, the residents along Jett Street requested the installation of a "Watch for Children" sign along the road; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) policy permits the installation of this sign along Jett Street; and

WHEREAS, the proposed location on Jett Street meets the essential criteria for the installation as it is a residential local road, based on the current RTMP, "Watch for Children" Sign Program; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that installing this sign promotes the health, safety, and welfare of the County and its citizens;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that it be and hereby does approve the purchase and installation of a "Watch for Children" sign approximately 200 feet past the posted speed limit sign on Jett Street (SR-1019); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, is authorized to transmit a copy of this Resolution to VDOT.

Item 27. Utility Operations; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Execute a Task Order with Tri-State Utilities Company for the Cured in Place Pipe Lining Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewer Infrastructure in North Stafford.

Resolution R21-270 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A TASK ORDER WITH TRI-STATE UTILITIES LLC FOR THE CURED IN-PLACE PIPE LINING REHABILITATION OF THE NORTH STAFFORD SANITARY SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

WHEREAS, the inspection, cleaning and lining of degraded sanitary sewer mains and laterals using cured-in-place pipe (CIPP) lining is one method of rehabilitating aging sewer pipe, which can eliminate costly emergency repairs and reduce damaging overflows; and

WHEREAS, the CIPP lining will reinstate the integrity of a deteriorating sanitary sewer pipe and places it back to full active service; and

WHEREAS, the County has an existing contract with Tri-State Utilities LLC for the CIPP lining through Rider Agreement No. 21-062-5080CI, which rides a contract awarded by the City of Hampton dated September 27, 2018, expiring on October 30, 2023; and

WHEREAS, funds are available in the Utilities Capital Improvement Program Fund for the sanitary sewer CIPP lining rehabilitation services;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a task order with Tri-State Utilities LLC for the cured in-place pipe lining rehabilitation of the North Stafford sanitary sewer infrastructure in an amount not to exceed Nine Hundred Fifty-One Thousand Six Hundred Ninety-Seven Dollars ($951,697), unless modified by a duly executed contract amendment.

Item 28. Utility Operations; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Execute a Change Order to Task Order 3 with Sagres Construction Corporation for Phase 2 of the Ferry Farms Waterline Improvement Project.

Resolution R21-271 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CHANGE ORDER TO TASK ORDER 3 WITH SAGRES CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION FOR PHASE 2 OF THE FERRY FARMS WATERLINE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

WHEREAS, the Ferry Farms waterline improvement project would address aging and deteriorating infrastructure, which currently conveys potable water in the Ferry Farms subdivision; and

WHEREAS, the improvements would increase the service life of the Ferry Farms subdivision water distribution system, improve reliability, significantly reduce service disruptions, and reduce annual maintenance costs; and

WHEREAS, the change order represents Phase 2 of a multi-phased effort to replace all original piping throughout the subdivision over the course of three to five years (Project); and

WHEREAS, the Task Order 3 was procured through the Utilities On-Call General Construction contract with Sagres Construction Corporation, Contract #21-003-5030SB-R-SC; and

WHEREAS, funds for the improvement services are available in the Utilities Capital Improvement Program Fund;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a change order to Task Order 3 with Sagres Construction Corporation for Phase 2 of the Ferry Farms waterline improvement project in an amount not to exceed Three Hundred Seven Thousand Six Hundred Seventy-Seven Dollars ($307,677), for a total contract amount of $636,032.47, unless modified by a duly executed contract amendment.

<u>Item 29. Utility Operations; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Approve Expenditures and Ratify a Contract with Carter Machinery Company Incorporated for Generator Services, Inspection, Maintenance and Repair.</u>

<u>Resolution R21-276 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE EXPENDITURES AND RATIFY CONTRACT WITH CARTER MACHINERY COMPANY INCORPORATED FOR GENERATOR, INSPECTION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR SERVICES

WHEREAS, additional professional services are needed to service, maintain, and repair generators at various County facilities that are beyond the scope of staff; and

WHEREAS, the County executed a contract with Carter Machinery Company, Incorporated on February 2, 2021, Stafford County Rider Agreement #21-042-5010CI, which rides the City of Suffolk's Contract #19014, (Contract) for these generator services; and

WHEREAS, the current Contract term is through September 30, 2021, with two additional one-year terms ; and

WHEREAS, the Departments of Utilities and Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities anticipate the total contract cost will exceed $200,000, necessitating Board approval of the contract; and

WHEREAS, funds are available in the Utilities and Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities Departments' operating budgets;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the contract with Carter Machinery Company, Incorporated, Stafford County Rider Agreement #21-042-5010CI, for generator service, inspection, and maintenance, is ratified and approved for the first year of the two additional years provided in the contract; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to approve expenditures with Carter Machinery Company, Incorporated for repairs in an amount not to exceed Nine Hundred Thousand Dollars ($900,000) in Fiscal Year 2022, unless amended by a duly-executed contract amendment.

Item. 30. Utility Operations; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Execute Contract Renewals for Pump, Gearbox, Blower Repairs and Parts, and Electronic Motor Testing.

Resolution R21-277 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE CONTRACT RENEWALS FOR PUMP, GEARBOX, BLOWER REPAIRS AND PARTS, AND ELECTRONIC MOTOR TESTING

WHEREAS, additional professional services are needed on an as-needed basis for electronic motor testing and pump, gearbox, and blower repairs and parts for the County's water and sewer pump stations and treatment facilities; and

WHEREAS, the County has an existing contract with Best Repair Company, Incorporated for electronic motor testing services, Rider Agreement #19-5030-CI044, which rides the City of Richmond Goods and Services Contract #17000002805, with a term expiring on August 24, 2021; and

WHEREAS, Rider Agreement #19-5030-CI044 may be renewed for one additional year through August 25, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the County has an existing contract with Best Repair Company, Incorporated for pump, gearbox, and blower repairs and parts, Rider Agreement #19-5030-CI027, which rides the City of Richmond Good and Services Contract #18000003762, with a term expiring on August 29, 2021; and

WHEREAS, Rider Agreement #19-5030-CI027 may be renewed for two additional years through August 29, 2023;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract amendment to renew Rider Agreement #19-5030-CI027 with Best Repair Company, Incorporated for two years for the provision of pump, gearbox, and blower repair services in an amount not to exceed Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars ($800,0000), unless modified by a duly executed contract amendment; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to execute a contract amendment to renew Rider Agreement #19-5030-CI044 with Best Repair Company Incorporated for one year to provide electronic motor testing services in an amount not to exceed Three Hundred Thousand Dollars ($300,000), unless modified by a duly executed contract amendment.

Item. 31. Utility Operations; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Execute Amendments to Water Tower Lease Agreements for Telecommunications Service Providers.

Resolution Resolution R21-279 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO THE DEED OF WATER TOWER
LEASE AGREEMENT WITH T-MOBILE NORTHEAST LLC

WHEREAS, the County executed a Deed of Water Tower Lease Agreement (Lease) with T-Mobile Northeast LLC (T-Mobile) on April 10, 2017, to install telecommunications equipment at Ferry Road Water Tank (Tower); and

WHEREAS, the Tower is located on Stafford County Tax Map Parcel No. 55-60A, located at 9 Ferry Road within the George Washington Election District; and

WHEREAS, T-Mobile requested to amend the Lease to allow T-Mobile to replace the original equipment that was installed in 2017 and change the access protocol for entering the Tower site; and

WHEREAS, the amendment also includes an annual rental increase of $3,000 to the current annual rental fee of $34,200, for a total annual rental fee of $37,200;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that it be and hereby does authorize the County Administrator, or his designee, to execute the First Amendment to the Deed of Water Tower Lease Agreement with T-Mobile Northeast LLC to replace outdated equipment, revise the access protocol, and increase the rental fee for the Ferry Road Water Tank, located on Stafford County Tax Map Parcel No. 55-60A.

Resolution R21-298 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO THE DEED OF WATER TOWER LEASE AGREEMENT WITH CELLCO PARTNERSHIP, DBA VERIZON WIRELESS

WHEREAS, the County executed a Deed of Water Tower Lease Agreement (Lease) with Cellco Partnership, a Delaware general partnership, dba Verizon Wireless (Verizon) on October 9, 2015, to install telecommunications equipment at Embrey Mill Water Tank (Tower); and

WHEREAS, the Tower is located on Stafford County Tax Map Parcel No. 29G-BB and located within the Austin Ridge subdivision; and

WHEREAS, Verizon has requested to amend the Lease to allow Verizon to replace and update the current equipment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that it be and hereby does authorize the County Administrator, or his designee, to execute the First Amendment to the Deed of Water Tower Lease Agreement with Cellco Partnership, dba, Verizon Wireless to replace outdated equipment and revise the access protocol for the Embrey Mill Water Tank, located on Stafford County Tax Map Parcel No. 29G-BB.

Item 32. Utility Operations; A Resolution Authorizing the County Administrator to Approve Expenditures and Ratifying the Contract with Visu-Sewer East LLC for Manhole and Lateral Rehabilitation Services.

Resolution R21-280 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE EXPENDITURES AND RATIFYING THE CONTRACT WITH VISU-SEWER EAST LLC FOR MANHOLE AND LATERAL REHABILITATION

WHEREAS, the monolithic lining system extends the service life of the existing manholes that are being compromised by the presence of hydrogen sulfide; and

WHEREAS, each manhole rehabilitation process will pressure wash the interior to remove all debris, pressure grout all leaks to stop infiltration, rebuild the interior of the manhole, apply Raven 405 Epoxy to the walls and bench of each manhole; and

WHEREAS, the County executed a contract with Visu-Sewer East LLC on July 30, 2020, for the manhole and lateral rehabilitation services, Rider Agreement #21-008-5080CI, which rides Frederick County Sanitation Authority dba Frederick Water Contract #MA 12-18; and

WHEREAS, the contract value is anticipated to exceed $200,000 in total cost, necessitating further Board action to ratify the contract and approve expenditures exceeding $200,000; and

WHEREAS, funds for the rehabilitation services are available in the Utilities Capital Improvement Program Fund;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the contract with Visu-Sewer East LLC, Rider Agreement #21-008-5080CI, for manhole and lateral rehabilitation services and initial term of July 30, 2020 to February 25, 2021, with two additional one-year terms be and it hereby is ratified and approved; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to approve expenditures with Visu-Sewer East LLC in an amount not to exceed Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000), unless modified by a duly executed contract amendment.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Item 33. Discuss Consideration of Rescinding Resolution R21-262 Regarding the Cedar Lane American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Project - Mr. Chris Edwards, Director of Utilities, reported that this item is to discuss consideration of rescinding R21-262 regarding the Cedar Lane project and ARPA funding. He stated that this was a continuation of the July 6 work session, with two items needing to be clarified: What areas zoned industrial or commercial could use the proposed sewer line, and what impacts would this have on future developments.

Mr. Edwards reported that the Cedar Lane project was broken into two phases, with the first phase served by the proposed sewer line; the second area was 14 residential houses in the urban services area that could be considered underserved because they are on well and septic. He stated that phase 1 was considered time sensitive and was approved for ARPA funding. He said the area shown in red on his map were currently zoned B-2, and it was about 40 acres and could use a sewer line; the area in yellow was about 250-275 acres and was currently zoned A-1 and could also use the sewer line but would have to have the six-acre lot minimum. He said that there is a proposed development on the 40 acres that has about 400,000 square feet, and in discussions with Economic Development, this area could generate about $650,000 in real estate tax revenue per year and could get rid of a sewer pump station as a benefit to the utility.

He pointed out the area in red zoned B-2 is about 3,000 feet away from the sewer pump station, so it becomes cost infeasible to construct sewer on the site. He said that the area shown in yellow and orange crosshatch could also use a proposed line, and that would need to be rezoned from its current A-1. He added that the orange area with the dark orange crosshatching is the portion of George Washington Village that would be industrial or commercial, and this area could also be served by an existing sewer line, as could most of the other areas in orange—which are more feasible than the areas shown in red because the orange is in closer proximity.

Mr. Coen asked for clarification of whether the area in yellow is zoned residential.

Mr. Edwards responded that they overlayed what they received as George Washington Village, and the areas in orange would be residential, and the areas with crosshatching would be industrial/commercial. He said that they basically laid the proposed development with the County's current sewer lines.

Mr. Coen asked if this was a new George Washington Village, as that original application had been voted down.

Mr. Edwards responded that staff just wanted to make sure they showed that area over top of it, but right now the area proposed for development in red.

Ms. Vanuch confirmed that the development had been voted down.

Mr. Snellings asked what the drop-dead date was for this.
Mr. Edwards replied that their goal for construction would be the end of calendar year 2022, but the way construction projects were tracking out, it would be a year and a half.

Mr. Snellings asked about the timeframe for the money.

Mr. Edwards responded that the area in red is looking at the same timeline and was maxing out the time they had to build this.

Mr. Snellings commented on the green line as being the existing current sewer line, with the dark green line being proposed, and he asked how that affected the area in red.

Mr. Edwards explained that this would put a sewer line in close proximity to the red, and the dark green line was being proposed, which would put it within a few hundred feet so they could be served more easily—and currently, there is limited area.

Mr. Snellings asked if the reason they were running this was because the pump station was at the end, and he asked if the pump station was there now.

Mr. Mike Smith responded that the pump station is there now, and the general area is the green line. He said that the company coming into that red area would design the line, and the County would construct it; so that design would include the portion they would pay for. Mr. Smith stated that the main concern is that the rest of the area zoned A-1 would gain access by putting in the new line, and there is a small portion that would gain a bit of an advantage from that line, but they could also build their own line from the pump station since it's right there. He stated that the entire other area already has access to that gravity line and would not gain any access, so the only area that would gain any access was the portion on the proposed George Washington Village plan—which the Board would have to rezone, and currently there are no plans to do that. He said if they decided to rezone it, it would only be for the industrial side that gained access, whether it was residential or anything else.

Mr. Snellings asked what would happen if a future Board came in, because the entire portion to the south is George Washington Village, and what would happen if it was rezoned. He asked whether they could tap into this line.

Mr. Smith responded that if it were rezoned, the new line would be tapped into the area that was proposed as an industrial/commercial area. He said that the residential area in George Washington

Village already has access to a gravity line—and this line going in does not increase the residential access by the proposed plan.

Mr. Snellings commented that this could be changed.

Mr. Smith confirmed this.

Mr. Snellings stated that his other concern was the residents there, as they would have a sewer line literally running by their house—yet they wouldn't be able to tap into it, as George Washington Village would be.

Mr. Smith said that there was a time-sensitive portion and another portion that would not be put in as a time-sensitive portion, but it would come back in September for a discussion of adding a gravity line there that could be tapped into. He said that if they don't put in the commercial line, they can't put in the line for the residents.

Mr. Snellings asked what the final drop-dead date was for the Board to rescind it or let it go.

Mr. Smith responded that there is no drop-dead date; the commercial entity is moving forward and wants to connect a line; the line that is best for utilities is this gravity line, and they are beginning the process to design that. He said if they don't use it, they'll have to put in another pump station or use an existing pump station that the County will have to maintain. He added that the pump station is at the end of its useful life, and it would have to be rebuilt at about $1.5 million, which would not provide additional service for Cedar Lane residents.

Mr. Snellings asked if he meant commercial and not industrial.

Mr. Smith responded that the commercial development was industrial—not retail—and Merritt Properties wants to put in about 400,000 square feet of flex industrial space, with about a $60 million investment and some associated tax revenue. He said that it's likely they'd have tenants when they build these, and the jobs that go along with those, but those are not guaranteed. He stated that the time-sensitive part is to get the buildings in the ground, and other sensitivities relate to costs, which will escalate if they delay.

Mr. Snellings asked Mr. Smith to explain more about what type of business that is.

Mr. Smith explained that Merritt Properties develops flex space with high-quality buildings and is currently doing a project in Quantico now. He said that the buildings range from about 100,000 square feet to an entire building, which is in demand right now, and the leads they get from the state are looking for buildings that are in place and have that flexibility in size.

Mr. Snellings asked if this did not go through, if the residents of Cedar Lane would not have anything either.

Mr. Smith confirmed this.

Mr. Coen asked for clarification that if the County uses the federal money for extension of this into a residential area, whether the company is paying for it or if the theory is that taxes will.

Mr. Smith explained that the portion they would pay for was the portion on their property, which they would have to install anyway—and the portion on the outside that is the County's is being suggested to use ARP funds form to bolster economic development.

Mr. Snellings said that he did not plan to rescind this and reverse the decision, as it helped to have this explanation and the map.

Item 34. County Administration; Consider and Discuss Amendments to the Board of Supervisors 2021 Redistricting Communications Plan Outline - Mr. Anthony Toigo, Constituent & Legislative Affairs Officer, stated that he would present this item in consideration of adoption of R21-219. He explained that this item is a continuation of the Board's discussion at its June 15, 2021 meeting, concerning stakeholders for the 2021 redistricting process. He said that at that meeting, the Board had asked the Redistricting Commission to look at the criteria for stakeholders, as well as the public meeting process and how they intend to incorporate them, as well as bringing back recommendations to the Board.

Mr. Toigo stated that the Board met on July 13 and had recommendations that he would detail. He said that the recommendations concern both the public information process and the definition of stakeholder: what their criteria is and their roles and responsibilities. He said that the committee is recommending two additions to clarify public involvement and stakeholder involvement in redistricting. He said that rather than the staff and Board developing a list of who the stakeholder should be, the committee suggested having an application process of those interested in serving as stakeholders to apply to the County, based on the criteria in the "stakeholder" definition. He stated that the committee believes it's favorable because the application process would resolve any concerns about the County or staff selecting potential organizations to serve, and it would also allow interested groups to inform the County as to how they're affected by redistricting. He said they would be able to demonstrate their qualifications and attest to whether or not they meet the stakeholder definition. Mr. Toigo said that this would all be done through the simple application form in their background packet in Attachment 2. He said that interested groups are asked to fill out the form and complete the attestation specific to the definition of a stakeholder developed by staff.

Mr. Toigo said the second recommendation from the committee is to allow an additional public hearing at the beginning of the redistricting process that's open to all, and this would be identical to the content from the original stakeholders meeting—to go over circumstances contributing to the redistricting, such as delays with the census, factors at the state level, the Redistricting commission etc. He said this would be an open meeting to coincide with the stakeholder meeting, which is a bit more inclusive to stakeholder organizations.

He presented the "stakeholder" definition and said there were four criteria that stakeholder organizations were proposed to be: They have to be a government entity, political organization, or nonprofit organization; they have to serve Stafford County; their functions, responsibilities and membership must be affected by redistricting decisions of the Board of Supervisors, and they must attest to this on the stakeholder application (ex: a political party); they cannot represent a for-profit interest; they must appoint a County resident to serve as their designee and must appoint a new designee in the event of a vacancy.

Mr. Toigo stated that stakeholders are essentially a liaison and are proposed to have the ability to represent organizations at group meetings, which will be one at the beginning and one at the end, and they must have the ability to ask process-related questions about the process. He said they can share feedback about the organization and are also proposed to inform the organizations about the 2021 redistricting: ideally, with some degree of reach.

He said that the question before the Board today are does the Board concur with the redistricting Committee's suggested amendments to the redistricting communications plan, and does the Board agree with the definition of "stakeholder" as proposed. He stated that based on these discussions, some of their next steps include a draft County news story "call for stakeholders" ready to go, and they could also get the form published on the County website with an accessible link by the following day, should the Board agree to go forward with this resolution. Mr. Toigo said they can also inform the Board about potential stakeholder applicants on the September 21 meeting which would allow two weeks for organizations to apply. He noted that any initial redistricting meeting would be open to all and would be held sometime in late October.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Lamb to approve the resolution R21-219 as presented.

Mr. Coen commented that part of what drove this was the timeline because of the census data and the delay in state process, which gave them ideas about surveys and input—rather than be arbitrarily picked. He said that the committee members had concern there would be no favoritism, and this seems to resolve that. He stated that they also wanted to make groups aware of what's going on because it changes, so that was the second part of achieving transparency.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, Dudenhefer, Lamb, Snellings, Vanuch
Nay:	(0)	
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Resolution R21-219 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REDISTRICTING COMMUNICATIONS PLAN OUTLINE

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Board of Supervisors established a Redistricting Committee on March 3, 2020 to analyze population data and recommend 2021 adjustments to election district lines and polling locations; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County faces a significant redistricting in 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors recognizes the significant impacts of redistricting and wishes to increase public transparency about the redistricting process; and

WHEREAS, the 2021 Redistricting Process is complicated by unprecedented delays in the release of Census Data and flexibility is required to increase public transparency and participation; and

WHEREAS, the dates, times, and frequency of Redistricting meetings shall be determined by staff and the Board of Supervisors as they occur throughout the process, and be timely communicated and shared with the public;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that it be and hereby does adopt the amended 2021 Redistricting Communications Plan Outline; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the Redistricting Committee to revise the 2021 Redistricting Communications Plan Outline, as may be needed in response to unforeseen changes in the 2021 Redistricting process, and such revisions will be communicated to the Board and the public; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that staff and the Redistricting Committee will keep the Board informed of all meetings for the 2021 Redistricting process as these meetings are scheduled.

Item 35. Planning and Zoning; A Resolution Authorizing a Time Extension for the Planning Commission to Make Recommendations for the Comprehensive Plan Five-Year Update - Mr. Jeff Harvey, Director of Planning and Zoning, stated that as Ms. Vanuch had mentioned, they were considering R21-290 to grant the Planning Commission some time on the Comprehensive Plan update. Mr. Harvey said the plan is the County's guide for future land use and development and was generally a 20-year plan, but the state requires counties to have a Comprehensive Plan and review it every five years. He noted that there was no requirement to make changes within that five-year review, but they must do the five-year review.

Mr. Harvey reported that in January, the Board of Supervisors gave the Planning Commission direction to proceed with the five-year update of the plan document, and the Commission has been diligently working on it. He said that under state code, the Planning Commission is charged with the responsibility of drafting any amendment or the Comp Plan itself and making recommendations to the Board. He stated that the Commission has formed a subcommittee and has had a total of 19 meetings, with another scheduled the following day—but due to a number of extenuating circumstances, they have not been able to complete the task of presenting a finalized document to the Board as of today's deadline.

He said that there is an additional request for more time, and the Planning Commission chairman has requested consideration of extending the Board's request to October 15, which means the Commission would have to have the document finalized by September 22 to move forward for its public hearing on October 15; the Board could potentially hold a public hearing on October 19 if that were to occur.

Mr. Harvey stated that staff supports the Planning Commission's recommendation to have additional time to consider the Comprehensive Plan update, and in his discussions with their chairman, he asked what would happen if they can't make the September 22 date, and that would result in the Commission asking for more time.

Mr. Dudenhefer said that he had heard from a couple of Planning Commission members who say they don't need the extra time, and that staff is requesting more time.

Mr. Harvey responded that staff has been working with the committee, and there have been issues with staff workload as well as a vacancy that has delayed work with the committee—but staff is committed to working hard to meet the Planning Commission's desired timeline.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked if this would fall under actions they cannot take after election day.

Mr. Harvey responded that he would refer to counsel for that answer.

Ms. McClendon clarified that it is a prohibited item, and the Board would have to waive its bylaws to take it up in November or December.
Mr. Dudenhefer said that if there were any hiccup at all and this were deferred until next year, a new Planning Commission would have to pick up and run with the old Commission's recommendations—and chances are, they would have to start completely from scratch, so all their work would be ineffective.

Mr. Harvey explained that if the Board does not waive its bylaws and the matter is deferred to the Board from the Commission in October, then it would default to Board consideration in the next calendar year. He said that if the Planning Commission did not finish its work before the end of the calendar year for any reason, it would also have a new Commission constituted to be considering it.

Mr. Dudenhefer said by the end of October, not the end of the calendar year.

Mr. Harvey stated that by the end of October if the Commission finished its work, unless the Board waived the bylaws would have to wait to take action until the new Board is constituted next year.

Ms. Vanuch commented that the Planning Commission doesn't have the same bylaws as the Board, so they could vote on this—and even if the extension is granted to October 22, they could vote on it; if it were passed at the Board meeting and the Board was unable to vote on it, the Board would have to waive its bylaws to take action on it, or it would fall to the new Board. She said that if the Planning Commission already voted on it, the new Commission wouldn't have the authority to take it back up after this PC has voted on it. She added that they could vote on it up until December.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked if that were correct.

Ms. McClendon confirmed that it was a correct assessment of the possibilities with regard to the timeframe.

Mr. Dudenhefer said that all the work that's been put into it could go down the drain in January.

Ms. McClendon clarified that the only time constraint the state code requires the Board to take up Planning Commission-initiated comp plan amendments within 90 days, so the new Board would have to take this up 90 days from when the Commission recommends it, and this is in conjunction with the provision in their bylaws about the two months of no action. She stated that there are several different timelines that overlap here.

Mr. Harvey stated that under state code, the Board is obligated to wait until the Planning Commission prepares the amendment, so in some regards, even if the Board doesn't pass the resolution, they would still be in a situation where the Board has to wait on the Commission to finish its work.

Mr. Dudenhefer said that he has been here a long time and does not recall ever betting against a recommendation from Mr. Harvey, but he was on this, based on conversations he's had with Planning Commission members who want to get their work done and get it before the Board before it shuts down. He stated that there was no guarantee the Board would vote to waive, based on the comments heard about deferring everything. He also asked if this update was basically data driven, and it wasn't a case of holding public hearings with lots of public input.

Mr. Harvey responded that the effort to date has focused on individual committee meetings, with specific invited guests, such as the Fredericksburg Builders Association and Fredericksburg Association of Realtors. He said they've also had a number of citizens attend meetings to express their desires to expand or contract the urban service area for specific land use issues. He emphasized that this has been a targeted approach in that regard, but all the meetings have been open to the public and have been available to be viewed by WebEx. He added that the committee has been going line by line throughout the document, and there has been debate about certain word choices—which is partly what has caused the extensive review.

Mr. Dudenhefer stated that after conversations he has had with several key members of the Planning Commission, they don't think they need the time and want to move forward, so he will not support the resolution.

Ms. Vanuch said that she has spoken with the chairman and her district's PC member, and they have discussed the fact that staff is very busy and is trying their hardest to get this out the door. Ms. Vanuch stated that she served on the subcommittee when she first joined the Commission and knows this is really tedious—with most of it falling on Mr. Zuraf. She stated that if they give them the time extension to mid-October being requested, they can go ahead and advertise it and have it on their Board public hearing notices for October 19. She said that they can also do a special joint meeting at the end of October just to do the Comp Plan if it came into a situation where they wanted to get this done before the election. Ms. Vanuch emphasized that she didn't want the election to be the reason that they don't make sure they have the time to do what they need, and specifically Mr. Zuraf, from getting their feedback. She said she would support the extension request.

Mr. Coen said that there are large elements to the plan, then there are nuances. He stated that there are certain broad things they've already agreed to; then there is wordsmithing.

Mr. Harvey responded that this was a fair characterization.
Mr. Coen said that the law technically says they're supposed to look at it and vote—so there are counties that do a cursory review and keep it as is. He stated that the Commission could approve the larger elements before the election, then ask for permission to do some of the wordsmithing in the next year.

Mr. Harvey confirmed that the effort could be divided into different pieces as Mr. Coen was suggesting, so that could be a strategy if the Planning Commission chose to go that route.

Mr. Coen stated that he felt they could get the broad elements done, then continue with the wordsmithing—and if that came before the new Board next year, they'd just be looking at words. He added that he was not trying to micromanage the Planning Commission, but it seemed there was another way to handle this without the risk of running out of time.

Mr. Snellings pointed out that the Board's bylaws are their bylaws—and he understands that Planning Commission members may not favor it, but the reality is that the Board needs to think about staff, who are shorthanded and pushed to the walls. He said that he would support this proposal, keeping in mind that they can waive their bylaws after the election and still vote on it.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they could call for the question.

Ms. Vanuch agreed.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. Snellings to approve R21-246 to extend the Planning Commission's timeframe for making amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Bohmke stated that she looks at this as common sense, as the Planning staff work so hard and have a lot on their plate—and she looks at this as a common courtesy to staff, with a 60-day extension. She said that the Planning Commission members who are on this ad hoc committee are very busy, and this is a no-brainer. She added that she agreed with Mr. Snellings that they could waive their bylaws later, and it's not the end of the world if they waive them after the election. She added that she would support this.

Ms. Lamb said that she was supporting this because there were statutory requirements for public meetings and hearings that have to occur, and this has to happen.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(5)	Bohmke, Coen, Lamb, Snellings, Vanuch
Nay:	(1)	Dudenhefer
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Resolution R21-290 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION GRANTING THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADDITIONAL TIME TO REVIEW, AND AS NECESSARY, PREPARE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO, THE "STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA, COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, 2016-2036", AS LAST REVISED (COMPREHENSIVE PLAN)

WHEREAS, the Board adopted Resolution R21-08 requesting the Planning Commission review and prepare recommend proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan pursuant to Virginia Code §§15.2-2229 and 15.2-2230; and

WHEREAS, Resolution R21-08 requested the Planning Commission forward its review and recommended proposed amendments to the Board by August 17, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has not completed its review or preparation of proposed amendments and the Planning Commission Chairman requested that the Board grant additional time;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the Planning Commission be and it hereby is granted additional time, to October 15, 2021, to provide its review and make final recommendations to the Board regarding proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 36. Discuss Stafford County School Curriculum, Project 1619, and Critical Race Theory - Ms. Vanuch stated that as Mr. Snellings had alluded to earlier, the Board had this item on the agenda a few other times but had to move it due to the amount of information on the agenda. She said that there was a request by the County Administrator to have someone from the schools available to answer questions from the Board of Supervisors, but the School Board has asked that their staff brief them first, which is scheduled to take place August 24. Ms. Vanuch said that the schools plan to send someone from their staff to the Supervisors' September 7 meeting, but Mr. Kizner's last day is the last day of August, so she is not sure who they would send.

Ms. Vanuch said that Mr. Snellings had requested this item, so she would defer to him for comments before opening it up to the full Board.

Mr. Snellings commented that he thought his last six months on the Board would be fairly laidback, but he got himself into this and requested it for good reason. He explained that back in June, he sent an email to two School Board members and asked them specifically if they had planned to teach any form of Critical Race Theory or Project 1619 in the school system. Mr. Snellings said that he received no response whatsoever. He noted that the reason he made the inquiry was because he was getting questions about, and there were differing answers as to whether CRT was being taught, and in some cases, it was simply being called something else.

Mr. Snellings stated that he felt the best thing to do was to bring this out in the public and have the school system come here and go on record as to whether or not they are teaching it. He said that it was supposed to be held in July, but he asked for a delay because the agenda was already so large, and he didn't feel they could do the item justice. He noted that it was deferred to this meeting, but the chair has explained why it was again slated for deferral from this meeting. Mr. Snellings said that what greatly concerns him is that the School Board should already know what's going on in the school system and already know what's being taught and what isn't. He stated that he is hoping to get a final answer at the September 7 meeting, because he has done a lot of research on this, and he wanted to get to the bottom of this.

Ms. Bohmke added that from what she has heard from teachers, they are not calling this "Critical Race Theory," but they are doing everything that represents it. She said that she has heard this from teachers only in the school division, not from students.

Mr. Coen stated that after Mr. Snellings contacted School Board members and didn't get a response, he contacted his representative and had numerous conversations. Mr. Coen said that she had wanted this to be brought up before the school year started, because a preemptive statement would allay concerns. He said that the feeling was that it was of such magnitude that the superintendent or someone would want to say something from the dais with more gravitas than just issuing a statement. He stated that he looked forward to hearing from the School Board on the 24th and to the Supervisors' discussion on September 7.

Ms. Lamb echoed concerns from other members and feels there needs to be an open discussion. She said that there is a question from some School Board members as to why the Supervisors would bring this up, and the answer is because they represent constituents who care about what their children are being taught. She stated that she felt it was a wonderful byproduct of COVID and people having to teach their kids and get to know the curriculum—because that may have been missed—and she was grateful for constituents bringing it forward. Ms. Lamb emphasized that they deserve to completely understand what is being taught in schools.

Ms. Vanuch stated that she agreed with all comments made, and if there are parents that have proof of any CRT curriculum or teachers, they should feel free to reach out to Supervisors prior to the September 7 meeting, so they can directly ask those questions to schools and get to the bottom of those answers. She noted that it would be at the 3:00 p.m. meeting and would come on the agenda as Unfinished Business because they cannot take action on something under New Business at the first meeting.

Item 37. County Attorney; Present and Discuss Proposed Amendments to the Board's By-Laws and Rules of Procedure, and Electronic Participation in Meetings Policy - Mr. Coen said that as the agenda and meetings are getting longer, he has reached out to different entities. He said that in the packet, this topic expounds on the different changes. He said that included are a red-lined version and a version with annotation to know where suggestions came from. He suggested having people look at it, then having the discussion and review in greater detail at the next meeting. He added that he did not think the Board could do this topic justice if they had a full agenda.

Ms. Lamb said she would like to echo those comments. She said that in addition to Supervisor Allen not being present, and since what's presented are the bylaws, she thought the topic should be deferred.

Mr. Presley said he had spoken with the County Attorney when the group was discussing the last issue about Comprehensive Plan approval. He said that might be something that could be excluded from that provision. He said the bylaws then wouldn't have to be waived when this comes back again. He said this is probably not going to be unique to this year, and there will probably be other situations where the Board is going to have to do that review of the Comp Plan every five years. He said it might be in an election cycle where this could come up again. He said he doesn't think that was necessarily the intent—to prevent a Board from going through the process and pleading that process—but he poses it for consideration when it comes back to the Board at the next meeting.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the Board could get the language of what that would look like. She said a lot of times when there are residential rezonings, they need to have a Comp Plan amendment tied to them. She said that she would like the distinction that it's only applicable to the five-year update, versus a Comp Plan amendment tied to a residential rezoning. Ms. Vanuch said this is new business so would come back on the next meeting as Unfinished Business. She said to make sure everyone reads those bylaws and have conversations with supervisors Lamb and Coen.

Item 38. County Administration; Consider Adopting a Joint Schools Working Committee Charter - Mr. Presley said the Board has a copy of the proposed Joint Schools Working Committee charter. He said this was developed by the joint schools working committee over the course of about three meetings. He said the charter is pretty straightforward and does talk about the purpose of the committee. He said it also explains how the members will be appointed by each board, and then goes into some detail about procedures regarding when information is requested from staff and giving staff time to appropriately respond. He said that any amendments and the charter itself must be approved by both boards. He said this draft charter was approved by the School Board on July 27, 2021 and is now before this Board for consideration and approval. He said the members of the Joint Schools Working Committee can speak to the charter and any concerns the Board may have.

Ms. Vanuch asked if any of the members had any comments, questions, or concerns.

Ms. Lamb said the committee has been working on this charter for a long time, and even though it's technically not something that is time sensitive, it seems reasonable to move this forward. She asked if there was any legal reason to not categorize this as time sensitive, vote on it, and move it forward.

Ms. Bohmke said that as the Board was just stating regarding some other decisions being made, she feels like the Board should wait until Ms. Allen is present to vote on the charter. She said she does not feel there is any hurry, and the Board knows that this is an ongoing charter.

Ms. Vanuch said this will show up at the next meeting as Unfinished Business.

Item 39. Human Resources; Consider Adopting a Telework Policy for County Employees - Director of Human Resources Shannon Wagner stated that she would address the proposed telework policy, which was presented to the Finance, Audit, and Budget Committee on June 15 and earlier that afternoon to respond to some follow-up questions and refresh them after the summer break. She said she would be going over a few key discussion points and talk a bit about enforcement and metrics, incentives for those not eligible to telework, number of eligible days weekly to telework, and percentage of usage by department.

Ms. Wagner reported that the purpose of the policy is to provide flexibility to the workforce and improve the work/life quality of employees. She said that telework is not new to the organization, as Stafford County has been offering telework on an ad hoc basis for many years. She said through the pandemic, the percentage of employees teleworking increased dramatically, to maximize social distancing while navigating through the COVID-19 virus.

Ms. Wagner said there have been numerous articles from many professional HR organizations, such as SHRM, talking about the increased employee engagement and satisfaction, reduced absenteeism, and increased productivity that teleworking programs can have. She said that in addition, this is becoming more critical as other organizations and private sector companies are implementing policies related to telework. She said from a recruitment and retention perspective, Stafford County really needs to keep pace—and having a formal policy will help provide more structure and guidance to departments as they navigate teleworking environments.

Ms. Wagner stated that her team reached out to several departments and asked what percentage of their staff would be eligible to telework under the parameters of this policy. She said that "some portion of the time" does not necessarily mean that all employees would have a permanent telework schedule to the full extent of the policy. She emphasized that it's really a maximum picture of what that could look like, but there could be variations depending on the use in that department.

Ms. Wagner said the presented slide summarizes which departments and what percentage of staff, and after the conversation with the FAB committee earlier today, there was a subsequent slide added. She said it summarizes each department's response to what percentage of staff they believe they would be able to provide telework to.

Ms. Wagner said metrics for teleworking were discussed quite a bit, and departments gave many different examples of metrics they were currently using or intended to use. She said the organization has been using metrics for some time, and as a formal telework environment is entered into, those metrics will be able to be fine-tuned. She said some departments are more advanced than others at using these skills, but it is certainly a goal of the organization to continue to progress those forward. She said under the teleworking policy, employees will be expected to maintain and/or improve the high performance standards and customer service expectations.

Ms. Wagner said her team also reached out to several peer localities to see what is being done, and almost all of them already have a telework policy in place. She noted that Spotsylvania did not have a policy in place when her team reached out back in June, but they were working on putting something together for consideration by their County and Board. She said many localities offer very flexible telework agreements that do not place a limit on the number of days an employee could telework, and that is really managed at the department level. She said that as an example, Prince William's policy does not mean that any employee can telework 100% of the time, but there are divisions within the organization that may have that based on the needs or parameters in that office. She commented that Hanover County is similar to the structure being proposed today here, and Chesterfield has a more limited telework policy that really focuses on adverse weather conditions.

Mr. Snellings asked what type of incentives theoretically would be offered.

Ms. Wagner responded that theoretically, they were asking the question of what might be offered to individuals who are not eligible to telework, be it some type of compensation or additional leave, or something of that nature. She said that in the private sector, the reverse is being seen—where employees who are teleworking are being provided a stipend to cover the cost of broadband services. Ms. Wagner said that per the survey completed by her team, none of the jurisdictions are offering incentives of any kind, and staff is not recommending incentives at this time for Stafford.

Ms. Wagner said there would be a formal process put in place. She said several of the proposed documents were included with the Board package that would include the employee initiating the request to have a telework agreement. She said the manager would then approve or not approve based on that employee's position and the individual's current performance. She said there are a number of checklist items to ensure the work environment is appropriate, and a formal agreement that would outline the different parameters and expectations between the individual and the manager. She said it would be up to the manager to determine whether the position has the capacity to have telework as part of its role, looking at the individual's performance as well.

Ms. Wagner said there are a few considerations staff is recommending for this policy, including a maximum of two days per week for employees and one day per week for managers, which is defined as anyone who is managing another person and not necessarily a function.

Mr. Snellings asked why it was set at two days and not three or four.

Ms. Wagner responded that this was talked about a lot, along with using telework as a space-saving mechanism, with a variety of different pros and cons to having more or less days. She said that two days a week was less than 50% of the time, and it was felt that after the pandemic, there was a lot of value to having one-on-one interaction with teammates in the office. She said that from a cultural perspective, there was something lost with the increase in out-of-office time.

Mr. Snellings said he understands that, but there are a lot of people who don't want that. He said there are a lot of people who don't want that interactive space who are introverts and want to be left alone to do their work. He said his daughter-in-law works for the federal government and teleworks five days per week and has been for over a year and a half. He said she has not been in her office in that time, and he doesn't understand why this policy is being limited to two days per week, but he added that it can be discussed during the next meeting.

Ms. Vanuch said that she and Ms. Bohmke are both on FAB and spoke about this, and they felt this might be sort of a pilot to try it and work out the kinks of setting department policies and then bring it back to the Board to expand it if things are going well. She said the other consideration is making sure all the equipment is available.

Mr. Snellings said the organization just had a year-long pilot program.

Ms. Lamb replied that this was true, but it was not done with policies and parameters in place. She said there are a lot of checks and balances, as Ms. Wagner has pointed out.

Ms. Wagner said that she wants to highlight again that the employee is expected to maintain their level of productivity while teleworking. She said if they are unable to do so, management would attempt to work with the employee, but ultimately this is a benefit that can be removed if it is not working out. She stated that it is very crucial to this policy and the organization that customer service be maintained with both internal and external customers.

Ms. Wagner said there is another provision related to where the telework may occur. She said it is currently limited to within the state of Virginia. She said the County Attorney's office and staff have talked about different complications that can arise when teleworking out of state, such as different state taxes, worker's compensation, HR employment laws that vary state to state, and other things that can cause impacts on the operations. She said that for these reasons, at least initially, telework cannot take place outside of the state.

Ms. Wagner said in regard to Mr. Snellings' question about the number of days per week, in certain examples the policy does maintain the County Administrator's ability to provide an exception if there were a case that would rise to that level.

Mr. Snellings said he went through the policy in a bit of detail yesterday and asked why the safety checklist was necessary. He said he understands there was a committee that did this, but it almost needs a structural engineer to create the home office. He asked why this is needed for someone's home, as no one was going to go in and inspect the space.

Ms. Wagner said the committee tried to balance that and said the list could be summarized to a more condensed version, but ultimately the purpose of that checklist is to cover the organization and the employee. She said they are still working on the clock, worker's compensation would still be applicable in a situation of workplace injury, and the organization is responsible to provide a safe working environment. She said that while the policy perhaps overshoots the task, the reasoning was to have parameters for the employee to follow.

Mr. Snellings said all of the Board members work from home and have never gone through a checklist—and no one came to his house to inspect where he was sitting on his laptop. He emphasized that he doesn't see the purpose and feels it's an overextension. He said he thinks the County should be encouraging people to telework, and when roadblocks are put up, that is not encouragement. He said he is totally in favor of the more a person wants to telework, the better, if it fits into the metric parameters.

Ms. Lamb said that in responding to Mr. Snellings' concerns, the reason she did not question the checklist is because when she worked for the federal government and the DOD, she also had to do that checklist. She said when she asked the Department of Homeland Security why it had to be done, she was specifically told that it was related to insurance and worker's compensation. She said that she was told by completing the checklist, it allowed the liability to be moved to where it belongs, which would be on the homeowner. She said that as Board members, they don't fill them out because they are elected positions and don't have an office.

Ms. Lamb said she loves the teleworking benefits, but there was no structure before—and all the lessons learned over the past year are what Mr. Snellings is talking about. She said that this is bringing those all together in a policy with structure that can guide a successful environment and redirect any performance impact, positively or negatively, across the organization.

Mr. Snellings said he would like something from worker's comp or the insurance company that says they require a safety checklist.

Ms. Wagner responded that she will certainly ask for that.

Ms. Vanuch said since this is new business, it would be back on September 7, 2021.

Ms. Bohmke commented that they had said this was going to be a pilot program that would then have feedback from staff, but she doesn't remember if the time period was to be three months or six months. She said that based on that feedback, adjustments would be made to the policy. Ms. Bohmke asked Ms. Wagner to be sure that is included in the resolution when it comes back to the next meeting.

<u>Item. 40. Discuss Permitting Process and Development of a Customer Service Survey for County Website</u> - Ms. Bohmke reported that about six years ago, there was a meeting with FABA and the business community, with different stakeholders invited—and they listened for about two hours to

concerns and complaints. She said it was when the County was moving all of the permits online, and it pains her when people say not very positive things about planning and zoning. She said because of that, when she hears things like, "I don't ever want to do business in Stafford County again," it really bothers her. She said there are two sides to every story, which is something she has learned after 12 years of being an elected official.

Ms. Bohmke stated that she does believe there are still improvements that can be made in the system and encourages the Chairman and County Administrator and staff to work with the Board to figure out where the bottlenecks or delays are. She gave an example of an item sitting at VDOT for three months and then someone not getting their permit for seven months. She said the Board has to figure out where these holdups are in the system and then improve the policies and follow-up on how to make things better. She said she does not want again to be at someone's 80th birthday party and gets the barrage of what the Board is not doing well. She said they all know that the staff works extremely hard, and everyone on the Board is a phenomenal public servant, but it is their role to find the problems and make them better.

Mr. Presley said there is no question there is a lot of room for improvement in the permitting process, and staff realizes that as well. He stated that the meeting that Ms. Bohmke was referring to and that Mike Smith had attended led to the effort that is going through the process of an RFP. He said that was being worked on when COVID hit and was pulled back because all of the processes changed. He said they didn't feel it was appropriate to move forward in the midst of all of that, and many companies didn't want to get involved with this type of work at that time.

Mr. Presley said that they are beyond that now and are getting back into that whole effort and are getting ready to issue the RFP. He said there is a lot of work to do, and it is an absolute priority of this organization. He said that what Andrew Spence had referenced about the citizens-request management system is going to be a great tool for the County. He said there is an option to set up a special element of that just for developers or engineering companies to come in and submit permits where they can go in and if there's an issue, it can be submitted right in the system and will go to everyone who needs to see it. He said the system will direct and track recurrences.

Mr. Presley stated that he went through this at a previous organization, and it was a very comprehensive process mapping for every permit that was applied for. He said they mapped out every step that included internal and external requirements and found out that for some permits, there were 38 steps—which is insane—and they were able to eliminate half of the steps in most cases.

Mr. Presley said that will require his team coming back to this Board to change ordinances and policies. He said that over time to solve a small issue, new ordinances are adopted, and new steps are created in the process. He told the Board that they will see him and his team come back, but they will give a full report—and when the work is done, the Board will be able to see the ordinances that are being recommended for elimination due to redundant steps. He said that while this will take a bit of time, it will be much more efficient sand transparent, and developers will know exactly where they stand at all times.

Ms. Bohmke said that a lot of the frustration is when there is a permit that has been in for six months or so, the developer has addressed all of the minor things, and then at the very end, the developer is told of another item they didn't complete but was never told about along the way.

Mr. Presley said that will definitely be addressed as part of this process.

Ms. Bohmke thanked Mr. Presley for that response.

Ms. Lamb said that she agrees with Ms. Bohmke and looks forward to seeing that value stream analysis, adding that she shares some of her frustrations. She said she wanted to talk about the development of a customer service survey for the website and asked Mr. Presley if, as the County moves over to an ERP system, whether the OpenGov software or their website will support creating a survey to generate good data analytics.

Mr. Presley said he is not sure what the ERP looks like yet in terms of platform, but ultimately, most of them do have that element. He said the CRM system provides that ability, as well as trend analysis that can then be integrated into the other systems like OpenGov.

Ms. Lamb said what she was referring to was the ability to create a survey on anything—not just specifically on those data analytics, because they don't know what's in the future.

Mr. Presley replied that is what CRM is. He said it does not have to be a specific issue but can pertain to whatever people are complaining about. He said that based upon the complaint and once there are trends, routings can be developed so that once a complaint comes in, the necessary people will be notified immediately. He said the customer will also get a response that says their complaint has been received and has been assigned to a certain person who will respond with a certain number of days. He said if that assigned person does not respond in a certain number of days, the manager of that individual gets an automated notification that the response was not made, and the system will track and manage the entire process.

Mr. Presley said all of the Board members reference how busy staff is, and these tools will help staff do their job more efficiently and more effectively—and more importantly, to respond to citizens. He said one of the greatest frustrations he hears is that if the County would have talked to a requestor sooner, the issues could have been resolved. He said that people get busy, and these

tools help to bring the staff and County to the 21st Century and get things where they need to be to respond appropriately.
Mr. Coen asked if this would also apply to ordinary people trying to do things and not just developers.

Mr. Presley responded yes.

Mr. Coen said he wanted to make sure as the comments used referred to the citizens as well as developers and thanked Mr. Presley.

Ms. Vanuch said this is a new business item, but there is no action outside of what the County Administrator mentioned. She asked Mr. Presley if he would like to bring an update at the end of the year, or what he would like to see as a traction process.

Mr. Presley said he will be providing updates as the RFP gets put out. He said Paul will be coming back providing updates.

Ms. Bohmke asked if Mr. Santay is going to give a quick management summary of the RFP process.

Director of Development Services Paul Santay said the RFP is to hire an outside consultant to come in and review the policies, processes, where things can be streamlined in the codes and ordinances that conflict with each other. He said that also part of that scope is to get stakeholder feedback from businesses, homeowners, etc. He said that the County does have the capabilities to work with Community Engagement to get something out there for the short-term. He said this RFP holistically will capture all of that information to provide back to the Board at a later date.

CLOSED MEETING

At 5:05 p.m., Ms. Lamb motioned, seconded by Mr. Snellings, to adopt proposed Resolution CM21-15.

Ms. Vanuch stated: "I would like to disclose that I own property located across the street from 1508 Garrisonville Road, which is owned by the All-Muslim Association of America and is the subject of active litigation. My property is among several parcels which could be impacted or affected by the use of 1508 Garrisonville Road as a cemetery. Discussions regarding litigation and the 1508 Garrisonville Road property would have County-wide impacts and would have no soul impact on my property alone. In accordance with Virginia Code Section 2.2-3.12(b)1, I have no conflict of interest that would prevent me from participating fairly, objectively, and in the best interest of the public. I have also provided disclosure to the clerk in writing. Clerk, if you will please record my disclosure in the record today and at any future meeting where the Board discusses or considers this matter."

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, Dudenhefer, Lamb, Snellings, Vanuch
Nay:	(0)	
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Resolution CM21-15 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for consultation with legal counsel pertaining to opioid litigation to which the County is a party, *Board of Supervisors v. Mashane Nini*, *United States v. Stafford County*, *All Muslim Association of America v. Stafford County*, and *Allen, et al. v. Stafford County* where such consultation in open meeting would adversely affect the litigating posture of the Board; discussion and consideration of the acquisition of an interest in real property for a recreational facility, which is a public purpose, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board; and discussion concerning a prospective business where no previous announcement has been made of the business' interest in locating its facilities in the County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711 (A)(3), (A)(5), and (A)(7) such discussions may occur in Closed Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

CLOSED MEETING CERTIFICATION

At 6:29 p.m., Ms. Lamb motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to adopt proposed Resolution CM21-15(c).

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, Dudenhefer, Lamb, Snellings, Vanuch
Nay:	(0)	

Absent: (1) Allen

Resolution CM21-15(c) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON AUGUST 17, 2021

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 17th day of August, 2021, adjourned into a Closed Meeting in accordance with a formal vote of the Board and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act provides for certification that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with the law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that to the best of each member's knowledge (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the

Following the certification of the closed meeting, Ms. Lamb motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke to adopt proposed Resolution R21-293 and proposed Resolution R21-315.

Resolution R21-293 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR AND THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO EXECUTE THE VIRGINIA ABATEMENT FUND SETTLEMENT ALLOCATION MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AND ANY AND ALL DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO OBTAIN AND DISTRIBUTE THE OPIOID SETTLEMENT FUNDS

WHEREAS, the Board, through counsel, and the Commonwealth of Virginia, through the Office of the Attorney General, are separately engaged in litigation seeking to recover costs incurred and to be incurred in abating the opioid addiction epidemic that plagues Stafford and other Virginia communities; and

WHEREAS, the Board and the Commonwealth share a common desire to abate and alleviate the impacts of the opioid addiction epidemic and to maximize litigation recoveries from those third parties responsible for same; and

WHEREAS, in order to advance their common interests, the Board and the Commonwealth, through counsel, have extensively negotiated the terms of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) relating to the allocation and use of such litigation recoveries; and

WHEREAS, the Board's outside opioid litigation counsel has recommended approval of the proposed MOU; and

WHEREAS, the County Attorney has reviewed the available information about the proposed MOU and concurs with the recommendation of outside counsel; and

WHEREAS, the Board agrees with counsels' recommendation and desires to enter into the MOU;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Attorney and the County Administrator, or their designees, be and they hereby are authorized to execute the Virginia Abatement Fund and Settlement Allocation Memorandum of Understanding pursuant to the terms discussed in closed session; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Attorney, County Administrator, Chief Financial Officer, and Treasurer, or their designees, are also authorized to execute any and all other documents necessary to effectuate this Resolution, and to obtain and distribute the opioid settlement funds.

<u>Resolution R21-315 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR AND THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO EXECUTE ANY AND ALL DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO SETTLE *STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS V. MASHANE NINI,* CL21-1147

WHEREAS, the Board and Mashane Nini are parties to the condemnation case, *Stafford County Board of Supervisors v. Mashane Nini,* CL21-1147; and

WHEREAS, the parties in the above-referenced case desire to enter into a settlement agreement to resolve the respondent's claim for just compensation under the terms and conditions discussed in closed session with the County Attorney;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that the County Attorney and the County Administrator, or their designees, be and they hereby are authorized to execute any and all documents that they deem necessary and appropriate to settle *Stafford County Board of Supervisors v. Mashane Nini,* CL21-1147, under the terms and conditions discussed in closed session.

At 6:30 p.m., Chairman Vanuch recessed the afternoon session of the August 17, 2021 Board meeting.

At 7:00 p.m. Chairman Vanuch called the evening session to order. Ms. Lamb gave the invocation and Ms. Vanuch led the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

PRESENTATIONS – There were no presentations.

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC – Ms. Vanuch said this is the time of the public presentations portion of the meeting, where any member of the public can come and address the Board and will come to the podium, state their name, address, and the district of Stafford County that they reside in, if known. She said members of the public can speak about anything as long as the Board is addressed as a whole and not individual Supervisors. She explained the protocol and timing for public speakers and introduced the first speaker.

1. Mr. Jeff Adams, 449 Kellogg Mill Road - said he is in the Hartwood District and has been for many years, while opening a bag and displaying eggs and an open jar of what looked like milk. He said that according to Mika Brzenzinski of MSNBC News, he is a mass murderer, according to what she said the other day. He said she forgot to tell you that he was suicidal. He said he knows that he's suicidal because the jar of milk in his hand has never been in a refrigerator, has never been pasteurized, and has never been filtered. He then held up and announced an egg still in its shell and cracked it into the jar of milk and continued by stirring the egg in the milk. He said he plays Russian Roulette all the time with the milk as his pistol, the egg as the bullet, and he drank the jar contents.

   Mr. Adams said as a farmer, he is concerned about a lot of things and one of them is alpha-gal allergy, which is a meat allergy. He listed a variety of bacteria, viruses, conditions, disease, and predator-like creatures. He then held up a COVID sign and a bag of manure. He held up the bag of manure and said it is literal. He then held up the COVID sign and said this is figurative. He said if the Board wants to mandate things, how about 30 square feet of garden space for every elementary student. He said let them learn how to raise beds, learn how to garden, put food on the table. He said how about making every high school senior know how to change a flat tire when they are on the side of the road. He said there are all kinds of things we can mandate, but if it's going to be masks and vaccines, then he is not hesitant and is not taking it. He thanked the board for their time.

2. Ms. Lorraine Serbinski, 49 Hunton Drive - said she is presenting tonight to speak against the Leeland Road pedestrian and bicycle upgrade project. She said this plan involves using eminent domain to take the current path and widen it from five feet to 10. She said while she supports the need for a sidewalk where there isn't anything currently, tearing out the existing path and destroying the trees does not benefit the Leeland Station community. She said this morning, a 15-year-old was hit by a car at her bus stop near Leeland Road near Deacon where there is no shoulder nor sidewalk. She said if this project were about safety, full attention and resources would be about fixing that section of the road and not wasting time and taxpayer money, ripping up an existing path.

   Ms. Serbinski said it was mentioned that the path would be part of the East Coast Greenway. She said as a community, they are confused as to why they should give up what they cherish and pay for to accommodate these bicyclists. She said this project has little to do with safety or the VRE or benefiting the community. She said it has a lot to do with allowing the bikers to travel full speed down a smooth path, and the community has to sacrifice for them to do so. She said the community ends up losing actual green for more pavement called a greenway.

   Ms. Serbinski said that a citizen request back in 2010 brought this plan to fruition. She said there are over 700 homes in the community, and what they say matters too. She said they will have to live with what's done when the bulldozers are gone. She said this project will drastically change the aesthetics of the community, and this is their property that's being taken and destroyed. She said more than 400 trees and landscaping items are possibly going to be removed, and these are 20-year-old trees; what trees remain will likely die within a few years from the use of heavy machinery and damage to the root systems. She said the community does not appreciate being forced to accept an austere project that will change the front of their community, lower property values, destroy the natural aesthetics, and take away the uniqueness of 20-year-old trees, which are increasingly hard to find in an ever-developing area.

   Ms. Serbinski said VDOT has repeatedly used ADA regulations as a reason to destroy the current path. She said these rules do not apply to an existing path, but only to new construction, and this narrative is misleading to the public. She said pavement buckling was a reason listed for removing the trees; however, trees can have root systems spanning seven times the diameter of the canopy, causing buckling even from a distance away. She asked what the plan is when the remaining trees eventually buckle the new pavement and asked if the community is to believe the only fix is to tear it all out and start over. She asked what happens to trees on residents' property with offending root systems running near or underneath the path. She said these trees on their property will die from the domino effect. She said the residents of Leeland Station want to keep Leeland beautiful and ask for the Board's help in finding a better way, and she thanked them for their time.

3. Mr. Melvin Allen, 5 Burning Bush Court - thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. He said he believes there are issues with the Rappahannock Regional Jail. He said from the records, it can be seen that Stafford County has paid millions of dollars into this jail and when a citizen goes to a meeting and is given the impression that it doesn't matter, it leaves a very negative connotation. He expressed a significant amount of dissatisfaction with the response from the Board on the issue of the jail and said the community needs diversity on the jail board. He said there are 11 people on that board that includes nine white men and two white women. He said he is not racist, but in today's society, what is happening right now needs to be looked at. He said even the Governor of Virginia recognized it in the document he held up that spoke to the criminal justice system and diversity. He said it is a very large community that is requesting diversity on that board, and he thanked the Supervisors for their time.

4. Mr. Milton Bratton, 37 Bloomington Lane - thanked the Board for allowing him to speak. He said he wanted to reiterate what Mr. Allen said about a coalition that was started to address some of the issues that have been received with regard to the Rappahannock Jail. He said that the coalition has received multiple letters stating that the conditions during the COVID-19 time were unbearable and inhumane, medications were not distributed, the virus went rampant through the jail, and help was asked for to see if there could be relief offered to that particular jail.

   Mr. Bratton said the jail normally houses 1,000 people and got up to a peak of almost 1,300 people. He asked what could be done and what citizens could actually do. He said instead of throwing their hands in the air and saying live with it, he recognizes that he has two sons, one that graduated with a member of the Board. He said his family is part of the community, and if for some reason, one of his sons or daughter ended up in jail, he would at least think they would have a place for them to correct and remember what they are not supposed to do, but at least survive it. He said there were people that died of COVID-19 in the Rappahannock County Jail. He said his biggest concern is that the inhumane conditions need to be improved for everyone that has to live there.

   Mr. Bratton asked if it is possible for the coalition and community to be represented on the jail board and offered it to even be a human rights representative to mitigate some of the concerns. He said he would like it to be someone of a diverse understanding who can represent the family and those in the jails. He said this request has been made multiple times, and there has been no action. He said there is expertise, understanding, and willingness that is not being allowed, and it needs to be looked at. He thanked the Board for their time.

5. Ms. Lori Rys, 3 Jody Court said she moved to the Eastern Hill subdivision 18 years ago next to Vulcan land, which specifically does not allow active mining. She said at some point, the Vulcan Quarry expansion project will come before the Board of Supervisors, this is a massive project with industrial activity unlike any other in Stafford County. She said it impacts far more residents than were ever notified.

   Ms. Rys said the Planning Commission spent months with this proposal up until 10 minutes before the vote at 1 a.m., changes were still being made, and the Commission still denied the recommendation. She said she and her neighbors have repeatedly asked for a comparison of what conditions and ordinances are currently in effect and what will be under the new proposal. She said it is their perspective that the new proposal will eradicate any safeguards the long-established neighborhoods have had. She said the hours of Planning Commission discussion solidified this topic for her community, and the Board can see from staff reports that a denial would not impact Vulcan's ability to do business in Stafford. He said right now their future is secure for the next 64 years, but they are asking for that to be extended even further.

   Ms. Rys said that while the community has various perspectives, but the fear of amplification of an already difficult impact is the drumbeat. She said the machinery can already be seen, already get the dust, and asks what it will be like if Vulcan is allowed to move closer to their community. Ms. Rys said the community voices have been in unison asking to please say, "No. No more. No additional impacts. No new industrial uses. Enough is enough."

   Ms. Rys said most of what the Board will hear is from Vulcan and those who stand to profit from the proposal, and she asked the Board to please bear that in mind and carefully examine every word. She said Vulcan will present reports, and she asked that they be examined for integrity and that the Board be vigilant. She said this is their business, but it is also the lives of those in the community. She noted that she has repeatedly heard that Vulcan will be given whatever they ask for, and there is no point in objecting as no one will listen.

Ms. Rys said before the Planning Commission hearings even began, she asked Jeff Harvey if certain aspects were a done deal, and he told her that all applications are judged on specific criteria. She said she continues to believe this to be the case and said there is a fundamental bond between the Supervisors and the residents: trust. She said that trust is that the Supervisors will hear the residents and act in their best interest, and she trusts that when the Board does hear what the residents have to say, they will put quality of life ahead of quality rock.

6. Mr. Ashby Baber, 134 Debra Drive - thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak and said he has lived at that address for over 30 years. He said his backyard touches property that was, or still is, owned by Mr. Lemming and Ms. Healy, who are working with Vulcan Materials to get the property rezoned from agricultural to heavy industrial. He said he bought his home over 30 years ago and raised his family there, planned on retiring there, and has enjoyed it. He said Vulcan Quarry was there when his family moved there, and they have learned to live with the quarry there. He said they do make some noise, but a lot of other businesses make noise too, and people learn to live near train tracks and firehouses.

   Mr. Baber stated that he is asking the Board to not allow Vulcan to move any closer to his house, and he has pictures of the ceiling in his house cracked from the explosions at the quarry from their current distance. He said that in all of the zoning and planning board meetings that he has attended and the question-and-answer session that was held at North Stafford High School, hundreds of people spoke. He noted that everybody had cracks in walls, foundations, ceilings, and broken windowpane seals continuously breaking. He said that Vulcan explained that settling in a house is normal, but when you take 100 people from Hartwood and 100 from another area past them, there will not be 100 people with those issues in their homes. He said as much as Vulcan would like the Board to think they had nothing to do with it, he thinks they do. He said he is not asking for anything to change in what they are doing but asked that it does not move any closer to his home.

   Mr. Baber said the people in Eastern View seem to have a noise and dust problem that Vulcan can't take care of, and he is concerned about that also coming to his neighborhood. He said he referenced in 2011 when there was an earthquake in the area, that the explosions are like having two or three earthquakes a month. He asked the Board to say no to the conditional use permit that Vulcan is going to ask for and to the rezoning of property that used to be a farm behind his property to heavy industrial. He thanked the Board for their time.

7. Mr. Moe Petway stated that he lives in Spotsylvania but is part of the Rappahannock Regional Jail Coalition. He said as Mr. Allen and Mr. Bratton have already shared, the

coalition has prepared some paperwork for the Board and directed them to the first sheet that states Stafford County contributed over $15M to the Rappahannock Regional Jail. He said in the last 25 years, there has only been one person of color on the Rappahannock Regional Jail Board. He said the coalition is concerned about the County spending $7M to an organization that does not represent diversity. He said Governor Northam has been stressing criminal justice reform—which means rethinking and reorganizing things that have already been done to improve the process.

Mr. Petway directed the Board to look at the bill that is item 5108. He said it is underlined and said Gov. Northam has said the spirit of the jail is to have representation with community of minority interest. He said Ms. Guzman expanded and said people of color and mental health are represented on a state criminal justice policymaking. He said he is asking the Board to look at this and not just take one person's word for this. He said he is disappointed because there was a person who was on the board and didn't give the community the courtesy of what they were looking for. He asked the Board to review the packet and come back for discussion to the Coalition so wrong assumptions are not made.

Mr. Petway said at this time, all of the individual communities totaling $15M in funds paid to RRJ, were done without any representation of the African American community. He said House Bill 5108 specifically address people of color should be on policy-making procedures of the Board. He asks the Board to not let this float and do not pass it along. He said Spotsylvania is going to be having two members that they have appointed to look into this. He said diversity is the way and thanked the Board.

Ms. Vanuch said those were all of the speaker cards she has and asked if anyone else would like to address the Board.

8. Ms. Denise Smith, 760 Garrisonville Road - said she is the steward of 55 acres of land with an old growth forest, and there are plans for there to be a nature center, community retreat space, and eventually an equine therapy center. She said as the Board starts to review the information regarding the Vulcan Quarry expansion, she said they will notice there is one large, gaping hole in the information given: there is no environmental impact study.

   Ms. Smith said in 2010, Vulcan received a letter from the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) voicing concern about the mining impacts to endangered species on the land surrounding the quarry at that time and warned of the impact of siltation, such as dirt run-off from the never-ending berms they are creating, as well as the impacts of quarry activity near a quiet creek and its tributaries. She said the letter also said that keeping open the wildlife corridors between the quarry and among the neighboring properties to minimize the impact on wildlife from quarrying activity. She said the Board can probably recognize that that completely decimates habitat.

Ms. Smith said that recently the Department of Mines and Minerals has stated that usually a quarry will apply for permits for the areas where they want to expand from the DMM first, before asking the County for zoning and special use permits and the reconfiguring of conditions and proffers, as has been going on for the last few months. Ms. Smith said all of these things are supposed to happen after all of the studies are completed—not before.

Ms. Smith said the Board does not have all of the information and asked them to demand the environmental impact study before discussions begin of the proposed expansion. She thanked the Board for their time.

Ms. Vanuch asked if anyone else would like to speak.

9. Ms. Bridgette Farrell Kuzma, 30 Garfield Street - said she is speaking to express her concern about Vulcan's plan for proposed expansion. She said she appreciates all of the time and effort the Planning Commission put into questioning and attempting to understand what Vulcan is asking to do, and more importantly, how it will affect residents. She said she also appreciates that after all of that time and research, the Planning Commission voted 4–2 to recommend denial of this proposal. She said that as the Board knows, their votes are the votes that allow this proposal to go through or not.

   Ms. Kuzma said she believes Vulcan's proposal is intentionally multifaceted, lengthy, and confusing. She said there are many pieces to it, and she hopes the Board will closely examine all of those pieces, while again keeping in mind the interests and quality of life of the Stafford County residents over the large company that is Vulcan.

   Ms. Kuzma said that while Vulcan does produce product that is used in the community, this expansion is not necessary for Vulcan to continue conducting its business as usual. He said what this proposal will do is allow extraction and crushing operations on parcels where those operations are currently not allowed. She said those are parcels that border residential land. She said it will also provide a new location for a concrete plant. She said there is currently a concrete plant utilized by Vulcan located close to I-95 and larger roads. She said building a new concrete plant in Vulcan's proposed location moves more trucks onto roads that are not intended for such traffic and that are highly traveled by school buses and students walking and in cars.

Ms. Kuzma said she and her husband have lived in their home in the Eastern View neighborhood for almost 21 years. She said they live across the street from land that is adjacent to parcel 20-2. She said that in 1988, Parcel 20-2 was reclassified from A1 to M2 with proffers. She said these proffers stated that no mining quarry activities could take place on 20-2. She continued that it allows for accessory uses that do not create adverse noise impacts and that the property would not be used for extraction of minerals or stone.

Ms. Kuzma said 33 years later, with a neighborhood still adjacent to Parcel 20-2, this proposed CUP wants to now allow heavy industrial and heavy manufacturing for specifically stone extraction. She asked what has changed in this time that this activity should suddenly be allowed. She said it will certainly create adverse noise impacts for residents in the same homes that were there 33 years ago when this was initially proposed and approved with proffers. She said it does appear that Vulcan will lobby for extraction on a small portion of Parcel 20-2. She said that would require removal of proffers put in place to protect the nearby residents.

Ms. Kuzma said the comprehensive object 4.6 is about minimizing the impacts of mineral extractions on nearby properties. She said allowing more mining on more land close to homes will not have a minimal impact. She asked that the Board please consider all of the adjacent neighborhoods and residents who are affected by this proposal and asked that they consider every word of this proposal and its negative impacts for so many residents. She said as Vulcan's neighbors, they say no to this proposed expansion and hopes the Board will keep them in mind in all of their research and decisions. She then thanked the Board for their time.

10. Mr. Todd Repass, Jr., 2 Neabsco Drive (Falmouth District) - said he is proud to be a resident of Stafford County and truly appreciates the public service that each Board member provides. He said he has attended but has never spoken at a Board meeting before, but tonight he has an urgent request. He asked the Board to please look into the Leeland Road High-Speed Bicycle Pass and consider not letting it move forward. He said this project makes absolutely no political, economic, or physical security sense.

    Mr. Repass said this is planning a security and natural disaster that accommodates an estimated five bicyclists per day. He said when asked how many would use it, VDOT's official answer is that they don't track that information. He said when he asked how many voiced that they would use it, they quoted less than five. He said that is over $500,000 per bicyclist that the taxpayers are funding.

Mr. Repass said there was no crime study done because VDOT doesn't have to do one. He said when you destroy all of the physical security barriers of fencing, trees, culverts, etc. and increase the transient activity, crime follows. He said it takes only one injured or impacted child walking to school and asked who would be responsible for this decision. He said there was no noise abatement analysis done because VDOT doesn't have to do one. He said when you destroy all trees and other natural sound barriers, noise increases. He said there was no analysis done on the impact of artillery fungus on the houses within the impact zone because VDOT doesn't have to. He said when large amounts of mulch with artillery fungus present, it spreads.

Mr. Repass said VDOT did not follow proper notifications on this project, and they know it. He said he respects the VDOT representatives for working with them now, but it still doesn't make sense. He said VDOT has said that if the $2.8M isn't spent on this project, Stafford County could lose the funding. He asked if the County really wanted to spend $2.8M on a project that is unnecessary just because it doesn't want to lose the funds. He asks why not spend it elsewhere in Stafford for highway projects that each Board member supports.

Mr. Repass asked again for all parties to rethink this project and thanked the Board for their service and time.

11. Mr. Chris Campana, 4 Neabsco Drive (Falmouth District) - said he too lives in Leeland Station, and when they moved to the area back in 2000, they lived in the Stratford Place, and when Leeland Station went in 2005, he and his family were drawn to the beauty of the community with the trees and the fence. He said three years ago, they moved there.

    Mr. Campana said there is a crosswalk at Conway Elementary, but there is not one at the Leeland Train Station. He said he has witnessed a man in a motorized wheelchair cross from the commuter lot at Leeland Station over to a playground area where there is no crosswalk. He said nobody stops for him and people will actually stand out in the road to wave motorists down. He asked the Board if they've ever walked down that path and said it's beautiful. He said the VDOT-proposed image removes those trees, and their proposed plan would take years to develop before anyone has the opportunity to enjoy them.

    Mr. Campana said there is a guard rail there with a plastic fence and trees, and just as Mr. Repass had mentioned, there is a barrier in the event a car runs loose on the road. He said if you take that stuff away, now people walking on the path are exposed. He said that during the September 3, 2019 meeting, a Board member mentioned that they could not support something that does not include the individuals it's going to impact. He said VDOT did not contact all of the members that would be impacted in Leeland Station. He asked for the Board to consider looking at the VDOT plan, then consider looking at going in the other direction from Deacon Street and the crossing at Leeland Station. He said that would be a better option from the community's point of view, as it would offer safety and they wouldn't lose a path. He thanked them for their time.

12. Ms. Annalee Judd, 223 Switchyard Court in Leeland Station - said she is concerned about the bike path and proposal of what is wanting to be done. She said her main concern is that there is no sidewalk that leads from Leeland Station to Deacon Road. She said there was some poor girl today that was struck in a hit-and-run—and if there had been a sidewalk, she would never have been hit. She said this proposal is to tear up a sidewalk that is already there and protected by trees and a nice fence, yet there is no sidewalk on the other end. She said the priorities are all mixed up here. She said safe sidewalks are needed on the other end, and to keep the safe sidewalk that is already there. Ms. Judd emphasized that in her view, safety should come first.

13. Ms. Ree Campana, 4 Neabsco Drive – said she wants to reiterate what has been said about Leeland Station. She asked the Board to go back to the September 3, 2019 meeting in which this Board was discussing a different project. She said one of the Board members made a very wise statement that everyone needs to be brought into the fold when decisions are being made. She said that at that meeting when the proposal of the bike trail was brought up, a few sitting here did not appreciate the price tag associated with it. She said she would love this Board to go back and revisit that as well because the price tag is $2.8M for 0.7 miles. She said it makes no sense and is not something wise to do with taxpayer money. She thanked them for their time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Item 41. Utility Operations; Consider Adoption of Fees Associated with and Establishment of a Fats, Oils, and Grease (FOG) Program for Commercial Kitchens - Mr. Chris Edwards stated that he would present the Fats Oils and Grease (FOG) Program, along with Environmental Compliance Manager John Randal, who could help answer any questions. Mr. Edwards said that approximately 50% of all sanitary sewer overflows can be attributed to FOG. He said Stafford County spends over $1.5M annually to make sure this does not happen, which is a fairly significant impact to the annual operating budget.

Mr. Edwards said the primary components of the FOG program include some standard policies and procedures that are required. He said this is mostly awareness education for ensuring that people do not put FOG down drains, providing oil recycling containers since there is no place to put oil, and ensuring that people install and maintain their grease-control devices.

Mr. Edwards shared a slide to demonstrate the types of businesses that have a higher impact from the FOG program and said they are those that have a high potential for grease: where meat is cooked from raw sources, they have a lot of fried food, and they already have a grease-control device as required by the International Plumbing Code.

Mr. Edwards said the permit details are based upon best management practices for most restaurants and will require annual inspection. He said with that inspection, there will be a $100 permit fee and a $50 reinspection fee for those in violation. He said the goal is to make sure that the County is following all of best management practices and to implement the fee in January 2022. He said that will allow for a grace period until the beginning of the year.

Mr. Edwards moved to the next slide and said that the program is designed to promote industry standard best management practices, but the goal is to help make sure there are not issues with sanitary sewer overflows from FOG in the future. He said this was approved by the Utilities Commission in May 2021 and would need Board action tonight.

Mr. Snellings asked if this means that inspection will take place in every restaurant in Stafford.

Mr. Edwards said they will not be going into every restaurant—only those that have high potential, meaning those that do a lot of frying and cooking. He said a lot of the work will be done through the website, so if there is maintenance on the grease-control device, those receipts can be submitted. He said the goal is to make sure restaurants that utilize those devices are providing their staff with training and providing maintenance on the device to limit the amount of oil and grease going down the drain.

Mr. Snellings asked if there is any equipment that needs to be installed.

Mr. Edwards responded that most places already have a grease-control device. He said there may be one or two that will have to install an under-sink grease-control device, but most already have a larger one in the parking lot, and the goal is to make sure they are pumping it out.

Ms. Bohmke said she feels like they've talked about FOG before and asked if this is a different permitting fee.

Mr. Edwards said that his department has previously done some educational things and did postpone the program until the pandemic was passing. He said this summer, after some issues continued, staff felt it was time to push the program forward.

Ms. Vanuch asked what the definition is of a "commercial kitchen." She said she is aware of several nonprofits that have opened up and asked if those were considered commercial, or if a church was considered to have a commercial kitchen.

Mr. Edwards explained that a commercial kitchen is really defined by the County as one that is going to be doing any kind of large-scale cooking that includes cooking meat from a raw state, but not necessarily reheating anything. He said the target of this program is those kitchens that are doing large-scale cooking on a daily basis or using a fryer on a daily basis. He said it won't be churches, but rather those places that are selling food on a day-to-day basis.

Ms. Lamb said she was all good until Mr. Edwards said he would exclude churches. She said the only reason she's bringing it up is because there are churches that have programs designed to feed the community on certain days of the week. She said she has gone to some of those and there are fried foods being distributed, so she wondered what would be done for those places.

Mr. Edwards replied that he is not sure if churches are required to have a separate permit, but the target of this program is those restaurants providing day-in, day-out service.

Mr. Randall said that as they begin this process, they will first go to all of those restaurants that are known to do this type of frying, and they will begin the process. He said he will also go to any business where there are known problems with grease in the interceptors. He said if they have problems with grease and interceptors—and find out the church is causing it—he will help them by first educating them, and then if needed will add them to the process.

Ms. Vanuch asked what the cost is for one of these devices.

Mr. Randall said that generally as the kitchen is being built, the trap is put in. He said if a kitchen does not have it, they can put one under the sink that is smaller and is relatively inexpensive. He said all of that is much less expensive than digging up the lateral because it's all full of grease.

Mr. Coen said that in theory, the restaurant will get the $100 permit fee that they will pass onto the consumer. He said the other option would be the $1.5M fee that is put on all the taxpayers and water users in the County to clean up the damage.

Mr. Edwards showed images of clogged drains.

Ms. Vanuch opened the public hearing.

Seeing no speakers, Ms. Vanuch closed the public hearing.

Ms. Lamb motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to approve Ordinance O21-35.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, Dudenhefer, Lamb, Snellings, Vanuch
Nay:	(0)	
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Ordinance O21-35 reads as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO ADOPT THE FATS, OILS, AND GREASES (FOG) PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL KITCHENS WITH ASSOCIATED FEES

WHEREAS, Stafford County Code Chapter 25, Article X, Sewer Use Standards regulates the use of the County's public sewer system (System) and prevents the introduction of pollutants into the System that will interfere with its operation; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County Code Sec. 25-199(b)(17) prohibits users from introducing into the System fats, oils, or greases (FOG) of animal or vegetable origin in concentrations, which may cause blockages in the System or that exceed the local limit established for oil and grease; and

WHEREAS, in order to significantly reduce the introduction of FOG into the collection system a formal pretreatment program is necessary with routine inspections to enforce grease control device maintenance, oil disposal, and best management practices; and

WHEREAS, the FOG Program will be administered under the Stafford County Pretreatment Program (Program) and governed by the conditions set forth in the Stafford County Department of Utilities Commercial Kitchen FOG Discharge General Permit Policy required for commercial kitchens with high-potential for FOG discharge; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-2122 and County Code Sec. 25-260, the Board may adopt reasonable fees for the reimbursement of costs of setting up and operating the Program; and

WHEREAS, the permit fees are structured to offset the cost of administering the Program and partially funding a Pretreatment Inspector position; and

WHEREAS, the Utilities Commission held a public hearing at its meeting on May 11, 2021 and recommended adoption of the FOG Program and associated fee; and

WHEREAS, the Board has carefully considered the recommendations of the Utilities Commission and staff, and the public testimony, if any, received at the public hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that it be and hereby does adopt the Stafford County Department of Utilities Commercial Kitchen Fats, Oils, and Greases (FOG) Discharge General Permit Policy (Program) to regulate the discharge of FOG by commercial users into the public sewer system; and

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the following fees associated with the Program are hereby established:

Annual FOG Permit Fee	Reinspection Fee
$100.00	$50.00

; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER ORDAINED that this Ordinance shall be effective January 1, 2022.

Item 42. Budget and Management; A Resolution to Budget and Appropriate Prior Year Schools Health Insurance Savings to the Schools Health Insurance Fund for a Payment to Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust - Ms. Andrea Light said the School Board has requested a budget appropriation of prior-year health benefit savings in the amount of $9M, to be sent to the other post-employment benefits trust fund. She said the calculation of the $9M follows policy requirements that the Board has established for County, which is incurred but not reported, plus 10% of annual claims.

Ms. Coen asked if there is already money in the existing budget to go into this funding.

Ms. Light said she does not believe she has seen them budgeting for OPEB costs in the past. She said the County does budget for healthcare costs for both employer and employee portions.

Ms. Vanuch opened the public hearing.

Seeing no speakers, Ms. Vanuch closed the public hearing.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Lamb for approval of R21-233.

The Voting Board Tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, Dudenhefer, Lamb, Snellings, Vanuch
Nay:	(0)	
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Resolution R21-233 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE PRIOR YEAREND SCHOOLS HEALTH INSURANCE SAVINGS TO THE SCHOOL HEALTH INSURANCE FUND TO TRANSFER TO THE OTHER POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS (OPEB) TRUST

WHEREAS, Schools health insurance savings in the amount of $9,000,000 were realized by the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 and held in reserve; and

WHEREAS, on June 29, 2021, the School Board passed a resolution requesting the Board approve the budget and appropriation of FY2020 funding from the Schools Health Insurance Fund in the amount of $9,000,000 to be transferred to Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust; and

WHEREAS, this amount exceeds one percent of the FY2022 Budget and therefore, in accordance with the Virginia Code the Board has held the required public hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that Nine Million Dollars ($9,000,000) of health insurance savings held in prior yearend fund balance within the Schools Health Insurance Fund be and it hereby is budgeted and appropriated the Schools Health Insurance Fund to make a payment to the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust.

Item 43. Planning and Zoning; Consider an Ordinance to Amend and Reordain Stafford County Code to Modify and Establish Requirements for Dedication of Land and Improvements to the County - Mr. Harvey stated that proposed ordinance O21-26 will amend subdivision and zoning ordinance provisions that are not in compliance with state code. He said staff has become aware of a situation where the local ordinances require dedications of land for by-right development, which is not permitted. He said dedications of land can be obtained for approval of development projects through the rezoning process, but not for by-right development. He said the code sections that are changing are sections 22-166, which currently require dedicating land for parks, schools, and other public purposes if they have been identified in the Comp Plan. He said that section will be repealed.

Mr. Harvey said Section 22-167 will also be repealed and deals with right-of-way additions along roadways. He said Section 22-221 will remove the requirement to provide trails and bike lanes as identified in the Comprehensive Plan. He said this does not preclude the County from requiring sidewalks as part of normal development.

Mr. Harvey said the zoning ordinance would also amend Section 28-38 and require a set-aside for the planned roadway improvements. He said the code requirements through 28-106 would prohibit parking in travel lanes within those planned set-aside areas. He said Section 28-258 will delete reference to land dedications. He said the Planning Commission held its public hearing and is recommending approval, as is staff.

Ms. Vanuch opened the public hearing.

Ms. Vanuch closed the public hearing and asked if there was a motion.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Lamb to approve O21-26.

Mr. Coen asked if this would impact the amount of acreage being put aside for green space or other elements.

Mr. Harvey said the ordinance requirements for open space are set based on the property boundary. He said in cases of set-aside, the property boundary is not changing, so the set-aside will count towards open space area. He said that unlike the current situation, if they dedicate a right of way, that is no longer part of the property. He said that is one of the benefits to the property owner in this property.

Ms. Vanuch said there is a motion and a second, no more discussion, and to cast votes.

The Voting Board Tally was:

Yea:	(5)	Bohmke, Dudenhefer, Lamb, Snellings, Vanuch
Nay:	(1)	Coen
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Ordinance O21-26 reads as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 22-166, "PARKS, SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC LAND;" SEC. 22-167, "RIGHT OF WAY ADDITIONS;" SEC. 22-221, "CURB, GUTTER AND SIDEWALKS, WHERE REQUIRED;" SEC. 28-38, "PERFORMANCE REGULATIONS;" SEC. 28-106, RIGHT-OF-WAY PROTECTION;" AND SEC. 28-256, "REQUIRED STANDARDS AND IMPROVEMENTS GENERALLY" TO MODIFY AND ESTABLISH REQUIREMENTS FOR DEDICATION OF LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS TO THE COUNTY

WHEREAS, County Code Sec. 22-166, "Parks, schools and public land;" Sec. 22-167, "Right of way additions;" and Sec. 22-221, "Curb, gutter and sidewalks, where required;" of the Subdivision Ordinance and Sec. 28-38, "Performance regulations;" Sec. 28-106, "Right of way protection;" and Sec. 28-256, "Required standards and improvements generally" of the Zoning Ordinance require dedication of land and public street right-of-way to the County as a condition of approval of site plans and subdivision plats ("Dedications"); and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to amend the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances to bring the Dedications into compliance with law and best zoning and subdivision practices; and

WHEREAS, the Board considered the recommendations of the Planning Commission and staff, and testimony of the public, if any, received at the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Board believes that public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning and subdivision practices require adoption of such an ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 17th day of August, 2021, that Stafford County Code Sec. 22-166, "Parks, schools and public land," Sec. 22-167, "Right of way additions," Sec. 22-221, "Curb, gutter and sidewalks, where required," Sec. 28-38, "Performance regulations," Sec. 28-106, "Right of way protection," and Sec. 28-256, "Required standards and improvements generally" be and they hereby are amended and reordained as follows, with all other portions remaining the same:

Sec. 22-166. - ~~Parks, schools and public land.~~<u>Reserved</u>

~~In subdividing property, consideration shall be given to suitable sites for parks, schools, roads, and other areas of public use as contained in the comprehensive plan. Sites for parks, schools, or other public facilities shall be indicated on the preliminary plan to determine if, when, and in what manner such sites will be dedicated to, reserved for, or acquired by the governing~~

~~body for that use. This regulation shall not be construed to preclude the dedication of property for public use not included in the comprehensive plan, provided such property is accepted by the county for dedication and maintenance.~~

Sec. 22-167. - ~~Right-of-way additions.~~ Reserved

~~(a) Where the comprehensive plan indicates a proposed right-of-way greater than that existing along the boundaries of a subdivision or lot, the additional right-of-way shall be dedicated for public use when the plat is recorded.~~

~~(b) When a new subdivision abuts one side of an existing or platted road or street, the subdivider shall be required to dedicate at least half the right-of-way necessary to make the street comply with the minimum right-of-way width prescribed by this chapter.~~

Sec. 22-221. - Curb, gutter and sidewalks, where required.

Curb, gutter and sidewalks shall be required, at a minimum, within the right-of-way for all streets, accessways or service drives in subdivisions as follows:

(1) Curb, gutter and sidewalks shall be provided within the right-of-way of all streets, existing and proposed, within subdivisions which contain any lot less than thirty thousand (30,000) square feet in size except for full low-impact development subdivisions in accordance with the provisions of chapter 21.5 of this Code where curb and gutter shall not be required within the right-of-way of all streets which front on lots greater than ten thousand (10,000) square feet in size and where sidewalks shall not be required. Pedestrian trails and/or bicycle lanes may be provided in lieu of sidewalks within the right-of-way of all arterial or collector streets, existing and proposed, within subdivisions which contain any lot less than thirty thousand (30,000) square feet in size. ~~Pedestrian trails and/or bicycle lanes shall be provided where specified in the comprehensive plan or where there is a connection to an existing pedestrian trial or bicycle lane.~~ The provisions of section 22-223 shall still apply.

(2) Curb, gutter and sidewalks shall be provided within the right-of-way of all streets, existing and proposed, within cluster subdivisions except for full low-impact-development subdivisions in accordance with chapter 21.5 of this Code. In full low-impact development subdivisions, curb and gutter shall not be required within the right-of-way of all streets which front on lots greater than ten thousand (10,000) square feet in size, and sidewalks shall not be required within the right-of-way of all streets which front on lots of any size. Pedestrian trails and/or bicycle lanes may be provided in lieu of sidewalks within the right-of-way of all arterial or collector streets, existing and proposed, within cluster subdivisions. ~~Pedestrian trails and/or bicycle lanes shall be provided where specified in the~~

~~comprehensive plan or where there is a connection to an existing pedestrian trial or bicycle lane.~~ The provisions of section 22-223 shall still apply.

Sec. 28-38. - Performance regulations.

(f) *~~Setbacks r~~Requirements where street improvements are planned.* Where roadway improvement plans ~~exist,~~ are identified in the Comprehensive Plan ~~approved by either the state or county~~, or are approved by either the Virginia Department of Transportation or the board of supervisors, for the widening, opening, or relocation of any street or highway within the county, it shall be required that setbacks for any new construction be calculated based on the planned right-of-way area and that the location of improvements be set outside of the planned right-of-way area as provided herein ~~in order to protect and preserve the right-of-way for such proposed street or highway~~. The planned right-of-way area shall remain free of structures, parking areas, vehicle travel lanes, and monument signs, except for perpendicular utility crossings, perpendicular entrances, and approved landscaping.

Sec. 28-106. Right-of-way protection.

Roads shall be constructed and rights-of-way provided in accordance with the Stafford County Subdivision Ordinance and Virginia Department of

Transportation standards. Where roadway plans ~~exist~~ are identified in the Comprehensive Plan, or are approved by either the Virginia Department of Transportation or the board of supervisors, for widening, opening or relocating any street or highway within the county, setbacks for any new construction shall be calculated based on the planned right-of-way area. Parking areas, loading areas, and vehicle travel lanes shall not be located in such planned right-of-way areas, except for perpendicular entrances ~~in order to preserve and protect the right-of-way for such proposed street or highway~~.

Sec. 28-256. - Required standards and improvements generally.

(c) In addition to improvements and standards specified in other sections of this article, the following minimum standards and improvements shall also be required:

(1) ~~When a site development plan abuts one side of any public street which is in the state highway system and/or maintained by the county or which is proposed by the comprehensive plan of the county, the development shall be required to dedicate at least one-half of the right-of-way necessary to make horizontal and vertical adjustments to such street. Any such right-of-way addition shall be dedicated for public use when the plat is recorded. When a site development plan is presented on~~

~~public streets of less than fifty (50) feet in total width, additional right-of-way shall be dedicated to achieve at least a minimum fifty (50) feet in width. The board of supervisors may grant relief from the requirement to dedicate right-of-way; provided, that no such dedication shall create a nonconformity. All building setbacks~~ Development within planned right-of-way areas shall be ~~measured~~ in accordance with applicable subdivision and zoning ordinance requirements, including but not limited to subsection 28-38(f).~~from the additional dedicated right-of-way. No alley on a site plan shall have a right-of-way of less than twenty (20) feet.~~

~~(8) In the preparation of site development plans, consideration will be given to provide suitable areas for parks, schools, open space and other areas of public or private recreational use, especially when such facilities are proposed in the general vicinity of the area under consideration in the adopted comprehensive plan for the county.~~

(~~9~~8) Adequate fire hydrants, with assurance of adequate water supply and distribution systems, will be provided by the developer, unless county policy, approved programs and the conditions then present warrant otherwise. Fire hydrants will be provided in the total area to be planned, and in such locations as are approved by the board of supervisors or its designated agent.

(~~10~~9) Landscaping plantings, screening, fences, walks, curbs, gutters and other physical improvements shall be installed, where appropriate, along all affected street frontage and shall be designed to be congruent with physical improvements on adjacent properties, as required by this article, or other ordinances of the county and the regulations of VDOT, where appropriate, will be provided by the developer.

(~~11~~10) No uses requiring a site plan as listed in section 28-245 of this article shall be located within a minimum distance of any sewerage treatment facility less than that specified by Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Health requirements.

(~~12~~11) For any new construction or addition requiring a major site plan, the developer shall provide lighting in accordance with section 28-87 of this chapter to adequate light the parking areas, as well as illuminate the entrance onto public streets and any walkways bordering the parking areas. Installation and operating costs of such lighting shall be the responsibility of the developer/owner. Such lighting shall be located, screened or shielded so that adjacent residential uses are not directly illuminated. The location of the required lights and related information shall be shown on the site plan.

Adjournment At 7:57 p.m., Chairman Vanuch adjourned the August 17, 2021 Stafford County Board of Supervisors meeting.

Frederick J. Presley
County Administrator

Crystal L. Vanuch
Chairman

Bill and Pinyada Gordon
73 Royal Crescent Way
Fredericksburg, VA 22406

Stafford County Board of Supervisors
1300 Courthouse Road
Stafford, VA 22554

28 July 2021

To the Honorable Members of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors:

I wish to add my name to those who are calling upon Stafford County to join its municipal neighbors, Fredericksburg City and Spotsylvania County, in offering real estate tax increase exemptions for homes which see an increase in value due to the installation of solar panels.

Every day, more and more stories are published about the havoc being wreaked throughout the world as a result of climate change. Extreme weather events, flooding, melting of polar ice caps, historic droughts, wildfires so severe they create their own weather and animal species becoming more aggressive as a result of climate change reducing their available food and habitat.

In this environment, it is incumbent on our elected leaders to be proactive in embracing all available means to reduce our carbon footprint and try to slow, if not the reverse, the detrimental effects of climate change, which are no longer some abstract, far-future threat, but are here now.

While investment in solar energy has become more affordable over the past few years, the costs remain significant, even factoring in the federal tax incentive, which will begin to sunset in 2023. Even Dominion Energy is working to incentive solar adoption through its support of the net metering program, under which the utility pays solar customers whose systems generate more electricity than they can use, and send that excess to the grid. Given the expense associated with these systems, concerns regarding a potentially higher real estate tax bill could very well stand in the way of making a decision that otherwise would be good for their wallets, and would unquestionably be good for the community, the state, the country and the world. I don't see how the county coffers would suffer from offering this simple protection for would-be solar customers sitting on the fence.

Your municipal partners in Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania have already seen the wisdom and benefit in offering this incentive to its residents. Why has Stafford dragged its feet on following suit? I urge you to bring this up before the full Board of Supervisors and immediately enact a plan to put in place a real estate tax increase exemption for homes which see an increase in value due to the installation of solar panels.

Your constituent,

Bill Gordon

Saturday, July 31, 2021

Dear Stafford County Board of Supervisors:

We learned from a July 2020 Free Lance-Star newspaper that the Stafford NAACP requested the Stafford County Board of Supervisors to remove all Confederate symbols such as street names, statues, memorials, flags, etc. from Stafford County. We, your constituents, desire to present you another viewpoint. We wish our heritage, our history, not to be erased.

We are descendants of soldiers who sacrificed, suffered, and bled to protect the homes, families, and all people of Stafford County. We believe their heroic sacrifice is worthy to be remembered. We are the Major General Fitzhugh Lee Camp, one of four "Camps"of the "Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV)" in our local area. Most of us live in Stafford County with a few of us living in neighboring Spotsylvania County, Virginia. Many of us are descended from families of Stafford County during and before the War Between the States, 1861-1865, e.g., Newton, Shelton, etc. Some of us came to Stafford County because of the history honored here through historic sites, street names, statues, memorials, etc. Like famous Confederate Generals Robert Edward Lee and Thomas Jonathan Jackson of Virginia, who opposed slavery, our ancestors fought in the Confederate Army solely to protect their homes, families, and their neighbors from invading armies. Our ancestors sought to uphold the Constitutional Rights of Individual Citizens and their States. We are a diverse group of men in the SCV Camp. In our SCV Camp, we are First Responders, Law Enforcement, Veterans of our U.S. Armed Forces, a Christian Pastor, a U.S. Government Civil Rights Specialist, etc. The Sons of Confederate Veterans, Inc. are men descended from Confederate Soldiers and Sailors. Like our diverse ancestors in the Confederate Army and Navy, the SCV is composed of African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, Native

American Indians, and Caucasians.

We do not want our history to be erased. We do not want our honorable ancestors to be dishonored. While we respect the heritage of others, we also want our heritage to be respected. Thank you, our local representatives, for hearing our concerns. If you would like to meet with us, we would be agreeable to discuss with you our concerns.

Respectfully, your constituents from the Major General Fitzhugh Lee Camp of the Sons of Confederate Veterans,

D. Wayne Retter

Michael Virts

Mr. Michael Virts
6 Adam Ct
Fredericksbrg, VA 22405

Cell Phone: (301) 466-5803