BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 15, 2022

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, February 15, 2022, 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; Pamela Yeung, Vice Chairman; Tinesha O. Allen; Meg Bohmke; Thomas C. Coen; Darrell English; Monica Gary (remote).

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

Ms. Vanuch stated that Ms. Gary was absent due to a medical condition but would like to participate in the afternoon session remotely from her home, and she asked for a motion to allow Ms. Gary to participate in the Board meeting through electronic communications.

Ms. Yeung motioned to allow Ms. Gary to participate in the meeting electronically. Ms. Bohmke seconded the motion.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	
Abstain:	(1)	Gary

Ms. Vanuch recognized that February is Black History Month, and the County website has two videos that spotlight Stafford's 350+ years of African American history. She noted that the videos are on their website and social media pages, and she thanked Ms. Yeung and Ms. Allen for the incredibly eloquent and inspiring comments in the videos on the African American experience in the country today.

Ms. Vanuch reported that the United Way had tax assistance available, and the Rappahannock Area United Way provides free tax assistance this time of year. She stated that if your household income is less than $80K annually, you are eligible to receive free tax assistance from professionals through the United Way; more information is available at rappahannockunitedway.org. She commented that the Board is grateful for their partnership and service to the community.

Ms. Vanuch reported that the FRED free transit buses would go fare free starting February 28, funded by a grant from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDRPT) and is made possible by funding and support from localities like Stafford. She commented that the Board appreciated FRED making the service more accessible for residents.

PRESENTATIONS

Proclamation Recognizing Deputy Olivia J. Hepperle for Outstanding Service to Stafford County and its Animals

Ms. Vanuch stated that Deputy Olivia Hepperle had investigated the animal cruelty case for the dogs Gracie and Dean, and Dean was so weak he could not walk a few weeks ago. She said that Deputy Hepperle initiated care for both dogs and took Dean home to foster; Dean had to stay overnight in an animal hospital because he struggled to breathe. Ms. Vanuch explained that the vets called Deputy Hepperle, and she rushed to his side; when he knew she was there, his heart rate went up—and today both dogs are doing better but still have a long road to recovery.

Ms. Vanuch stated that Stafford County was honoring Deputy Hepperle today for making the difference between life and death for these two dogs and the other animals she encounters every day. She presented Deputy Hepperle with a proclamation in honor of her service and read it into the record, stating that both dogs have improved and brought a much needed spotlight on the excellent work of the deputy and the staff of the Stafford County Animal Shelter.

Proclamation Recognizing Michael T. Smith For 36 Years of Service to Stafford County

Ms. Vanuch stated that Mr. Michael T. Smith would be retiring after 36 years of service, noting that he worked his way up from wastewater plant operator in 1986 to the second-highest job in the County—which is an accomplishment in an era where people rarely stay in a job for more than a few years. She said that Mr. Smith's dedication and loyalty to the County are only matched by all the employees who have worked under him, and his institutional knowledge and friendly, helpful demeanor would be greatly missed. Ms. Vanuch stated that the County wished him well as he and his wife traveled the U.S. in their new camper.

Ms. Vanuch read the proclamation and presented Mr. Smith with the recognition, and he accepted the proclamation at the dais.

Mr. Smith said he owed a lot to the County and appreciated the opportunities it had given him.

ADDITIONS - DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

Mr. Presley stated that there was an addition to the agenda for a discussion re: joining the Virginia Coalition of High-Growth Communities Association, requested by Supervisor Bohmke. He said there was also an addition to a handout for Item 24 under New Business re: Planning and Zoning considering a time-limit extension request for reclassification application RC-161-51330, "Willow Run," with this handout replacing Attachment 2, a letter dated February 11, 2022 that replaces the email in the background report.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve the additions to the Regular Agenda.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Ms. Vanuch explained the protocol for public presentations and called the first speaker forward.

1. Ms. Margaret Lowry stated that she is a resident of the Rock Hill District and was before them again to stress the need for artificial turf field for stadiums at North Stafford and Colonial Forge high schools. Ms. Lowry said that she appreciated the Board's verbal acknowledgement of the need to resolve the parity issue at their February 1 meeting. She noted that June 2022 marks the 50th anniversary of the passing of the Equal Opportunity in Education Act, referred to as Title 9, and the Board and School Board have worked to make sure that all students have equal opportunities in Virginia High School League (VHSL) activities and athletics—yet they've been waiting eight years to resolve the equity issue regarding athletic facilities at the five high schools.

   Ms. Lowry stated that a great example of the benefits of equal opportunities has been in the success of field hockey teams at Stafford and Mountain View that have practiced and played on turf fields since 2014 and 2015. She said that since getting their turf fields, both teams have advanced to the state finals four to six times; Mountain View has won two state championships, and Stafford has been in the finals twice during that time period, including one time in 2016 when both teams were in the championship game.

Ms. Lowry said that spring sports would officially begin next week for the high schools, and girls and boys soccer and lacrosse teams at Brooke Point, Stafford, and Mountain View would all have practice times on their lined and lighted turf fields for games to be played on turf fields against every opponent except North and Forge. She said the activities administrators at those schools would be trying to rent fields for practices and scrimmages on days like today that are sunny but with muddy fields.

Ms. Lowry stated that Superintendent Taylor was proposing a budget for FY23 that requires funding for long-overdue increases in teacher salaries and maintenance funds for school repairs and replacement needs, and she is asking the Board to work with the School Board to find the funding to install artificial turf fields at North and Forge in summer of 2022, as students deserve to be given the same opportunities to success as those at the other three high schools. She quoted Billie Jean King's comment prior to the Superbowl: "It's hard to understand exclusion until you've been excluded."

2. Ms. Carol Lysher addressed the Board and stated that she lives in the George Washington District and was before the Board to ask them to find the money to fix the inequity of the stadium turf fields in the county. Ms. Lysher said that it's important to find the funding to fund them this summer because Stafford and Brooke Point high schools had their artificial turf installed in the summer of 2014. She said that a freshman athlete in 2014 who played football, field hockey, girls or boy soccer, and girls and boys lacrosse got to play all four other high school years on a quality turf stadium field. She said that was 2014 through 2018; then the cycle continues and repeats, and the same two schools have a new freshman class come in with four years of athletes competing and practicing on their high-quality turf fields during the fall of 2018 through spring of 2022. She noted that Mountain View, whose turf was installed in 2015, would have their eight years of turf play for all outdoor athletes that use the stadium turf in spring of 2023.

   Ms. Lysher stated that the benefits of turf fields have been documented, and it was the right decision of the past School Board and Board of Supervisors to begin the installation of turf for all their athletes and high schools. She said it was very hard to understand how all those rival athletes played and practiced on quality turf field for their entire high school career for the last eight years—yet North Stafford and Colonial Forge were being denied the same experience. She commented that there is no doubt it has impacted their sports programs and would continue to do so if turf installation continued to be delayed.

   Ms. Lysher said that she knows firsthand what a hardship it has been for North Stafford's field hockey team, as she volunteered last fall, and the obstacles were numerous. She said they appreciated the support of this Board to have parity in the high school stadiums, but the turf installation is needed as soon as possible so that North Stafford and Colonial Forge can eventually feature a senior class with athletes that have played their entire four years on home turf field and have become the best they can be. She urged the Board to help get the turf installation for this summer: 2022.

3. Mr. Jeff Adams of Kellogg Mill Road stated that he was before the Board to express his concern about High School #6 not having agriculture, and there was only one County agriculture teacher—all plants, with not a single animal science agriculture course taught. He stated that while the Board didn't design the curriculum, they do have the purse strings and could tell the schools that they need two ag labs and 2.5 ag teachers, adding that he would be the half teacher at no cost.

   Mr. Adams emphasized that they need to teach agriculture in school—and that one class also teaches plumbing, electrical, carpentry, small-engine repair, finance, and anatomy. He commented that it is a complete education from stem to stern; He teaches that on his farm and also participates in the State Fair. He said that he loves doing it and has invited the Board out to his farm. He stated that one teacher out of 13 schools is unacceptable, and Fort Defiance High School has three ag teachers, which is just one of five high schools in that county.

REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. English commented that if it weren't for farmers, they wouldn't be eating today, and he appreciated everything that Mr. Adams has said and done. He also thanked Ms. Julia Holmes for her technical assistance with his tablet.

Ms. Gary stated that Mickey Kwiatkowski, a member of the community who served on the utilities commission for a long time had passed recently, and she wanted to express her condolences to her family. She said that she wishes she had gotten to know Ms. Kwiatowski, and she appreciated her service to the County.

Ms. Yeung stated that she had attended a redistricting meeting on February 10, a Fredericksburg Regional Alliance meeting and Virginia Railway Express (VRE) orientation on February 14, and the Board's Finance and Budget (FAB) Committee before the Board meeting today. She thanked staff for taking care of Mine Road and cleaning up that road, stating that she had received emails from constituents commenting on how nice it was to run on a clean sidewalk.

Ms. Allen commented that she would miss Mike Smith and his very dry, funny sense of humor. She said that Stafford County would be losing significant institutional knowledge, but Mr. Morris would do a great job filling those shoes.

Ms. Allen stated that as the weather begins to warm up and residents become aware of potholes, she asked that they contact the Board so they can relay the information to VDOT so they can start patching when that season begins.

Ms. Allen thanked staff and public safety officials for their work, adding that Mr. Smith was the perfect embodiment of that.

Ms. Bohmke stated that she agreed with Ms. Allen's comments about Mr. Smith and always liked calling him—as he was an early bird, in his office by 7 a.m. and always ready to pick up the phone. She said that Mr. Smith's institutional knowledge has been phenomenal, especially in understanding the intricacies of situations and in dealing with COVID issues. She commented that staff has really pulled together for the last two years in a time that has been very difficult, a lot of which the Board members do not see.

Ms. Bohmke stated that people may have seen the postings from VDOT regarding debris and downed trees, and she had seen a lot of that as she came down Massaponax Road the day before. She said that VDOT had sent an email containing the amounts of cubic yards that needed to be cleaned up, and they would be starting on the interstates, secondary roads, primary roads, and residential areas. She commented that while it may seem that no one cares, they do care—it is just a massive undertaking, and it would take several months to get all the debris removed and hauled to the landfill.

Ms. Bohmke thanked Mr. Adams for his comments and said that she had attended the National Association of Counties (NACO) Legislative Conference in D.C. the previous weekend, at which they talked about supply chain and the need to quit relying on people outside of the United States and rely on ourselves and local farmers. She added that she would agree with agriculture being in the curriculum.

Ms. Bohmke stated that she appreciated what Ms. Lowry and Ms. Lysher had said, especially since they brought up different items for conversation. Ms. Bohmke said that she had received an email from a constituent that said: "High school sports are a vital component of education. To pretend otherwise is to not understand the role it plays in many young people's mental health, engagement in the classroom, and opportunities to attend college. To continue to put these two programs at a disadvantage puts our student athletes at a disadvantage. Providing turf fields is just as important as the library and fine arts renovations that have been done at all of our high schools in Stafford County."

Mr. Coen stated that he agreed with Mr. Adams and has worked with him together in the schools for many years. Mr. Coen also expressed his great appreciation for Mike Smith and wished him well going forward. He commented that waterpipes have been breaking all over the place, and County utilities people have been doing so much to get water back to people's houses. He also praised Social Services for working to help those most in need, at a time when inflation rate was the worst it had been in 40 years.

Mr. Coen said that he and Ms. Gary serve on the Bylaws Committee. He stated some work was done in 2021 on the bylaws, but because of scheduling, they did not vote on it. He said that he would ask staff to send Board members the suggestions brought forward at the end of last year and a copy of the bylaws, then send input by the beginning of March so they can move on that.

Mr. Coen commented that he has seen Ms. Lowry and Ms. Lysher present at school meetings also, and he asked that staff bring the turf issue to the 3-on-3 meetings with the School Board. He stated that he has been pushing for companies to make donations to the school system for a specific need, and that would be tax deductible; other Supervisors have had ideas also, and he asked them to submit those ideas so they could be available at that meeting.

Ms. Vanuch thanked Mr. Adams for bringing the goats. She stated that she wanted to address the tax rates and the assessments that went out, and at their last Board meeting, Commissioner of Revenue Scott Mayausky had been present. She said that the *Free Lance-Star* had done an article on the assessments, which averaged a 24% increase—and constituents were very concerned about what the Board was going to do with the tax rate this year because their assessments had increased \$100K-\$150K. Ms. Vanuch said they would be setting the advertised tax rate, which isn't the set rate but is the highest starting rate advertised, then they go through the discussion process before deciding on the tax rate. She encouraged residents to get involved in these discussions, because that will determine whether they will pay additional taxes moving forward.

<u>REPORT OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY</u>

Ms. McClendon had no report.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Presley commented that it has been a pleasure to serve with Mike Smith over the past five years, stating that Mr. Smith had been a Co-Deputy County Administrator and mentor to him when he arrived—then served as his right hand after he got situated. He wished Mr. Smith and his wife the very best as they embark on their cross-country journey.

Mr. Presley stated that the Board has the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) and Construction Update in their information, and he had a few updates as well. He said that staff is working with VDOT now to have some "No Parking" signs installed on the south side of Capital Avenue to resolve instances with vehicles blocking the road; VDOT is developing schematics of where those might be located and will bring them back to the Board.

Mr. Presley reported that Musselman Park was moving forward, with construction taking place now and the parking lot and trail underway, with initial phase one work to be completed sometime in the month of March.

PROPOSED FY2023 BUDGET

Mr. Presley stated that he was pleased to present the FY23 proposed budget, and he acknowledged the many accomplishments made possible by Board decisions and the hard work of dedicated staff. He said that the Stafford Cares initiative enabled them to provide hundreds of thousands of dollars of support to local restaurants during the height of the pandemic when many of them were closed to in-person dining. He said the program also provided critical food for those most in need.

Mr. Presley said that another item to highlight was the Board's adoption of the Healthy Growth strategy to limit growth in rural areas, and the Board also approved the first phase of Downtown Stafford to encourage growth in the urban services area—both of which were strategic plan priorities. He noted that the County also worked very hard to expand broadband to those areas underserved, through a VATI grant that was focused in the Widewater and Aquia areas, with those efforts being expanded now with another grant received in the western part of the County.

Mr. Presley stated that as part of the budget process, they visit the County profile each year and find that Stafford continues to be one of the fastest-growing counties in the state, with the median household income, home prices, and GDP all continuing to rise at rapid rates. He said that at the same time, unemployment has fallen from its pandemic high to a new low of just under 2.5%.

Mr. Presley said that he would discuss some of the drivers influencing the budget proposal he would be presenting, beginning with the impacts of growth. He stated that as their population grows, there is an increasingly greater need for additional teachers, new schools as reflected in the CIP, public safety personnel, and other staffing throughout the organization, to meet the needs of that growth. He noted that construction of new homes did not slow during the pandemic and actually picked up—and along with that comes increased expectations for the County to provide amenities such as new trails, parks, roads, and better flow of traffic.

Mr. Presley said that the impacts of COVID-19 have created some truly generational challenges with respect to the economy, and inflation has had a major impact on operations. He stated that as everyone is contending with rising prices and consumer price index at its highest level in 40 years (7.5%), the organization is also dealing with those challenges and increased costs for pretty much everything they do. He noted that gas prices have increased 75% since April 2020, when it was $1.94, to yesterday's cost of about $3.41. He emphasized that this means they are just paying more and more for all the goods and services they utilize.

Mr. Presley stated that the pandemic has also caused the "Great Resignation," as workers across the country are reevaluating their lives and careers and are moving onto something else or leaving the market altogether. He said that many people were retiring or leaving and starting a new business, or just finding a new path. He stated that the U.S. sits at 11 million job openings, which is the largest amount in the last 20 years—which means there are plentiful opportunities for people to move, particularly in this area. He said that salaries are also increasing at an alarming rate for many professions, making it more difficult to attract talent. He noted that Stafford's unemployment rate is at about 2.5%, so finding people to fill those positions locally and retaining quality employees continues to be a major challenge.

Mr. Presley said that the Board has seen the slide he was presenting in the CIP work sessions, and it represents the steps involved in the budget process. He stated that community input was provided early on and throughout the process, but particularly in the comprehensive plan development process, with the plan having been recently updated. He said that the Board then takes input they receive from their constituents through many different avenues to inform the development of the strategic plan. He noted that they have talked before about doing a survey for all citizens to provide more input to that effect.

Mr. Presley stated that the strategic plan aligns and focuses the resources in government to achieve the desired outcomes in both the Board and the community. He said that the five-year financial plan takes all that information and lays out the budget estimates over the next five years, and that is for the Board to consider as it plans the next fiscal year's budget, which is where they are now in the process. He explained that staff takes the Board direction, along with the operational needs of each department, which are submitted to the Office of Management and Budget to outline their needs for the coming year. He stated that they take that and the Board priorities, the capital project needs for the coming year, put all that information together, and develop the budget he presents today.

Mr. Presley said that the Board would hold a series of work sessions open to the public, and those would all lead up to the budget public hearing, and all of these details would be discussed at that time but are also up on the County website in the Open.gov platform—which is a much more user-friendly tool for citizens to drill down on any aspect of the budget they want to learn more about. He emphasized that unless people get involved, the County can't know what they are thinking.

Mr. Presley stated that he would do a recap of their five-year plan over the last three years, and this basically outlines what their proposed tax rates have been over the last three planning processes, dating back to the FY20 budget and going up to the most recent one, which was just completed with the Board. He noted that in FY20, the proposal for the five-year plan and the County Administrator's budget was to hold that rate at $1.01. He said that the rates increase in the outyears, and what's driving that is major capital projects—primarily High School #6.

Mr. Presley stated that as the years progressed, the Board adopted a 97-cent tax rate in FY20, which was a direct response to the pandemic. He said they had no idea what to expect, and the Board held 13 budget work sessions as they tried to anticipate the budget impacts. He said that in FY21, they recommended the $1.01 because of the uncertainty of the continuing pandemic, but a lot of the returns they were seeing in the revenues were higher than projected the previous year, so they were justified to maintain the 97-cent rate.

Mr. Presley stated that even though the numbers change in the outyears, one thing that remains consistent through that is the fact that High School #6 is coming and does include increases in each of the five years. He noted that in the five-year plan, the price tag used was the last one the Board had adopted: $124 million. He said that in the proposed CIP, it is in there at $151 million plus $14 million for offsite costs, for a total of $165 million—which is in the CIP and in the proposed budget, but not reflected in the five-year plan.

Mr. Presley presented a graph showing the all-funds revenues, noting that the bottom figure has ballooned by about $120 million, the bulk of which is debt for the high school project and several other capital projects. He said that $77 million of the $120 million is bond proceeds, with another $21 million in increases from state funding for education purposes; this also explains the 61.6% increase over last year in terms of the share that goes to schools, debt service for schools, and capital.

Mr. Presley stated that for the General Fund, there is an increase of about $31 million, with $13 million in revenue coming from real estate—both the proposed tax increase and new development.

He presented a budget overview and said that it proposes decreasing the current FY22 tax rate from the 97 cents to the FY23 proposed rate of 88.5 cents, a decrease of 8.5 cents over last year. He stated that it assumes a 21% reassessment increase as presented by the Commissioner of Revenue and would represent a 7.1% property tax increase.

Mr. Presley said that this also accounts for the 40% increase in exonerations predicted; the current year's exonerations are about $1.2 million in the hole already based on projections from last year, primarily due to disabled veterans tax exonerations. He noted that as projected for next year, they are looking at about $14.5 million in exonerations, which equates to about 6.4 cents on the tax rate. He stated that the average assessed home value per the Commissioner of Revenue is about $386,000, so at the 88.5-cent tax rate, the average real estate bill would be about $3,416, or about $249 more than last year for the average homeowner.

Mr. Presley reported that on the expenditure side, they would be looking at an overall General Fund increase of 8.5%, and a 6.1% increase in the schools' fund. He said that key budget drivers are presented here and would be discussed later in the presentation.

Mr. Presley stated that budget priorities fall into the categories of Budget Commitments, which includes what is needed to meet their ongoing and ever-increasing mandates, as well as their continuing commitment to community partners; Sustainable Positioning, which is the viable actions they can take for a balanced budgeting approach to address the market and economic impacts he had mentioned and the impacts of growth. He said that third is Strategic Prioritization, which is about meeting the Board and community priorities to continue to move Stafford forward.

He said that in terms of budget commitments, whether it is supporting the community, meeting new mandates, or honoring fiscal policy practices, the components of the budget always include several obligations, including regional obligations in increasing funding for the Rappahannock Regional Jail and Juvenile Detention Center. He said with respect to staffing increases, they are focused here on items that are out of the County's control, such as $2 million worth to cover the new minimum wage act passed by the legislature and the overtime act. He noted that they are also accounting for VRS and health insurance increases, along with positions approved midyear such as Grant Manager and Grant Accountant. He stated that for partner commitments, the budget is proposing an investment of $700K to support community partners through programs like the library and other community nonprofits. He said that ongoing costs include maintaining the current debt service for community investments and capital asset insurance costs; under policy requirements, there are several that require the County to continue to be a high-performing financial organization. He noted that an example was contributing 3% of the budget to 3R by policy, a contingency of .5%. and dedicated funding to PDR and financial policy limitations.

Mr. Presley reported that under Sustainable Positioning, employees are the County's greatest asset, and the Board has been very supportive in implementing pay improvements for all employees, beginning with the classic comp study for the general government side and the public safety salary scale adjustments. He said that employees had to contend with many of the same impacts of rising costs, and this budget proposes a modest 2% pay increase for non-public safety scale employees and fully funds the next step of the public safety step plan, which is an average of about 2.75% for those employees.

Mr. Presley said that to mitigate inflationary pressures and maintain competitiveness in the market, staff is proposing a rather aggressive adjustment to the pay scale in general government of 4.5%, and 3.5% for the public safety step plan. He noted that the combined increase on both sides would be about 6.5%. He added that with the market they are in right now and the factors with the communities to the north, this is a prudent approach to try to maintain the employees they have now and attract those they would need to. He said that in following past Board direction for keeping pace with population growth, there are recommendations for key additions to public safety and social services.

Mr. Presley stated that there are two ambulance crews—a north and a south—which were discussed as part of the standards of cover report received from Fire and Rescue during their retreat. He said they had originally included another engine crew for 12 positions, but the department decided it was more important to get the ambulance crews, so they swapped those out. He said they also included three battalion chiefs because they added fire crews and need additional leadership to help manage that growing staff. He reported that there are five sheriff deputies, based on the population growth, and one Family Service Specialist III. He said that in coming budget years and the five-year plan, Social Services will be seeking additional staffing because their case rates are exorbitantly high compared to surrounding localities.

Mr. Presley stated that other strategic priorities include funding for a Cultural Resource Specialist, support for a land preservation partnership with the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust to help manage PDR properties. He said there is also funding for seasonal staffing for the Historic Port of Falmouth, which is a very successful effort done last year as a pilot, and there is additional funding for the Board to use to consider for other community events, such as the tree lighting and a parade.

Mr. Presley said that for Quality Education Opportunities, the second goal of their strategic plan, staff proposes full funding of the Superintendent's requested budget at $8 million, an increase of 6.1% over last year. He stated that the funding would help with the final phase of the teachers' step salary implementation, along with the bus driver salary implementation, other school pay, and per-pupil increases. He said that staff is also proposing additional funds for the public day school and an electric vehicle program as a joint effort with the schools to look at infrastructure such as charging locations for buses and vehicles. He added that they would also use the grant position to hopefully get the money to install the infrastructure as much as possible.

Ms. Presley stated that to keep up with growth, there are a number of positions as shown on the slide presented and other initiatives for public safety, which is the largest area of funding in the budget at about $9 million; in addition to the positions he mentioned before, they propose four communications officers, another animal caretaker for the shelter, an evidence technician, and $530K for sheriff's vehicle replacement. He said they also have three sheriff's positions and three Commonwealth Attorney positions proposed, along with operating costs to support body-worn camera implementation the Board recently approved. He said the budget also includes some funding for Fire and Rescue for staff scheduling software, fire boat training and certification, and cyclical equipment replacement.

Mr. Presley said that under Organizational Excellence, he would like to focus on their own staffing, noting that the positions approved in last year's budget resulted in general government staffing for the first time since recession being over 2009 staffing levels. He said since that time, the County has grown by over 30,000 people, and there is still some work to do. He stated that in reaching out to departments for their requests—not including Fire and Rescue standards of cover and their needs as discussed in the Board retreat—they received more than 120 position requests. He said they were proposing nine positions on the general government side. In total for this budget, there were 47 positions requested, many of which they've already gone over with public safety; of those, 14 are Sheriff's Office, 15 are Fire and Rescue, three are Commonwealth's Attorney, and three are revenue-neutral positions.

Mr. Presley reported that on the resources side, they were proposing to devote resources and effort around their IT applications and support—particularly around security and cybersecurity—and some of the proposed software is to provide better defense against the attacks happening to all organizations. He said they have been building up the cybersecurity positions internally over the last several years, and IT is requesting additional resources to build upon that, as well as a software upgrade for the Commissioner of Revenue's Office. He noted that in terms of the ERP systems accountant and analyst, they are beginning the process of replacing the enterprise platform, which is all financial and HR systems; the current system is very outdated.

Mr. Presley stated that with other funds, the Transportation Fund, similar to home values, new and used vehicle values have skyrocketed over the last several years; the budget recommends reducing the personal property tax rate to the allowable rate of $5.49. He said the budget transfer from the General Fund would result in $4.8 million being utilized for the Transportation Fund.

Mr. Presley said that for the capital program, there were a number of projects identified in the proposed CIP, and High School #6 was the most immediate large project; this year, they would be looking at $51 million based on the higher cost in the current CIP proposal. He added that they would also see programming here for two fire stations and court renovations, as well as expansion for community space in the Widewater District, and they would dive into projects further during the budget work sessions. He stated that the budget proposes continuation of the plan the Board adopted last year for utilities, and in accordance with their adopted Utilities Fund policy, staff is proposing a 2.5% rate increase to support continued system growth and vital rehabilitation projects, as well as maintaining price increases for materials and chemical costs.

Mr. Presley summarized that the budget presented this evening reflects what staff feels are sustainable actions with an eye to the future, as provided in the five-year plan. He said the reason they do the five-year plan is so they don't run up against massive unanticipated tax increases in a given year. He said that they budget in a fiscal year of July 1–June 30, but taxing is done on a calendar year, so anytime they decrease the tax rate in a given year, it impacts the current fiscal year and the upcoming budget year.

Mr. Presley said that an effective rate at 78 cents would result in a $9.75 million decrease in the current year's budget; it would also result in a $23.2 million decrease in the upcoming budget. He noted that a cursory analysis shows that the effective rate of 78 cents would take their debt capacity out of what they just proposed for the high school; by going to 78 cents, they do not have the debt capacity to incur that kind of debt. He added that they could make adjustments and look at how to address that through other projects, and they would also be sitting down with financial advisors to focus on what that means for debt service.

Mr. Presley stated that even for the proposed 88.5-cent tax rate, as they saw in the five-year plan projection, they would still need to increase taxes next year to continue the work on the new high school as proposed—probably by about three cents, based upon current valuations. He stated that the 88.5-cent real estate tax rate fully funds the proposed budget and accounts for the high school project moving forward as scheduled at the higher cost recommended in the CIP. He noted that it provides for the continuation of the remainder of the Board's strategic plan priorities, as presented at their retreat, and it also addresses the current market realities and impacts everyone is seeing. He reiterated that the average tax increase based upon the average home price was about $249 per year.

Mr. Presley concluded by stating that they would cover the budget in much greater detail during their work sessions, and staff looks forward to the Board's direction, fresh ideas, and perspectives as they continue in their budget process. He said that staff's goal at this stage was to present a reasonable budget based upon the needs they have as a community and to keep them moving forward as a County. He said that the first budget work session would be February 22 at 4 p.m. in the A/B/C Conference Room; there will be a joint meeting with the Board of Supervisors and School Board on March 1, at which point school staff would present the School Board's proposed budget; on the same day, the Board of Supervisors would be deciding what to place the advertised tax rate at. He said that as Ms. Vanuch had stated, you cannot go above the advertised rate, but you can go below it. He stated that the budget public hearing is scheduled to take place April 5, and the budget adoption is slated for April 19.

Mr. Presley thanked all the staff and all departments for their help in development of the budget, particularly Director of Management and Budget Andrea Light and her staff: Donna Olsen, Kim Herman, Ariana Cooper, Katie Dent, and Deanna Green. He also thanked Andrew Spence and the Community Engagement team for putting together this presentation, as well as Donna Krauss, Mike Smith, and Mike Morris for all their input into the process.

Ms. Vanuch thanked staff and mentioned to the Board that they don't typically get into the weeds during this presentation, doing that instead during the budget work sessions. She opened the meeting up for questions and comments.

Ms. Allen asked why the tax rate was recommended for 88.5 cents instead of 89 cents.

Mr. Presley responded that it was based upon need, and they were not going to round it off; in the past, they have gone to the half-cent numbers and don't want to ask for more than what they need. He said that obviously the number would change between now and when the Board adopted the budget, and this rate was presented to balance the budget, as required by law.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Coen, to approve the Consent Agenda as amended.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	

Item 1. County Administration; Approve February 1, 2022, Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes.

Item 2. County Administration; Approve January 18, 2022 Board of Supervisors CIP Work Session Minutes.

Item 3. County Administration; Approve January 18, 2022 Board of Supervisors Five Year Financial Plan General Fund Work Session Minutes.

Item 4. County Administration; Approve January 19, 2022 Board of Supervisors Redistricting Work Session Minutes.

Item 5. County Administration; Approve January 27, 2022 Board of Supervisors Redistricting Work Session Minutes.

Item 6. County Administration; Approve February 2, 2022 Board of Supervisors Redistricting Work Session Minutes.

Item 7. Budget and Management; Budget and Appropriate Schools Year End Funding to Purchase 23 Buses.

Resolution R22-44 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDING FOR THE PURCHASE OF 23 MAINSTREAM SCHOOL BUSES

WHEREAS, on January 25, 2022, the School Board approved requesting the Board to budget and appropriate funds for the purchase of 23 mainstream school buses; and

WHEREAS, the Schools have identified the need for 23 mainstream school buses to maintain an adequate number of spare buses in its pupil transportation fleet;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 15th day of February 2022, that Schools' Capital Project Reserve funds held in County's General Fund be and they hereby are budgeted and appropriated as follows:

Fund	Purpose	Amount
County's General Fund	Transfer to Schools' Operating Fund	**$2,793,370**
Schools' Operating Fund	Purchase 23 Mainstream School Buses	**$2,793,370**

Item 8. Capital Projects Transportation; Authorize the County Administrator to Execute a Task Order with Volkert, Inc. for Transportation Planning Services Regarding the County's Transportation Impact Fee Program.

Resolution R22-43 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A TASK ORDER WITH VOLKERT, INC. FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING SERVICES REGARDING THE COUNTY'S TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Board identified reviewing, evaluating, and updating the County's Transportation Impact Fee Program as a critical part of the County's Transportation Improvement Plan; and

WHEREAS, Volkert, Inc. (Volkert) was selected as one of the qualified firms to provide on-call engineering services for Category C-Transportation Planning and Analysis, pursuant to Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 21-011-9602SP; and

WHEREAS, Volkert submitted a cost proposal for transportation planning services and analysis regarding the County's Transportation Impact Fee Program at a cost of $269,760; and

WHEREAS, County staff reviewed the proposal received and determined it to be reasonable for the scope of work requested; and

WHEREAS, funds are available in the Transportation Fund for this study;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a task order with Volkert, Inc. for transportation planning services and analysis regarding the County's Transportation Impact Fee Program, in an amount not to exceed Two Hundred Sixty-Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty Dollars ($269,760), unless modified by a duly-executed contract amendment.

<u>Item 9. Capital Projects Transportation; Petition the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to Accept Portions of Courthouse Road, Austin Ridge Drive, and Odin Drive into the Secondary State Highway System, and to Abandon Old Segments of Courthouse Road and Austin Ridge Drive.</u>

<u>Resolution R22-48 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION TO PETITION THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (VDOT) TO INCLUDE NEWLY CONSTRUCTED SEGMENTS OF COURTHOUSE ROAD (SR-630), AUSTIN RIDGE DRIVE (SR-1486), AND ODIN DRIVE (SR-2424) INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS, AND TO ABANDON OLD SEGMENTS OF COURTHOUSE ROAD (SR-630) AND AUSTIN RIDGE DRIVE (SR-1486), ALL LOCATED WITHIN THE GARRISONVILLE AND HARTWOOD ELECTION DISTRICTS

WHEREAS, construction of the I-95/Courthouse Road Interchange Project, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Project 009-089-F09, UPC# 13558 (Project), has resulted in adjustments to the existing roadway alignment, abandonments and additions to the State Secondary System of State Highways (Secondary System); and

WHEREAS, portions of Austin Ridge Drive (SR-1486), from its intersections with Century Street (SR-1932) to Sunflower Drive, and from Sunflower Drive to Courthouse Road (SR0630) have been realigned; and

WHEREAS, portions of Courthouse Road (SR-630), from the intersection of I-95 South entrance ramp to its intersection with Cedar Lane (SR-732) have been realigned; and

WHEREAS, new road segments of Austin Ridge Drive (SR-2423) and Odin Drive (SR-2424) have been completed and are ready for acceptance into the Secondary System; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.2-705, the Board desires to petition VDOT to include the realignment of Courthouse Road (SR-630) and Austin Ridge Drive (SR-1486), and new road segments of Austin Ridge Drive (SR-2423) and Odin Road (SR-2424), as detailed below, into the Secondary System; and

WHEREAS, VDOT inspected the applicable realigned and newly constructed portions of Courthouse Road (SR-630), Austin Ridge Drive (SR-1486) and (SR-2423), and Odin Drive (SR-2424), and found them satisfactory for acceptance into the Secondary System; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the Project realignments, several sections of Courthouse Road (SR-630) and Austin Ridge Drive (SR-1486) need to be abandoned from the Secondary System; and

WHEREAS, the new roads serve the same citizens as those portions of old road identified to be abandoned and those segments no longer serve a public need; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.2-912, the Board desires to petition VDOT to remove segments of Courthouse Road (SR-630) and Austin Ridge Drive (SR-1488) as detailed below from the Secondary System;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) be and it hereby is petitioned to include the following realigned and newly constructed streets into the Secondary System of State Highways:

Street Name/ Route Number	Station	Length
Courthouse Road (SR-630)	From: Inter. of I-95 South entrance ramp To: Inter. with Cedar Lane (SR-732)	0.40 mi. ROW 120' Variable
Austin Ridge Drive (SR-1486)	From: Inter. with Century Street (SR-1932) To: Inter. with Sunflower Drive	0.55 mi. ROW 120’
Austin Ridge Drive	From: Inter. with Sunflower Drive To: Inter. with Courthouse Road (SR-630)	0.20 mi.

(SR-1486)		ROW 120' Variable
Austin Ridge Drive (SR-2423)	From: Inter. with Courthouse Road (SR-630) To: Inter. with Odin Drive (SR-2424)	0.11 mi ROW 120'
Odin Drive (SR-2424)	From: Inter. with Austin Ridge Drive (SR-2423) To: 0.08 mile SE inter. with Austin Ridge Drive (SR-2423)	0.08 mi ROW 70'

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that VDOT is petitioned to make adjustments to the following sections of Courthouse Road (SR-630) and Austin Ridge Drive (SR-1486) within the Secondary System of State Highways:

Street Name/ Route Number	Station	Length
Courthouse Road (SR-630)	From: Inter. with Cedar Drive (SR-732) To: I-95 South on ramp	0.40 mi. ROW 120' Variable
Austin Ridge Drive (SR-1486)	From: I-95 South exit ramp To: Sunflower Drive (PR)	0.20 mi. ROW 120' Variable

An unrestricted right-of-way, as indicated above, for these streets with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage is guaranteed; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, shall forward a copy of this Resolution to the VDOT Transportation and Land Use Director, Fredericksburg District.

<u>Item 10. Capital Projects Transportation; Authorize the County Administrator to Execute a Contract Amendment with Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. for Additional Engineering Services During Construction of the Enon Road Water Storage Tank, and Budget and Appropriate Utilities CIP Funds.</u>

<u>Resolution R22-49 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT AMENDMENT WITH STANTEC CONSULTING SERVICES INC. FOR ADDITIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES DURING CONSTRUCTION OF THE ENON ROAD WATER TANK, AND TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS

WHEREAS, the County contracted with one of its on-call engineering firms, Stantec Consulting Services Inc. (Stantec), to provide engineering design services for the Enon Road Water Tank (Project), pursuant to Contract No. 16-4111-P103-STAN; and

WHEREAS, the design was completed and the Project was bid and awarded to CB&I Storage Tank Solutions LLC, pursuant to Resolution R22-07; and

WHEREAS, engineering services are required during construction of the Project, and Stantec provided a proposal in the amount of $105,800 to provide these services; and

WHEREAS, staff reviewed the proposal and finds the costs to be reasonable for the scope of services requested; and

WHEREAS, funds are available in the Utilities Fund, Capital Improvement Program and can be used for this purpose once budgeted and appropriated;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract amendment with Stantec Consulting Services Inc., for additional engineering services for the Enon Road Water Tank Project, in an amount not to exceed One Hundred Five Thousand Eight Hundred Dollars ($105,800), for a total contract amount of Three Hundred Eighty-Five Thousand Two Hundred Forty Dollars ($385,240), unless modified by a duly-authorized amendment; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Utilities Fund Capital Improvement Program funds are budgeted and appropriated as follows:

Department	**Purpose**	**Amount**
Department of Capital Construction	Enon Road Water Tank Project	$105,800

Item 11. Community Engagement; Proclamation Honoring and Recognizing Black History Month.

Proclamation P22-02 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION HONORING AND RECOGNIZING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

WHEREAS, Black history and Black culture are the history and culture of both America and Stafford County; and; and

WHEREAS, African Americans have made significant contributions in all phases of Stafford's economic, social, cultural and political life; and

WHEREAS, each year, Americans observe Black History Month by celebrating the histories, cultures and contributions of American citizens whose ancestors came from Africa and other countries abroad; and

WHEREAS, during America's worst period, the Civil War, Stafford County served as a beacon of hope to thousands of enslaved persons who made their way to freedom in Stafford County and points north; and

WHEREAS, African Americans helped establish the very pillars of our community, establishing churches and a system of schools for African American children. As well, African Americans led the fight for equity in education, which led to the eventual desegregation of schools in Stafford County and the area; and

WHEREAS, the work of our African American community has contributed to the great diversity and unity of Stafford County, with a rich history of different cultures and ethnic impact; and

WHEREAS, today, Stafford is proud to have the first female Black Board of Supervisors member, Tinesha Allen, and the first Black Vice Chairman of the Board, Pamela Yeung, both following in the footsteps of former Supervisor Robert Woodson, the first Black person to serve on the Board; and

WHEREAS, the theme for the 2022 Black History Month is Black Health and Wellness, and Stafford County particularly thanks African American members of the health care profession who have worked tirelessly during the pandemic and pledges to continue to make sure information and opportunities with regard to health care available to everyone, especially the marginalized and people of color; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that it be and hereby does declare and recognize February 2022 as Black History Month and honor all African Americans and their many contributions to Stafford, Virginia and our country.

<u>Item 12. Community Engagement; Proclamation Recognizing Michael T. Smith for 36 Years of Service to Stafford County.</u>

<u>Proclamation P22-17 reads as follows:</u>

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING MICHAEL T. SMITH FOR 36 YEARS OF SERVICE TO STAFFORD COUNTY

WHEREAS, Mike Smith is retiring after 36 years of service to Stafford County, most recently as Deputy County Administrator. Smith earned a Bachelor of Science in Biology from James Madison University. He is a veteran of many graduate-level government courses, including courses at Weldon Cooper, the University of Virginia and the University of North Carolina; and

WHEREAS, Mike Smith began as a Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator for Utilities in 1986. He was Manager of the Cool Springs Road Wastewater Treatment Plant, which was replaced in 1991 with the Little Falls Wastewater Treatment Plant, where he also served as Manager. He also served as the Assistant Director of Utilities, Director of Public Works and Director of Utilities.

Mike became Acting Deputy County Administrator in August of 2016 and Deputy County Administrator in October of 2016; and

WHEREAS, Mike Smith worked his way up through the organization, starting as a Wastewater Treatment Plant operator and ascending to Deputy County Administrator, earning respect and loyalty of staff in Utilities and Public Works along the way; and

WHEREAS, Smith led a team of professionals to start up a state-of-the-art Biological Nutrient Removal Wastewater Plant at Little Falls that met limits on the very first day and continues to win national awards 30 years later; and

WHEREAS, Over the years, Smith's steady and dependable leadership during times of organizational changes has been a great asset to the County and his vast reservoir of institutional knowledge will be sorely missed.;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors, on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that it be and hereby does honor and recognize Michael T. Smith for 36 years of service to Stafford County.

Item 13. Community Engagement; A. Proclamation to Recognize March as Women's History Month.

Proclamation P22-03 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO RECOGNIZE MARCH AS WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

WHEREAS, the 2022 Women's History theme, "Providing Healing, Promoting Hope," is both a tribute to the ceaseless work of caregivers and frontline workers during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and also a recognition of the thousands of ways that women of all cultures have provided both healing and hope throughout history; and

WHEREAS, since the beginning of human history, women have been caretakers of children, family and the community, healing people and giving them hope for the future; and

WHEREAS, nursing emerged as a profession in the mid-19th century, with Florence Nightingale being credited as the founder of modern nursing during the Crimean War, successfully improving the outcomes for wounded men; and

WHEREAS, American female nurses and physicians have been a part of every major American conflict since the Revolutionary War. Around 23,000 nurses served in World War I, 78,000 nurses served home and abroad in World War II, and more than 6,000 nurses served in Vietnam during the Vietnam War. Countless others have supported conflicts since then in the Gulf War, the War on Terror and in Afghanistan; and

WHEREAS, according to the 2019 American Community Survey by the United States Census, women accounted for three-quarters of full-time, year-round health care workers, a statistic that is even more important during the last two years of the COVID-19 epidemic; and

WHEREAS, over the years, women in Stafford County, the state and the country have eased suffering, restored dignity and made important decisions for our general as well as our personal welfare;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors, on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that it be and hereby does declare March as Women's History Month to honor and recognize women throughout history, especially those that have provided healing and hope through health care.

Item 14. Community Engagement; Proclamation Recognizing Sergeant Baris Demirci and K-9 Officer Titan for Outstanding Service to Stafford County.

Proclamation P22-19 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING SERGEANT BARIS DEMIRCI AND K-9 TITAN FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO STAFFORD COUNTY

WHEREAS, Sergeant Baris Demirci is an extraordinary K-9 handler for the Stafford Sheriff's Office. He is the K-9 coordinator, responsible for all K-9 training and recertifications; and

WHEREAS, Sergeant Demirci is a Sergeant on the overnight shift, supervising four deputies and handling all K-9 calls. He is described as diligent and tenacious in his duties and as a man of solid character with a work ethic second to none; and

WHEREAS, Sergeant Demirci has partnered with K-9 Titan, a two-year-old German Shepherd, for two years. Titan is explicitly trained for locating explosives, but he is also excellent at tracking; and

WHEREAS, Sergeant Demirci and Titan have worked together to track many suspects, sometimes apprehending multiple suspects who committed the same crime together. The expert skills demonstrated, put into use by Sergeant Demirci and Titan, allow deputies to take several suspects into custody without using force; and

WHEREAS, Sergeant Baris Demirci and his partner, K-9 Titan, recently worked together on apprehending a man who attempted to abduct a nine-year-old girl. The man would not come out of the house, and Sergeant Demirci sent Titan in to subdue the man until deputies could successfully arrest him. Their quick apprehension within hours of the incident helped reassure a grateful community; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County and its residents are safer because of the unique skills and expertise employed by Sergeant Demirci and Titan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors, on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that it be and hereby does honor and recognize Sergeant Baris Demirci and K-9 Titan for their outstanding service to Stafford County.

Item 15. Community Engagement; Proclamation Recognizing Deputy Olivia J. Hepperle for Outstanding Service to Stafford County and Its Animals.

Proclamation P22-20 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING DEPUTY OLIVIA J. HEPPERLE FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO STAFFORD COUNTY AND ITS ANIMALS

WHEREAS, Deputy Olivia J. Hepperle is a deputy with the Stafford County Sheriff's Office, working with Animal Control and the Animal Shelter; and

WHEREAS, in her three years with Animal Control, Deputy Hepperle has become known for going above and beyond in her job helping animals, even building a wheelchair for a duck. As well, she is known for being a team player for the Sheriff's Office, assisting patrol when she is not needed with Animal Control; and

WHEREAS, recently, Deputy Hepperle responded to a call and discovered two emaciated dogs in a terrible animal cruelty case, Gracie and Dean. Dean was so weak he could not walk; and

WHEREAS, Deputy Hepperle facilitated treatment for the dogs and was able to bring Dean home to foster him. Dean almost died after an overnight hospital stay but recovered upon the presence of Deputy Hepperle. Deputy Hepperle's care and love with these two unwanted and mistreated animals made the difference literally between life and death for them; and

WHEREAS, both dogs have improved and have brought a much-needed media spotlight on the excellent work of Deputy Hepperle and the staff at the Stafford County Animal Shelter; and

WHEREAS, these dogs and countless other pets survive and thrive because of people like Deputy Hepperle and allow the Animal Shelter to achieve its goal of Uniting Pets and People;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors, on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that it be and hereby does honor and recognize Deputy Olivia J. Hepperle for making a tremendous difference in the lives of the animals of Stafford County.

Item 16. Finance; Consent to the Issuance of Bonds for Virginia Railway Express (VRE)

Resolution R22-50 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION CONSENTING TO THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS FOR VIRGINIA RAILWAY EXPRESS

WHEREAS, the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC) and the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC) (collectively, the Commissions) operate the Virginia Railway Express (VRE) commuter rail service in Northern Virginia pursuant to the Master Agreement for Provision of Commuter Rail Services in Northern Virginia – Establishment of the Virginia Railway Express among the Commissions, the Participating Jurisdictions and the Contributing Jurisdictions (the Master Agreement); and

WHEREAS, the County of Stafford, Virginia (the County), is a Participating Jurisdiction under the terms of the Master Agreement; and

WHEREAS, on March 26, 2021, VRE entered into a Passenger Rail Improvements and Funding Agreement (the Funding Agreement) with the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, which was subsequently assigned to the Virginia Passenger Rail Authority; and

WHEREAS, the Funding Agreement includes provisions for the Commissions to fund a portion of the Planned Improvements of the Transforming Rail in Virginia Program, as well as the purchase of real property for right-of-way acquired by the Commonwealth of Virginia (the Project); and

WHEREAS, as provided for in the Funding Agreement, the Commissions will use Commuter Rail Operating and Capital (C-ROC) funds for a debt issuance as the source of the initial funding commitment to the Project; and

WHEREAS, in September 2021, the Commissions approved, updated, and amended Financial and Debt Management Principles for VRE to guide the issuance of debt backed by the C-ROC funds; and

WHEREAS, on November 19, 2021, December 2, 2021, and December 2, 2021, the Operations Board, NVTC, and PRTC each, respectively, authorized VRE staff to advance a public bond issuance backed by the C-ROC funds to support the financing of the Project, provided such bonds do not require credit support from, and are not a debt of, the County; and

WHEREAS, the issuance of public bonds backed by the CROC funds shall not require credit support from the Participating Jurisdictions or Contributing Jurisdictions and shall not be a debt of the Commonwealth or the Participating Jurisdictions or Contributing Jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section III(A)(2) of the Master Agreement, the Commissions shall utilize reasonable debt financing to the extent that such financing is advantageous to the commuter rail project and is in the interest of the parties to the Master Agreement, but requires that the Commissions not issue debt related to the commuter rail project, other than the initial debt, without the consent of all Participating and Contributing Jurisdictions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Stafford, Virginia, on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that it be and hereby does consent, in accordance with the terms of the Master Agreement, to the issuance of additional commuter rail revenue bonds by the Commissions in accordance with the Funding Agreement to finance the Project, provided such bonds do not require credit support from, and are not a debt of, the County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Attorney and the County Administrator, or their designees, are authorized to execute and deliver any and all documents that they deem necessary and appropriate to accomplish this Resolution.

Item 17. Legislative; Appointment of Mr. Nathan Mowery to the Embry Mill Community Development Authority (CDA) Board.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Item 18. Human Resources; Consider Updating the County's Drug-Free Workplace Policy and Related Sections in Other County Human Resources Policies.

Ms. Vanuch stated that the Board has been through this item a few times and at the last meeting chose to defer it because they were waiting for some additional information from Ms. McClendon that Ms. Gary had passed along, and she asked if staff had received that information.

Assistant Director of Human Resources Andrea Wilson confirmed that they had. She stated that they would be discussing the policy and approving some changes, and Ms. McClendon had put some things in the background report that summarized the questions that were presented at the last meeting. She said that what was included was the definition of "hemp" as including any cannabis plant or derivative thereof that contains equal to or less than .3% Delta 9 Tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) on a dry-weight basis; hemp was removed from the definition of "marijuana," meaning that it is no longer considered a controlled substance or drug.

Ms. Wilson stated that hemp products can be used over the counter and without a medical note or certification, and the question was whether or not the THC would show up in a drug test. She said if someone used a lot of lotions or ate a lot of candies that contained it, there was nothing in the testing that would prevent that from showing a positive test result. She stated that there were options that the County Attorney had put in the policy because the protocols were unable to distinguish between the products that would present a positive test result—but it would really have to be a lot to show up in a drug test.

Ms. Wilson said that the whole reason they are updating the policy is because the state of Virginia legalized recreational use of marijuana for individuals over the age of 21, so staff is incorporating some changes in the policy. She stated that key points are that they would still retain a zero-tolerance policy for the County, and they would make some adjustments to pre-employment testing related to changes. She said that high-risk safety-sensitive positions would remain under the random testing procedures, and they would still be able to test for reasonable suspicion; if anyone in those circumstances tested positive for marijuana, they would be subject to termination unless they had a valid certification for use of cannabis oil.

Ms. Wilson reported that staff recommendation is that they would not deny employment when they first come in if they test positive for marijuana; they would be hired and subject to a test 8–12 weeks from their date of hire. She noted that temporary seasonal employees would not be employed long enough for it to make sense for them to be retested. She said that Exhibit B in the Board package would allow for individuals in high-risk safety-sensitive positions to not be hired if they tested positive for THC.

Ms. Yeung asked what would happen if they were already hired and consumed marijuana and came in and were suspected of use, then tested.

Ms. Wilson responded that if there were reasonable suspicion such as an odor or erratic behavior or an incident such as an accident, those would be grounds to test for reasonable suspicion. She said if they came back positive at that point for marijuana, they would be subject to termination because the policy would still remain a zero-tolerance policy. She explained that employees would be told that when they came on board, and they would have been aware of the policy.

Ms. Yeung stated that it would be subjective as to someone's "erratic behavior" because of who they are, and she asked how they would follow a rule that was so subjective.

Ms. Wilson said that the County would expect its managers to present a reasonable case as to why there is reasonable suspicion, and there must be a reason to implement the random testing.

Ms. Gary stated that she would like to make a motion.

Ms. Gary motioned that they would approve the policy with the changes that they would not test for THC except for safety-sensitive positions. She said that they would have performance-based issues that they could test if someone was obviously under the influence, and deal with that with the zero-tolerance policy.

Ms. Vanuch stated that her motion was not part of the policy at all—doing no testing at all—so that would be a complete change of what was being proposed today.

Ms. Gary clarified that it would just be no testing for the THC.

Ms. Vanuch responded that this was not included in Ms. Wilson's proposal as presented.

Ms. Wilson said that in the summary provided by the County Attorney, the Board had the option of going from one end of the spectrum to the other: On the one extreme, saying that any form, generally prohibiting the use of the products that result in a positive THC screening result; or on the other side, the Board could relax the County's screening policy and no longer test for THC.

Ms. Yeung seconded the motion.

Ms. McClendon stated that they could amend the policy to whatever the Board votes on today.

Ms. Gary confirmed that her motion was not to test for THC except for safety-sensitive positions.

Ms. Bohmke said that she needed clarification of what was meant.

Ms. Allen stated that Ms. Gary motioned for them to not have any testing except for safety-sensitive positions such as public safety and utilities, as the code requires.

Ms. Vanuch said that her issue is that they are making a substantive change to what's been presented without reaching out to the Fire Chief or the Sheriff's Office, and she knows they have non-safety positions that are administrative, but they have different policies. She stated that she would like to know the impacts to them, because this was not at all what the Board had talked about in the five or six times they've discussed it—and she would not be comfortable moving forward with this type of motion without getting their feedback.

Ms. Bohmke commented that she finds this all very confusing, and made a substitute motion to defer this item to the first meeting in March. Mr. English seconded the motion.

Ms. Bohmke stated that they need to make sure they got this right, and she did not have an opportunity to reach out to Ms. McClendon before the meeting. She said that this was complicated, and she was not comfortable with making a vote today because she was not sure what she was doing. She suggested deferring it to gain more clarity.

Ms. Allen said that she is not opposed to that request if they want to have public safety personnel provide input, then they can make an informed decision. She said the Fire Chief and Sheriff's Office can come forward and express any concerns they may have.

Ms. Gary agreed to that as well.

Ms. Yeung asked if staff had reached out to the various departments to understand the implications before bringing it forward.

Ms. Wilson responded that they reached out to all departments to identify what their safety-sensitive positions were, to try to determine whether to do the pre-employment drug screenings and reject anyone hired who tested positive for marijuana. She said they would not exclude THC from the screening process, but for those employees in non-safety sensitive positions, they would hire them and then do the retest within the 8 to 12 weeks. She stated that she did speak with and got feedback from all departments and identified what the safety-sensitive positions were. She said that all of the public safety positions, with the exception of administrative staff, were said to be safety-sensitive positions, and they seemed amenable to the hiring and retesting in that particular situation. She said that she summarized those on the slide presented.

Mr. Coen said that he agreed with the substitute motion and the person who was most familiar with this, Ms. Gary, was not present.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	

Item 19. Consider Adopting an Addendum to the Stafford County Emergency Operations Plan to Establish Roles and Responsibilities for the Board Liaison Positions.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen to approve proposed Resolution R22-46.

Ms. Yeung stated that she wanted to make sure they had the Emergency Plan available, because she did not recall seeing it as a new Board member, and she would like for them to be able to give responses to constituents when they ask.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	

Resolution R22-46 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT ADDENDUM 1 TO THE STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA EMERGENCY OPERATIONS PLAN TO ESTABLISH BOARD LIAISON POSITIONS AND RELATED REQUIREMENTS

WHEREAS, the Board approved and adopted the current Stafford County, Virginia Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) on September 21, 2021, pursuant to Resolution R21-362; and

WHEREAS, the EOP is the guidebook that establishes the County's emergency operations framework and how emergencies will be staffed and handled within the County; and

WHEREAS, the Board established Board Liaison positions at its January 18, 2022 meeting, and selected Chairman Vanuch and Supervisor Allen for the positions, and Supervisors Gary and English as alternates; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to set requirements for the Board Liaison positions through the addition of an addendum to the EOP;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that Addendum 1 to the Stafford County, Virginia Emergency Operations Plan, attached as **Exhibit A**, be and it hereby is adopted.

Item 20: Planning and Zoning; Consider Time Limit Extension Requests for Certain Zoning Reclassification and Conditional Use Permit Applications (Projects Known as Adair Plantation, Belmont Park, Mabudian, Westlake, and Crucible).

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke to approve proposed Resolution R22-36.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	

Resolution R22-36 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION GRANTING TIME EXTENSIONS FOR VARIOUS ZONING RECLASSIFICATION AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS PURSUANT TO STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SECS. 28-162, "REVIEW AND REQUIREMENTS" AND 28-185, "CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT"

WHEREAS, on June 2, 2020, the Board adopted Ordinance O20-13, which established time limits for pending zoning reclassification and conditional use permit (CUP) applications; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County Code Secs. 28-162(h) and 28-185(b)(2) specify that any zoning reclassification or CUP application still pending more than eighteen (18) months from the date such application was filed shall be administratively closed by staff due to inactivity, but an applicant may request a time extension in writing prior to such deadline, which request must contain a definitive time for moving forward with or withdrawing the application, and the extension request may be granted by the Board; and

WHEREAS, certain reclassification and CUP applicants were notified that a request for a time extension must be received by December 1, 2021; and

WHEREAS, extension requests were received by December 1, 2021 for the following (collectively, Applications):

	Project Name	Application(s)	Tax Map Parcel No(s).	Election District
1.	Adair Plantation	RC20153419	44-121G	George Washington
2.	Belmont Park	RC20153239 CUP20153240	44-91, 92, 93A, 93E, 123A, 123B, 123D, 123E, 124, 124A, 125, 129, 129A, 130, 130A, 131, 132, 135,136, 136A, 137A, 138A, 144, 144B, 144C, 44C-3-3, 44C-3-4, 44C-3-5, 44C-3-6, 44C-3-7, 44C-3-8, 44C-3-9	Hartwood
3.	Mabudian	RC15150963 CUP15150816	20-99	Griffis-Widewater
4.	Westlake	RC17151764 RC17151895	35-20, 35-20A, 35-21, 35-22, 35-31 (portion), 35K-1A-1, 35K-1A-2, 35K-1A-3, 35K-1A-4, 35K-1A-5, 35K-1A-6, 35K-1A-7, 35K-1A-8 , 35K-1A-9, 35K-1A-10, 35K-1A-11, 35K-1A-12, 35K-1A-13, 35K-1A-14, 35K-1A-15, 35K-1A-16, 35K-1A-17, 35K-1A-18, 35K-1A-19, 35K-1A-20, 35K-1A-21, 35K-1A-22, 35K-1A-23, 35K-1A-24 , 35K-1A-25, 35K-1A-26, 35K-1A-A, 35K-1A-A1, and 35K-1A-B, 35K-1A-CC, 35K-1A-JJ, and 35K-1A-KK	Hartwood
5.	Crucible Properties II, LLC	CUP1200299	35-22	Hartwood

; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that time limit extensions for the Belmont Park Applications, pursuant to Stafford County Code Secs. 28-162(h) and 28-185(b)(2), are appropriate;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that time limit extensions, pursuant to County Code Sec. 28-162(h) and Sec. 28-185(b)(2), be and they hereby are granted as follows:

	Project Name	Application(s)	Time Limit Extend To
1.	Belmont Park	RC20153239 CUP20153240	August 31, 2022

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary to approve proposed Resolution R22-56.
The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay: (0)

Resolution R22-56 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO DENY TIME EXTENSIONS FOR VARIOUS ZONING RECLASSIFICATION AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS PURSUANT TO STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SECS. 28-162, "REVIEW AND REQUIREMENTS" AND 28-185, "CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT"

WHEREAS, on June 2, 2020, the Board adopted Ordinance O20-13, which established time limits for pending zoning reclassification and conditional use permit (CUP) applications; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County Code Secs. 28-162(h) and 28-185(b)(2) specify that any zoning reclassification or CUP application still pending more than eighteen (18) months from the date such application was filed shall be administratively closed by staff due to inactivity, but an applicant may request a time extension in writing prior to such deadline, which request must contain a definitive time for moving forward with or withdrawing the application, and the extension request may be granted by the Board; and

WHEREAS, certain reclassification and CUP applicants were notified that a request for a time extension must be received by December 1, 2021; and

WHEREAS, extension requests were received by December 1, 2021 for the following (collectively, Applications):

	Project Name	Application(s)	Tax Map Parcel No(s).	Election District
1.	Adair Plantation	RC20153419	44-121G	George Washington
2.	Belmont Park	RC20153239 CUP20153240	44-91, 92, 93A, 93E, 123A, 123B, 123D, 123E, 124, 124A, 125, 129, 129A, 130, 130A, 131, 132, 135,136, 136A, 137A, 138A, 144, 144B, 144C, 44C-3-	Hartwood

			3, 44C-3-4, 44C-3-5, 44C-3-6, 44C-3-7, 44C-3-8, 44C-3-9	
3.	Mabudian	RC15150963 CUP15150816	20-99	Griffis-Widewater
4.	Westlake	RC17151764 RC17151895	35-20, 35-20A, 35-21, 35-22, 35-31 (portion), 35K-1A-1, 35K-1A-2, 35K-1A-3, 35K-1A-4, 35K-1A-5, 35K-1A-6, 35K-1A-7, 35K-1A-8 , 35K-1A-9, 35K-1A-10, 35K-1A-11, 35K-1A-12, 35K-1A-13, 35K-1A-14, 35K-1A-15, 35K-1A-16, 35K-1A-17, 35K-1A-18, 35K-1A-19, 35K-1A-20, 35K-1A-21, 35K-1A-22, 35K-1A-23, 35K-1A-24 , 35K-1A-25, 35K-1A-26, 35K-1A-A, 35K-1A-A1, and 35K-1A-B, 35K-1A-CC, 35K-1A-JJ, and 35K-1A-KK	Hartwood
5.	Crucible Properties II, LLC	CUP1200299	35-22	Hartwood

; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that a time limit extension for each of the Applications for Adair Plantation, Mabudian, Westlake, and Crucible Properties II, LLC, pursuant to Stafford County Code Secs. 28-162(h) and 28-185(b)(2), is not appropriate;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that time a limit extension, pursuant to County Code Sec. 28-162(h) and Sec. 28-185(b)(2), be and they hereby are denied for the following applications:

Page 3

	Project Name	Application(s)
1.	Adair Plantation	RC20153419
2.	Mabudian	RC15150963 CUP15150816
3.	Westlake	RC17151764 RC17151895
4.	Crucible Properties II, LLC	CUP1200299

Item 20. Consider Time Limit Extension Requests for Certain Zoning Reclassification and Conditional Use Permit Applications (Projects Known as Adair Plantation, Belmont Park, Mabudian, Westlake, and Crucible).

Ms. Vanuch stated that if the Board wished to deny any or some of the projects, they can dictate in the motion which they choose to approve or deny, so they can be broken out individually.

Mr. Jeff Harvey reported that the resolution for denial would be R22-56, and he explained that the County Code stipulates that rezoning in conditional use permit applications must be dealt with and approved or denied by the Board within 18 months. He said the ordinance was adopted in June 2020, and the time window for all pending applications expired in December; these requests before them came in during November, before that expiration. He said the five applications had various submittal dates and cover the George Washington, Hartwood, and Griffis-Widewater districts.

Ms. Allen asked Mr. Harvey to explain the request from Mabudian.

Mr. Harvey responded that it is a minor proffer amendment and minor CUP amendment, and the site had originally been approved for an automobile sales facility—which was to be located indoors in a two-story building. He said the applicant in 2015 modified their request to ask for a single-story building with outdoor display and has put the application on hold.

Ms. Allen asked how long the application had been pending.

Mr. Harvey replied that it had been about six years.

Mr. Coen said that he had hoped to see a visual depiction of applications and dates, but his question was what happened to any of these were the Board to deny them because the applicants voluntarily deferred them.

Mr. Harvey explained that if the Board denied a request for an extension, the applicant had the opportunity to refile applications, so they would pay the application fee anew and reestablish it as a new application.

Mr. Coen asked if it were normal for an applicant to alter the application if the timeframe were adjusted, because it would not be coming back as the Board saw it and could be different.

M. Harvey stated that the applicant can make modifications to the proposed application, but if those changes are substantive—such as zoning district category—the application may be remanded back to the Planning Commission for a public hearing again.

Ms. Bohmke said that in looking at the correspondence from Charlie Payne, the Westlake proffer amendment with the different parcel numbers all seem to be separate applications.

Mr. Harvey responded that there were several applications, with a proffer amendment on the large Westlake parcel, and there were two rezoning applications: one for a portion of the property designated for a public use site, and a rezoning application on the adjacent property known as the Crucible site—which also has a CUP application filed in 2012 that is still pending.

Mr. English asked how long Westlake had been on the books.

Mr. Harvey responded that it first received zoning approval in 1989.

He clarified that the Adair Plantation application was filed in July 2020; Belmont Park was April 2020; Mabudian was October 2015; Westlake was April 2017; and Crucible was August 2012.

Ms. Vanuch asked about the time limit that the Board was supposed to respond.

Mr. Harvey confirmed that with CUPs, the state statute says the Board has up to a year in which to take action; in this case, it's gone beyond a year because the applicant has requested deferrals and the Board's consideration to take up the issue at a later date. He said that as of 2020, the Board passed an ordinance to try to clean up some things that had been lingering for a long time, so applicants know they need to move their projects through in a timely manner.

Ms. Allen motioned to approve R22-56 to deny the time extensions. Ms. Gary seconded the motion.

Ms. Allen commented that as it relates to Mabudian, she would like to deny that because she did not want to approve the extension.

Ms. Bohmke said that none of these are in her district, so she would yield to the Supervisors whose districts they are in.

Mr. English stated that he would deny Westlake and Crucible.

Mr. Coen commented that he did not remember Adair coming to the Board, and he asked if it had been yanked at the Planning Commission level.

Mr. Harvey said that the application had not moved forward to public hearing with the Commission yet and was still in review. He added that the Belmont Park applicants have refiled a new request, although it's under the current application.

Mr. English stated that the only one he wanted to pull out was Belmont Park.

Ms. Allen amended her motion to remove Belmont Park. Ms. Gary seconded the amendment to the motion.

Ms. Yeung asked if there were any risk in denying these.

Mr. Harvey said that it was the Board of Supervisors discretion how to deal with these, and a risk would be that the applicant would have to file a new application and start the process over—so the risk is probably more for the applicant than the Board.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	

Mr. English motioned to approve the extension for Belmont Park. Ms. Bohmke seconded the motion.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	

NEW BUSINESS

Item 21. Budget and Management; Appropriate American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Funds for Economic Development Purposes.

Ms. Andrea Light stated that she would present on ARPA in preparation for review of R22-20. She said that Stafford County was poised to receive $29.7 million in ARPA funding over two tranches, with the second tranche anticipated in May 2022. She stated that the Board had approved $8.5 million in appropriations to support several strategic initiatives, and Attachment 2 in the Board packets provides a list of all initiatives that have been appropriated and those anticipated to come back before the Board. She noted that approximately $1.2 million in ARPA funds had not been pledged, and staff expects to bring those to the Board as part of the CIP and budget work sessions. She added that prior to expending of the funds, the Board must appropriate these items.

Ms. Light reported that the Board approved R21-353 in October, which provided a strategy of how to use these funds: to provide support for the strategic plan and outcomes of the Board. She said that John Holden was present at this meeting to talk specifically about the economic development actions, and staff would continue to work with ARPA items and bring them forward for future appropriation. She noted that staff was working on some of the other strategies to try to bring forward; for example, in the Hartwood District, the Gauntlet Golf Course parking lot, which staff planned to bring back to the Board in early spring.

Ms. Yeung said that she was trying to establish where the ARPA funds were supposed to go.

Ms. Light responded that the funds are meant to help with economic recovery, increased broadband, utilities, and revenue replacement, to mitigate the effects of COVID-19. She said that there were many other directives within the Department of Treasury's final rule.

Ms. Yeung commented that they must meet specific criteria, one of which is to enhance businesses, and she surmised that this was why the economic development piece came in.

Ms. Vanuch suggested that Ms. Light sit down with Ms. Yeung, and other new supervisors if they were interested, and go through the millions of dollars they have provided the Economic Development Department related to CARES and ARPA funding previously.

Economic Development Director John Holden stated that the pandemic began in March 2020, and the economy essentially shut down. He said that the Stafford Board and EDA responded with CARES Act money, as well as the EDA's own funds, of $1.2 million. He introduced Joel Griffin, Chairman of the EDA, whom the Chairman asked to come back before the Board.

Ms. Vanuch said that the Board had asked the EDA to come back and speak on behalf of the consulting agreement they were pursuing and what specifically would be done, and whether the EDA was in support of that particular request when it was presented previously.

Mr. Joel Griffin stated that he was before them as Chair of the EDA to support the initiative that Mr. Holden would be speaking to, and they had an EDA meeting on the previous Friday, at which there was much discussion as to how to best implement these strategies. He said that the consensus was that Economic Development and Tourism staff was doing a tremendous job and was fully inundated with the actions and activities given to them thus far. He stated that they realize that some industries have been hit harder than others, with hospitality continuing to struggle to recover. He said that they have used a lot of money to support small businesses in the community during the pandemic and was one of the first regions in the Commonwealth to provide grants to small businesses—but they were still very much in need.

Mr. Griffin said that the initiative Mr. Holden was putting forward was supported by the EDA because it provides greater insight into the areas that need the most support and how best to do that. He stated that they had a burgeoning ecosystem in the County that requires entrepreneurs to start businesses, businesspeople to maintain them, and employees to be qualified for their work. He said that through these initiatives, the consultant should be able to provide insight into where they need to focus in the years to come.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the EDA took a vote at the meeting, or if it was just a discussion.

Mr. Griffin responded that they did not take a vote but discussed submitting a letter to the Board, and he was happy to send that forward if necessary. He stated that it was not an easy discussion, and there was a lot of conversation about how to best use the funds, as well as where the consultant would be spending most of their time. He said that with regard to the funds being allocated to the consultant, if you forecast over the course of three years, it is cheaper than hiring a full-time employee and doesn't take as long to hire them. He added that this was an expedient way to bring in an expert without the burden of a long-term commitment, and it addresses immediate actions of what they are looking to answer. He also said that it provided the opportunity as staff and members on where they need to focus their energies moving forward.

Ms. Bohmke stated that since they did not take a vote, she wondered what some of the consternation and dialogue was.

Mr. Griffin responded that at the end, everyone was in support of what the consultant would be spending their time on—the question was how the funding would be allocated. He said that it seemed like a large number for a consultant for a short period of time, but if you look at the full period they would be using the consultant, it was actually cheaper than a full-time employee.

Ms. Bohmke said that the amount wasn't really what mattered to her—it was what they were actually getting for the consultant, and what the deliverables were that they would be getting. She said that in any contract, there have to be deliverables.

Mr. Griffin noted that the EDA would be intimately involved throughout this process, and this would not be a "one and done" for them, as they are aggressively pursuing opportunities to expand the business community in the county.

Ms. Bohmke asked if that was part of the Economic Development agreement with the consulting company.

Mr. Griffin responded that the EDA would not have any authority over the consultant.

Ms. Yeung said that she had read they were already doing some work within the EDA but are also asking for the consultant, so she wasn't sure if the consultant was going to do something entirely different.

Mr. Holden explained that this was a County procurement—not an EDA procurement—and his office went through procurement and sent out an RFP in early 2021 when he recognized the economy had changed and they had a lot of work to do to support the businesses for the set-aside the Board had established. He explained that the contractor selected was Garella Partners, and they will work with staff who will work with the EDA and others, including the Board if they would like, to design a category of programs that he has recommended based on the guidance and Treasury rules. He said that the consultant would work with them and look at what other places are doing around the country to help them design the programs to support the businesses.

Ms. Bohmke asked for an example of a specific program, as this company has done this throughout the nation, and what they would be getting for their money. She emphasized that this was the question she has been asking for four months.

Mr. Holden referenced a chart and said they were reflected there, stating that they need help to design, manage, and administer programs so they follow all the Treasury rules and cover any audit issues. He said the Treasury guidance was not very clear and the rules are still unclear as to grants and loans to businesses, as it does not describe what happens to the funds when they are paid back. He stated that most federal programs allow for revolving loan funds, which can be used in other ways that are not specifically related to ARPA. He said that he was seeking professional guidance to help him clarify things like that.

Ms. Bohmke stated that she could put him in touch with Eryn Hurley, whom she just met at the NACO conference this week and has a standing dialogue with the Treasury Department on all the new rules that just came out.

Mr. Holden said that other examples would be for ARPA funds that can be used to help with existing businesses in their need to attract and retain talent in the workforce. He stated that working with the Virginia Employment Commission and Bay Web to get professional guidance on how to design programs that would complement the funds they can use so it won't duplicate them. He said that there are a number of firms that are desperate to find talent, and they want to design programs that help them do that.

Ms. Allen said that he was asking the Board to provide the manpower to help them navigate the challenges that the pandemic has brought to the EDA, and her question was what their staffing was like pre-pandemic. She said if they don't approve this, she wondered who would take on this responsibility.

Mr. Holden responded that they would need to work harder and have more time to do it. He explained that staff was able to adjust and design grant programs because a lot of things shut down, and they essentially stopped doing tourism. He said that today, that was not the case.

Ms. Allen said that the consultant would help in the process, and it sounded from Mr. Griffin that it would be higher to go this route than to hire the staff to do it.

Mr. Holden said that was why he sought an RFP in January 2021, recognizing that they needed staff capacity and professional guidance, and someone to look at what other counties were doing around the country.

Ms. Allen asked if he could possibly bring back a fiscal cost comparison in hiring staff, along with another option to have the current staff figure out the impacts of those. She clarified that the three options were the RFP as presented, hiring their own staff, and having staff figure it out.

Mr. Holden responded that he could bring it back under Unfinished Business in two weeks.

Ms. Allen suggested that they make sure whether the staff person would be temporary or permanent.

Ms. Yeung said that she had attended a meeting earlier where they approved a consultant for more than this, and she wondered what the hesitation was in ensuring they were using the money following ARPA guidelines.

Mr. Holden confirmed that she was correct, stating that the contract was proposed to be a one-year contract with two yearly renewals, so essentially it could be three years. He said it would be billed hourly by a consultancy group, so there are different experts in the group that may have different rates.

Ms. Yeung asked for confirmation that there would be a plan in place after the consultant leaves, and projects going forward.

Mr. Holden stated that the point is for the consultant to put those programs or projects together to come back to the Board for the further appropriation of the balance of the set-aside, which has been the intent all along, to advise on the best way to use these funds.

Ms. Bohmke said that one of the slides mentions the Heritage Trail, and she didn't think this was something they were moving forward with in Virginia, as it was over the next 10 years. She stated that she was trying to understand what would happen in the next year or two with that and how it could be impacted.

Mr. Holden responded that he chose that name and was unaware of an existing Heritage Trail, and the ARPA final rules allow for some ability to help impacted communities. He read from the specific rules: "…by addressing systemic public health and economic challenges that may have contributed to more severe impacts of the pandemic among low-income communities and people of color…by building stronger communities through investments." He said that they have to dig further into the ARPA rules to understand what those investments mean, because there are three different sections on what capital improvements can be done with ARPA funds. He commented that "Heritage Trail" was an example of engineering and planning.

Ms. Yeung commented that she appreciated that he was taking his time and making sure there is attention to public health and mental health.

At 5:10 p.m., Chairman Vanuch recessed the afternoon session of the February 15, 2022 Board meeting.

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

PRESENTATIONS

Proclamation to Honor and Recognize Black History Month

Ms. Vanuch recognized Metria Singleton, President of the Stafford Branch of the NAACP. Ms. Vanuch said the County has published two videos regarding Black History Month, and both were filmed at the Rowser Building, the former Stafford Training School, in front of the African American History Wall. She said that the Stafford NAACP was a great partner during Stafford's 350th anniversary celebration, facilitating various programs to bring Black history alive to visitors.

Ms. Yeung read the proclamation for Black History Month and presented the proclamation of recognition to Ms. Singleton.

Ms. Metria Singleton thanked the County on behalf of the Stafford Branch of the NAACP, noting that the mural on the Rowser Building was put on the wall in 2014 and there were new names and pictures to add to it.

Proclamation Recognizing Sergeant Baris Demirci and K-9 Officer Titan for Outstanding Service to Stafford County

Ms. Vanuch recognized Sergeant Baris DeMirci, and the dog Titan, for their role in catching the abductor of a young resident getting off of her school bus, noting that they had also invited School Board Chair Patricia Healy. She also thanked the K-9 Team and Sheriff's Office, stating that they all had a crucial role to play in catching the abductor so quickly. Ms. Vanuch read the proclamation recognizing Sergeant DeMirci and Titan for their outstanding service to Stafford County.

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Ms. Vanuch explained the protocol for public presentations and called the first speaker forward.

1. Mr. Jeff Adams stated that the goats he had at the afternoon meeting were Oberhalsi goats born on Groundhog Day, and he said they were a Swiss breed that came to the U.S. around 1900 and were primarily used as milk goats. He said that they have to find a way to get elementary school students on field trips to farms, and he was willing to host those events at his farm—which has about 10 different types of animals, the value of all of which he can speak to. He stated that you raise one type of goat if you want milk, another if you want meat, and another for cashmere or angora. He added that he was working with a local teacher on a traveling show that will feature where milk comes from and the four or five steps involved. Mr. Adams commented that farm kids learn "sex, life, and death," none of which can be avoided.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Item 25. Planning and Zoning; Consider (1) An Ordinance to Amend and Reordain the Stafford County Zoning Ordinance by Amending the Proffered Conditions on Tax Map Parcel No. 45-165, Zoned B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, Located Within the Falmouth Election District, and (2) a Request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to Allow a Mini-Storage Warehouse Use, Motor Vehicle Rental Use, and a Dwelling for a Watchman or Caretaker on Premises in the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District On Tax Map Parcel No. 45-165, Within the Falmouth Election District (Project Known as Southgate).

Principal Planner Mike Zuraf reported that this proposal is for reclassification and a conditional use permit, with an amendment to proffered conditions on property zoned B-2, Urban Commercial, to develop a mini-storage warehouse facility; the second part is to allow the mini-storage warehouse use, motor vehicle rental use, and dwelling for a watchman or caretaker in the B-2 district. He stated that the site is 8.16 acres, and Little Falls Run, LC is the applicant; the property is in the Falmouth District.

Mr. Zuraf reported that on multiple occasions, including before the application was submitted going back to November 2017 and February 2019, the applicant participated in community meetings at Drew Middle School with Ms. Bohmke and area residents. He said that during the Planning Commission review, the applicant and staff attended a South Gate HOA meeting on November 16, 2021 to continue discussion with the community and hear their concerns on this proposal. He said that overall, the proposal attempts to address the concerns raised by citizens at these community meetings.

Mr. Zuraf pointed out the subject parcel on a map, noting that it is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Cambridge Street, Route 1, and Southgate Avenue. He showed the current zoning of the site and surrounding area, noting that the light red represents the B-2 zoning; the adjacent properties to the west shaded yellow are R-1 suburban residential, and that area consists of the remainder of the South Gate neighborhood. He said the light green shading to the east is A-1 agricultural zoning, where the Walt Lou Mobile Home Park is located. He said with the zoning history, the site was rezoned to B-2 as part of the adjacent South Gate development. He said in 2004, the residential portion of South Gate consists of 152 single-family lots, and the surrounding residential area of South Gate is built out, while the commercial site remains undeveloped. He noted that the proffers that currently existed in the South Gate residential area would not be changed, so the amended original proffers only apply to the B-2 commercial portion of the area.

Mr. Zuraf stated that the aerial view shows the existing conditions of the site, which is currently undeveloped, and it includes a generally level plateau along the eastern side of the site along Route 1; the land slopes down to the south and west towards the homes on Queensland Drive and towards South Gate Avenue. He said there were no environmentally sensitive features or resources on the site; there are grasses and some trees that cover the slopes and around the adjacent Walt Lou trailer park area. Mr. Zuraf stated that there are also sidewalks on three sides of the site that were installed with the original development of South Gate. He said that the subject parcel is in two parts, divided by a platted right-of-way and the potential extension of Cool Brook Lane.

Mr. Zuraf reported that the general development plan shows the layout of the mini-storage facility, which consists of several one-story rental storage unit buildings totaling approximately 95,000 square feet in area; there is one two-story, 2,800 SF building that would house the office and dwelling for the watchman, which is adjacent to the entrance into the site. He said the design will locate buildings around the perimeter of the facility, with access oriented internally to the complex, and there are no building access points proposed along the outer side of the storage buildings—so the design serves to buffer the facility from the adjacent residential uses and intends to preserve the existing grass slope areas, enhanced screening with additional trees along the outer perimeter.

Mr. Zuraf said access would be off of Cambridge Street, with the intention of extending the northbound left-turn lane to also serve as access into the site. He said the entrance would reconstruct an existing entrance into the Walt Lou Mobile Home Park and provide an inter-parcel connection to that mobile home park property. He stated that the mini-storage office is adjacent to the entrance beyond the office, and there are secured gates that limit access into the units. He said the site also includes storage units on the second smaller parcel; a gated emergency access is proposed in that area but there would be no customer access from the neighborhood streets available in this location.

Mr. Zuraf stated that landscaping would include a double row of trees around the perimeter of the storage buildings. He said some of the key proffer amendments to point out are that it restricts the use to mini-storage warehouse with the dwelling watchman and motor vehicle rental uses, and the current proffers allow commercial retail uses on the property. He stated that there is also a maximum building area reduced from 300,000 square feet down to 100,000 square feet, and with the change in permitted use and maximum square footage, there would be a reduction in vehicle trips to the site from 12,800 down to 272 vehicle trips per day.

Mr. Zuraf said that this supports the next amendment, which would allow for relocation of site access from South Gate Avenue to Cambridge Street, and the current proffers restrict access to the site via South Gate Avenue, which is right-in/right-out restricted intersection along Route 1. He noted that the intersection has safety concerns with site distance limitations, and VDOT did approve an access exception for the facility off of Cambridge Street; the entrance addresses concerns cited by the community that customers with rental box trucks entering and exiting through the neighborhood would make a dangerous situation worse. In addition, he said, they envision that customers would often utilize the subdivision streets as a cut-through instead of going out to Route 1.

Mr. Zuraf stated that this would require site development consistent with the development plan provided, which would offer a level of assurance that the development be oriented toward

Cambridge Street. He noted that the design of the site would utilize storage buildings to enclose the facility and would include setbacks, as well as establishing building appearance standards.

Mr. Zuraf said there were several proffers added during the Planning Commission review to attempt to address community concerns, requiring pitched metal roofs and vinyl fencing along the outer perimeter of the storage buildings, as well as prohibiting standard painted metal garage doors from the exterior of any buildings unless completely screened from view by a vinyl fence. He presented an image of proffer Exhibit B, which illustrates the exterior view from Queensland Drive within the South Gate neighborhood and includes the new design and landscaping details.

Mr. Zuraf stated that the applicant is proffering to install lighting within the South Gate community, with the highlighted areas on the map presented identifying community spaces where pole-mounted lighting would be installed—including a basketball court, an adjacent open space area on Cool Brook Lane, and three tot lots. He noted that areas marked in blue would have entrance lighting; at South Gate/Cambridge Street, there would be a pole-mounted light; at the Bayside Drive/Truslow Road entrance, the lighting would be added to the top of two brick entrance columns that flank the entrance to the neighborhood in that location.

Mr. Zuraf said the comprehensive plan identifies a site within the recommended commercial node and suburban land use designations, and those are intended to encourage commercial activities where there are adequate transportation facilities to accommodate proposed uses. He noted that the plan also states that commercial uses adjacent to residential uses should be designed such that the use is integrated into the community. He said that the proposed use is more industrial than what is contemplated in commercial nodes in the comp plan; the Suburban land use designation does recognize that industrial uses may be appropriate in certain situations. He stated that staff believes the efforts made by the applicant to screen and separate the access from the residents help make this a more compatible use with adjacent residents; the low traffic volumes also make the use more appropriate, and most other commercial uses have higher traffic volumes that would likely not be granted the same access exception directly onto Cambridge Street as this use has been granted. He reiterated that the commercial CUP aspect of the proposal is to allow the mini-storage warehouse use, motor vehicle rental use, and dwelling for watchman or caretaker on premises.

Mr. Zuraf presented an evaluation of these conditional uses with the mini-storage warehouse use, and stated it would be a less intense use of the property than what is currently permitted. He said that the screening and site design proposed minimizes the visual impacts, and the dwelling for a watchman or caretaker helps to ensure proper management and security of the complex, with a person available on a regular basis to assist with any concerns. He stated that with the motor vehicle rental use, there is a drop-off area designated outside the access gates; the trucks would be stored inside the complex, and conditions intend to mitigate visual or noise impacts from the use.

Mr. Zuraf reported that several conditions were established and would limit the building height to one story except for the office and apartment building, which would be two stories; provide slatted aluminum fencing a minimum of eight feet tall, unless required to be shorter by code; locate dwelling for watchman or caretaker at the office; limit motor vehicle rentals to moving trucks and trailers; establish criteria where trucks can be dropped off and stored; permit one monument sign up to 12 feet tall and prohibit portable signs; no wall-mounted lighting permitted on the outer perimeter that might shine down towards homes; and no vehicle maintenance or repair permitted.

Mr. Zuraf stated that additional conditions require one-way in and out vehicle access through two access gates, prohibiting storage of any vehicles not associated with the rental use, a minimum travel way of 30 feet between buildings for safety purpose and emergency access, limiting hours of operation from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. each day, a double row of trees as mentioned around the exterior for screening, providing emergency access along the extension of Cool Brook Lane and the intersection with Queensland Drive, and prohibiting vehicle parking in that area.

Mr. Zuraf said that there are several positives with the overall evaluation of this proposal: it conforms with the comp plan guidelines for placing of industrial type uses in the Suburban Area; the proffers and conditions ensure the impacts to surrounding properties are minimized; the proffers establish the quality of the buildings will conform to the adjacent residential uses; proffers reduce the overall potential intensity of the development and limits the use of the property to that shown on the plan; and access is modified to minimize safety and adjacent resident conflicts. He noted that staff did not find any negative aspects to the proposal.

Mr. Zuraf stated that staff recommends approval with the amended proffers; staff also recommends approval of the CUP with conditions that would be subject to the approval of the zoning reclassification. He said that on December 8, the Planning Commission voted 6-1 to recommend approval of both applications.

Ms. Allen asked who the lone dissenting vote was on the Planning Commission and was told that it was Mr. English.

Mr. Coen stated that staff had mentioned "no storage vehicles not associated with the rental" and "limited motor vehicle rentals to moving trucks and trailers," and he had understood that this would be storage units, but it sounds like people will be able to rent U-Haul trucks as well.

Mr. Zuraf confirmed that this was part of the proposal and one of the specific requests.

Mr. Coen said when they were doing one of these businesses in his district, there was much consternation about vehicles being stored there.

Mr. Zuraf responded that a specific condition stipulates that the storage of vehicles can only be for U-Haul type rental vehicles.

Mr. Coen said that regarding the condition of limiting building height to one story except for office/apartment, that seems to mean the place for the watchman to sleep and is not apartments.

Mr. Zuraf confirmed that is what it refers to.

Ms. Bohmke said that she knows what the area on Queensland looks like and asked him to point out the screening on South Gate Boulevard and by Walt Lou Mobile Home Park.

Mr. Zuraf responded that they didn't have images on the others, but he presented the Generalized Development Plan that showed the location.

Ms. Yeung asked about the tot lots as mentioned and the fact cars and trucks would be driving by, and whether there was any perimeter around them to ensure child safety.

Mr. Zuraf responded that he cannot speak to the condition of the tot lots within the neighborhood.

The Chair asked to hear from the applicant.

Mr. Peter Basanti stated that he represents Little Falls Run and has Justin Boynton of the company here, along with Justin Troidl, the project engineer. Mr. Basanti said that Little Falls Run has developed and managed a number of these self-storage facilities over the years—in Stafford and in surrounding localities. He stated that it may not be the most appealing use, but there is a robust demand for it and the company knows how to do them, in addition to being about as low-impact and low-intensity use as possible on this parcel. Mr. Basanti said the 2004 zoning was mixed use and envisioned 300,000 square feet of retail/commercial with no limitation and anything by right in B-2 could go there; that required the access to go right through South Gate Avenue. He noted that the vehicle trips per day possible under those proffers were about 12,810.

Mr. Basanti stated that the current proposal limits this to three uses: the mini storage, the vehicle rental, and the dwelling for the caretaker/watchman. He said the vehicle trips per day under this structure would be 272, which is about a 50-fold decrease over the original proposal—and for that reason, VDOT allowed the relocation of the Cambridge Road access and the shared access with the Walt Lou Mobile Home Park to replace what would have been traffic going right into the South

Gate subdivision. He noted that this has been a very iterative process, with several community meetings dating back to 2017, and a lot of the earlier meetings were focused on this access issue, which has been resolved through reorientating it to Cambridge. He said that over the last few months, they have fine tuned the buffers, the fencing, the architecture with the pitched roofs, and the lighting amenities that the HOA had asked for on the Truslow entrance and the South Gate intersection, as well as lighting up the basketball court and tot lots.

Mr. Basanti said that they believe the final product is a significant upgrade in terms of impact and compatibility with the neighboring residential development, and they appreciate the time and effort that staff and the homeowners association and Ms. Bohmke and Commissioner Apicella have put into this. He offered to answer questions.

The Chair opened the public hearing and invited the public to speak. There being no speakers, the Chair brought the matter back to the Board.

Ms. Bohmke stated that the fence back on Queensland would be eight feet tall because there was concern about people's views from the second story of their homes, so they did the pitched roofs and the higher fence—and she asked if the rest was six feet in height.

Mr. Zuraf responded that the condition states: "All perimeter fencing shall be a minimum of eight feet tall, unless required to be shorter." He stated that along Queensland and South Gate would be eight feet, and also adjacent to Walt Lou, with some fencing along Cool Brook because of public right-of-way perhaps needing to be shorter—but there is a gate at the beginning of Cool Brook where the street ends.

Ms. Bohmke said that depending on when trees are planted, if this is approved by the Board, she asked if the ordinance requires them to replace those trees or bushes if any of them die.

Mr. Zuraf responded that early on, they had to be replanted; after a certain point, the requirement goes away. He confirmed that the timeframe for that was two years.

Mr. English stated that he was voting against this because he felt it was a bad location for this and a safety concern, and he didn't like the way the entrance was coming out at the top of the hill with the school there. He said that at South Gate, they have to make the right turn when they come out; with this, they can go either right or less when they come out of the storage unit.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Yeung to approve proposed Ordinance O22-06.

Ms. Bohmke said that she felt it was important to talk to her colleagues about what has transpired here. She explained that the project came about in 2004, and the area known as South Gate is all single-family homes; the area north of that is eight acres of land, and a lot of the people who bought homes in there assumed that the parcel was just greenspace and didn't realize that it was zoned B-2. She said when she first got on the Board eight years ago, a number of constituents had called her and asked if it would be rezoned into apartments or townhomes—and she said absolutely not. She noted that the property was in foreclosure at the time and was owned by Meridian Bank. She explained that in 2017, the applicant contacted her, and as Mr. Zuraf indicated, they had a town hall meeting at Drew Middle School.

Ms. Bohmke stated that her initial position with this project was that under no circumstances could they ever put a storage facility there and allow all the trucks to traverse through the development of single-family homes. She said she would never approve that, as the box trucks are large to traverse the road there, especially with cars parked on each side, and she also had concerns for the safety of children. She stated that the applicant went back to the drawing board and worked with VDOT, which has agreed to allow them to have an entrance just past Walt Lou, now with an inter-parcel connector. Ms. Bohmke stated that they also allowed them to have a left turn out in addition to the right turn in. She said that she isn't the traffic engineer and doesn't make those decisions, and that was made by VDOT.

Ms. Bohmke said that she has worked very closely with Keisha Evans, the HOA president for South Gate as of July 1, when the residents took the HOA over because parts of the development were still under construction. She commented that the County has vacillated on this project, and in the perfect world, they would like to have it as green open space—but by right, they could put a commercial shopping center in there and potentially have 10,000-12,000 vehicles per day, which the residents definitely did not want. She said to have an entrance off of Cambridge Street or Route 1 and have 272 vehicles per day is significantly better than any by-right scenario.

Ms. Bohmke stated that they had a Zoom meeting in November and she was not on the call because she didn't want to intimidate anyone, but Steven Apicella was on the call, and they had a very productive conversation. She said that the South Gate HOA asked for some of the lighting considerations, and the applicant took a lot of time looking at the viewpoint if you are on Queensland, the street that backs up to the storage facility, as you are on the second floor. She emphasized that they tried to make it as appealing as possible. Ms. Bohmke noted that the tot lots were put in by the original developer, and what they're doing now is trying to light them and putting lighting on the back entrance off of Truslow Road.

Ms. Bohmke said that given what the applicant has done and the work with the HOA, she is in favor of this project. She stated that it would be a travesty for a commercial shopping center to go in here, and while other Board members are against storage facilities because there are way too many in Stafford, there is clearly a demand for it in South Stafford or they wouldn't be building this. Ms. Bohmke added that this has been going on since 2017.

Ms. Vanuch stated that she would support this because the Supervisor of that district supports this, and there are not as many in her district as there are in others. She added that they have not received any public comment against it and no one came to speak against it.

Mr. Coen said that he also liked to defer to the Supervisor of the district in question, but he did have concerns about the map and driving through the mobile homes and through traffic through Queensland—as well as the location of the rental vehicles.

Ms. Gary commented that Ms. Bohmke has worked very hard on this with the constituents that live there, and she would support this proposal.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(1)	English

Ordinace O22-06 reads as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN THE STAFFORD COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE BY AMENDING THE PROFFERED CONDITIONS ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 45-165, ZONED B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL, LOCATED WITHIN THE FALMOUTH ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, Little Falls Run, L.C., applicant, submitted application RC18152265, requesting an amendment to proffered conditions on Tax Map Parcel No. 45-165 in the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, located within the Falmouth Election District; and

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

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the requested zoning amendments are compatible with the surrounding land uses and meet the criteria for a rezoning in Stafford County Code Sec. 28-206; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practices require adoption of this Ordinance to reclassify the subject property by amending the proffered conditions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that the Stafford County Zoning Ordinance be and it hereby is amended and reordained to amend proffered conditions on Tax Map Parcel No. 45-165 in the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, as specified in the proffer statement entitled "Proposed Proffer Statement," dated December 8, 2021, and signed January 20, 2022, in the locations identified on sheet 6 of the exhibit entitled "General Development Plan Southgate Self-Storage TM: 45-165 PCA# RC18152265; CUP #20153251 (Warehouse, Mini Storage) (Dwelling for Watchman or Caretaker on Premises) (Motor Vehicle Rental) Falmouth-Hartwood Magisterial District Stafford County, Virginia," prepared by Bowman Consulting, last revised and sealed December 2, 2021, as "PARCEL 1", "RESIDUE PART ONE", AND "RESIDUE PART 2", except as provided in the Proposed Proffer Statement, which states that "These Proffers shall not be deemed to apply to the approximately 12,926 square feet of area proposed to be conveyed to Tax Map Parcel 45-216 as part of a boundary line adjustment shown on Generalized Development Plan prepared by Bowman Consulting Group, Ltd. dated March 21, 2018, as last revised on December 2, 2021."

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen to approve proposed Resolution R22-32.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(1)	English

Resolution R22-32 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) TO ALLOW WAREHOUSE, MINI STORAGE; MOTOR VEHICLE RENTAL; AND A DWELLING FOR WATCHMAN OR CARETAKER ON PREMISES IN THE B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 45-165, LOCATED WITHIN THE FALMOUTH ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, Little Falls Run, L.C., applicant, submitted application CUP20153251 (Application), requesting a conditional use permit to allow warehouse, mini-storage; motor vehicle rental; and a dwelling for watchman or caretaker on premises, in the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, on Tax Map Parcel No. 45-165, located within the Falmouth Election District; and

WHEREAS, the Application was submitted pursuant to Stafford County Code Section 28-35, Table 3.1, which permits these uses in the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District, after a CUP is issued by the Board; and

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

WHEREAS, the Board has considered the criteria in Stafford County Code Sec. 28-185 and finds that the request meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance for issuance of a CUP;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 15th day of February, 2022, that a conditional use permit pursuant to application CUP20153251 (CUP) be and it hereby is approved with the following conditions:

1. This CUP is for warehouse, mini-storage; motor vehicle rental; and a dwelling for watchman or caretaker on Tax Map Parcel No. 45-165 (Property), in the locations identified on sheets 4B and 4C as "Denotes Area of CUP" of the exhibit entitled "General Development Plan Southgate Self-Storage TM: 45-165 PCA# RC18152265; CUP #20153251 (Warehouse, Mini Storage) (Dwelling for Watchman or Caretaker on Premises) (Motor Vehicle Rental) Falmouth-Hartwood Magisterial District Stafford County, Virginia," prepared by Bowman Consulting, last revised and sealed December 2, 2021 (GDP).

2. The Property shall be developed in general conformance with the GDP.

3. The buildings for warehouse, mini-storage shall be no taller than one (1) story, with the exception of one (1), two (2) story building which includes the office and dwelling for caretaker.

4. Any fencing on the Property not adjacent to the Southgate residential development shall be generally consistent with the aluminum fence detail included in the GDP. All perimeter fencing shall be a minimum of eight (8) feet tall, unless required to be shorter pursuant Stafford County Code.

5. Occupancy of the dwelling for watchman or caretaker shall only be directly related to the warehouse, mini-storage use and shall be located in the location as identified on the GDP.

6. The motor vehicle rental use shall be for the rental of moving trucks and trailers.

7. All storage and parking of rental vehicles and trailer equipment, including trailers, tow dollies, and auto transports, shall be limited to the designated parking spaces identified on the GDP as "Temporary Dropoff Parking" or within the secure storage facility. No rental vehicles or trailer equipment shall be stored or parked in any open space or any other off-site public roads or private travelways. The above defined parking spaces identified as "Temporary Dropoff Parking" shall be limited to use by rental vehicles and associated equipment.

8. All rental vehicles and trailer equipment on the Property shall be licensed and operable.

9. No vertical stacking of rental vehicles or trailer equipment shall be permitted on the Property.

10. A single monument sign shall be permitted in the general location shown on the GDP, which shall not exceed twelve (12) feet in height.

11. No portable signage may be utilized on the Property. All signage on the Property shall be of coordinated color and design.

12. No building mounted lighting is permitted on the outer perimeter of any storage buildings facing adjacent residential uses.

13. No maintenance of vehicles, mechanical maintenance, or automobile repair shall be allowed on the Property. The following activities are not considered maintenance and shall be permitted: changing windshield wipers, adding air to tires, changing light bulbs, cleaning windows, and vacuuming the vehicle interiors.

14. Vehicle travelways on the Property shall be kept clear for emergency vehicle access.

15. One-way access into and out of the Property shall be provided at the two security gates and shall include directional pavement markings, with the traffic flow direction as determined at time of site plan review.

16. The facility on the Property shall be designed to accommodate a dwelling for a caretaker.

17. Storage of any vehicles not associated with the vehicle rental use is prohibited.

18. Travelways between the buildings shall be a minimum of thirty (30) feet wide.

19. Hours of operation of the warehouse, mini-storage use (including when customers have access to the storage units) and vehicle rental pick-up and drop-off shall be limited to be between 6:00 A.M. and 10:00 P.M.

20. The existing trees along the slopes adjacent to Southgate Avenue and Queensland Drive shall be retained to the greatest extent possible and shall be complemented by the installation of a single or double row of evergreen trees, in locations necessary to enhance screening. Such additional trees shall be planted as close to the fencing as possible in an alternating pattern, forty (40) to fifty (50) feet on center, and of a minimum size that is consistent with the Stafford County Design and Construction Standards for Landscaping, Buffering and Screening (DCSL).

21. Ingress egress points for internal storage unit buildings shall be in compliance with the Stafford County Building Code.

22. Emergency access shall be provided along the extension of Cool Brook Lane at the intersection with Queensland Drive. No vehicle parking or storage of materials shall be permitted in the right-of-way for the extension of Cool Brook Lane from the intersection with Queensland Drive.

23. Any storage units physically located outside of the access gate shall be accessed by interior corridors via secured doorways.

24. This CUP may be revoked for a violation of any of these conditions or any applicable federal, state, or County code, law, ordinance, or regulation.

NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

Item 22. Update on Brooke Road Flooding

Ms. Allen said that Ms. Gary had a lot of questions about this in the Infrastructure Committee meeting two weeks earlier, and she wondered if the Board would be open to deferral until she could be present and could better participate.

Ms. Gary said that she would like the item to move forward and take a vote with moving forward with the access road at their next meeting.

Transportation Program Manager Alex Owsiak stated that he was there to provide an update concerning the flooding along Brooke Road, which refers to the portion of Brooke Road near Crow's Nest along Accokeek Creek—more specifically referred to as the S-curve near the intersection of Raven Road. He noted that this particular section of Brooke Road between the intersection with Raven Road and Maplewood Drive has been experiencing recurring flooding issues over the last several years, whereby the road becomes impassible to vehicles. He said the roadway section was located within a mapped floodplain and sits low, near the wetlands associated with the creek, providing little elevation for the water to drain out of the ditches into the local waterways.

Mr. Owsiak said when flooding occurs at the S-curve and VDOT has to close the road to traffic, approximately 450 households east of Raven Road are impacted, with no other means of ingress or egress. She stated that information from VDOT indicates that there are approximately 13 road closures on this portion of Brooke Road over the past three years, with an additional five closures due to flooding in 2021. He stated that the most recent traffic data from 2021 shows that approximately 1,800 vehicles traversed this particular section of the S-curve, and there is some fluctuation in that daily traffic.

Mr. Owsiak presented several slides that detailed the County's efforts to deal with the high water on Brooke Road, such as their early partnership with VDOT going back to 2015 to work on cleaning out existing roadside ditches and regrading roadside outfalls. He noted that it was a challenge working with VDOT to obtain the necessary environmental permits to work along the Crow's Nest area. He said that in 2018, the Board recognized that additional efforts were needed and authorized $25K for a preliminary engineering report and hydraulic analysis of Brooke Road; after review of that study, the results were presented to the Infrastructure Committee in December

2019 for direction on whether to pursue the individual culvert replacements that were identified in the report or work towards some of the larger-scale improvements recommended, such as roadway raising and realignment.

Mr. Owsiak said the following April, as part of their quarterly report, VDOT reported to the Board that they had serviced over 100 work orders along Brooke Road in the prior year, 75% of which related to the flooding; they had expended over $500K in maintenance work. He reported that in May 2020, the Board approved $250K in FY24 and FY26 as part of the six-year secondary plan funding, which would go to address culvert replacements in specific locations. She said after Brooke Road experienced some flooding events over that summer, the Board at their September 2020 meeting approved immediate funding in the amount of $300K to advance the culvert replacements into FY21.

Mr. Owsiak stated that staff had been engaging with VDOT regarding the possible culvert replacements and following VDOT's review of the report and existing field conditions, it was determined that additional survey, design work, and analysis would be needed—and all these costs would far exceed the $300K already approved by the Board. He noted that additional flooding also occurred on Brooke Road in the fall of 2020, and all the parties came together and realized that culvert replacements would not be sufficient to address the flooding issues out on Brooke Road.

Mr. Owsiak said that at the Board's behest, staff began to investigate some more immediate solutions; in December 2020, they partnered with VDOT again, the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to clear out vegetation and increase sight lines along the S-curve on Brooke Road. He said they also worked with VDOT to pump out the roadway to remove standing water and remove some beaver dams in Accokeek Creek. He stated that staff also began to investigate the option to construct a connection between the Windermere and Poplar Hills communities to provide emergency and egress route.

Mr. Owsiak stated that in January and February of 2021, staff held several virtual meetings with the Windermere and Poplar Hills community to construct this emergency access connection and answer their questions and concerns. He said that staff also made a presentation to VDOT's deputy commissioner about the issues on Brooke Road and was able to convince VDOT to reimburse the County for the construction-related expenses for the emergency access drive.

Mr. Owsiak reported that in March 2021, VDOT conducted an aerial survey along Brooke Road, while County staff continued to hold meetings with the Windermere HOA. He said in April, the County executed a contract to start design work for the emergency access drive and survey the existing Windermere Drive. He said that in June 2021, projects to construct the emergency access drive and reconstruct the portion of Brooke Road were adopted by the Board as part of their FY22-

31 Transportation CIP Plan. He said that in August 2021, draft plans for the emergency access drive were provided by the Windermere property owners and posted to the County's website about Brooke Road for comments. He said that in November 2021, staff posted another update to the website with a graphic showing the current alignment of Windermere Drive, as well as the easements that each owner on Windermere has dedicated for use of the road, and additional right-of-way the County would need to require to bring Windermere Drive into the public system.

Mr. Owsiak reported that currently, the County is working with engineers to finalize plats for the dedication and review by an appraiser to determine fair market value for the right-of-way the County would need to acquire. He said that as directed by the Board, staff has been pursuing two options to provide ingress and egress for residents east of the S-curve on Brooke Road. He mentioned that option one would construct the emergency access drive between Windermere, which is currently a private road, and Crestwood Lane, which is a state road, to provide a temporary detour around the S-curve. He added that option two consists of constructing the permanent fix to Brooke Road, raising and realigning the S-curve to drastically reduce the chance of future flooding.

Mr. Owsiak said there was a third option initially considered that would have created a connection between existing Courthouse Road and Brook Crest Lane, but that option was not selected to be pursued by the Board. He stated that the emergency access drive would connect Windermere and Crestwood Lane, and he noted the approximate location on the map provided. He said that emergency access would be a two-lane roadway approximately 22 feet in width, with a mixed gravel and asphalt surface, posted for 25 MPH. He said the County would control emergency access to the emergency drive through a series of gates on either end that would only be open to traffic when the S-curve was closed to traffic.

Mr. Owsiak referenced a map showing a more technical layout of the emergency access connection between the cul-de-sac at Windermere and the cul-de-sac on Crestwood, and he pointed out the location of the existing foot path that residents have been using to connect the two neighborhoods. He noted that the estimated cost for the emergency access drive is approximately $1 million, which includes design, right-of-way, and construction. He stated that the engineer is in the process of finalizing plats with the exact property impacts for review by an appraiser to determine the fair market value for the easements the County would need to acquire. He said that staff anticipates getting ready to begin the right-of-way acquisition process this summer and begin construction of the emergency access drive in spring 2023, with completion by the end of 2023.

Mr. Owsiak stated that before the emergency access drive can be opened to traffic, improvements to Windermere Drive would need to be completed as well as taking Windermere Drive into the state system to make it a public road. He said that because Windermere is a private road, it would need to be dedicated to public use and brought into the VDOT state system of highways before the general traffic can begin utilizing this as a detour route. He noted that VDOT has identified approximately $450K in improvements that would be required to Windermere Drive before traffic can utilize the road. He said that in conjunction with the emergency access drive, they have also been working to bring Windermere into the state system. He stated that the project for Windermere has reached the point of starting the right-of-way acquisition process with those impacted landowners this spring, and each landowner within the subdivision has an easement interest in the private road; the landowners that abut the road have a fee-simple ownership interest in the portion of the road that is on their property.

Mr. Owsiak commented that this makes it a unique ownership situation for Windermere Drive, where each landowner in the subdivision would have to accept the County's purchase offer. He said if any landowner disagrees with the purchase offer, the County would be able to use its imminent domain powers; however, the County would have to condemn property not only on the refuser's property but on any other landowner who has an interest in the easements and did not accept the original offer. He pointed out on a map provided that the existing Windermere Drive does not fall exactly within the middle of the easements that have already been dedicated by the owners, and he noted the areas outside of the dedicated easements that would have to be conveyed to the County and dedicated for public use to have VDOT accept Windermere into the state system. He noted that exact areas that would need to be dedicated would vary by individual property owner, and these range from 1.2 acres down to about 1/10 of an acre.

Mr. Owsiak stated that the last time staff communicated with the HOA in 2021, the majority of landowners were not in favor of the emergency access drive nor making Windermere a public roadway. He said that before staff proceeds with the right-of-way acquisition process on Windermere and for the emergency access road, they wanted to seek the Board's reaffirmation for support for these two projects before moving forward.

Mr. Owsiak said that for the reconstruction of Brooke Road, the S-curve experiences the most frequent flooding, and staff's environmental programs division has been working with one of their on-call engineers to perform a more complex hydrologic and hydraulic study. He said this was not only modeling of Brooke Road but also Accokeek Creek and the surrounding watersheds, to evaluate the causes and extent of the flooding along Brooke Road between Windermere and Poplar Drive, as well as evaluate potential mitigation options available to reduce flooding impacts and increase the road design level of service.

Mr. Owsiak stated that the model they have been working on will assess the impacts to the most flood-prone areas of Brooke Road from both current and future condition. He said that to better capture the impacts of upstream development in the adjacent Brooke Road and Accokeek watersheds, the model assesses runoff and flooding impacts from contributing watersheds under dense, forested conditions for baseline purposes. He emphasized that the report demonstrates that even under the original conditions, assuming there had been no development there whatsoever, there would still be flooding of Brooke Road. He said that further evaluation of the model results that the primary causes of flooding were due to the Accokeek floodplain effects, the lack of adequate drainage paths and ditches alongside the road, along with undersized culverts and topography of the area allowing nowhere for the water to flow.

Mr. Owsiak stated that according to the preliminary report, level of service for Brooke Road was less than a two-year storm event. He said that VDOT's minimum level of service for adequate drainage and safe passage on all public roads is a 10-year storm event; for those classified as minor arterial collectors, such as Brooke Road, the minimum standard is elevated now to a 25-year storm event—with some extra consideration for storm events above the minimum standards, assuming that the road was in a depression or had no overflow relief. He said that the preliminary review indicates that raising Brooke Road would need approximately five feet to meet VDOT requirements; however, according to their analysis, raising the road five feet would also allow the portion of Brooke Road to remain passable under hundred-year storm events. He stated that in conjunction with the hydraulic study, they have engaged with the same engineer through the County's transportation on-call contracts to provide a proposal for design services for the realignment and elevation where the flooding is most prevalent. He said that staff anticipates receiving and finalizing the agreement in March, then bringing it to the Board for award.

Mr. Owsiak reported that preliminary cost estimates for the raising and realignment of the S-curve are estimated at approximately $7.5 million, with the possibility of federal funding, and development and construction costs could increase slightly. He said the timeline for completion of this project is approximately five years, including design, right-of-way, utility relocations, and construction. He noted that environmental staff had recently submitted an application for a competitive Building Resilient Infrastructure in Communities (BRIC) grant, and they are seeking approximately $4.8 million through the Virginia Department of Emergency Management to fund the project.

Mr. Owsiak said that the third option was providing the connection between Courthouse Road and Brooke Crest Lane, and this option would have required construction of approximately 0.6 miles of new roadway through the middle of the existing Girl Scout camp. He said at a minimum, it would require additional trench widening of existing Courthouse Road, as well as almost the entire length of Brooke Crest Lane. He noted that these roads were not built to handle the kind of daily traffic Brooke Road sees and were just neighborhood roadways. He stated that the preliminary costs to extend the option from Courthouse down to Brooke Crest were estimated at almost $10 million, with a similar timeframe for realigning of the S-curve of about a five-year timeframe. He said that based on the costs, the Board decided not to pursue this option and to stick with the realignment of Brooke Road.

Mr. Owsiak stated that the staff engineer is working to finalize plans for property acquisition along Windermere Drive, and for the emergency access drive; if the Board still desires to proceed with the emergency access drive, staff anticipates presenting bona fide offers to property owners this spring and making bona fide offers to the owners that would be directly impacted by the access drive this summer. He said that County environmental staff would be conducting a further evaluation of the hydraulic model, analyzing for conceptual alternatives to mitigate the flooding for targeted storm events. He noted that staff is also scoping those alternatives with the engineer, which may include options for elevation of the road, realignment away from Accokeek Creek and additional culvert replacements with possible upgrades for backflow prevents to stop water from flowing from the creek back up into the culverts and into the roadway.

Mr. Owsiak stated that County transportation staff has been working with one of their on-call engineers to finalize a scope and fee proposal to begin design work on the raising and realignment of the S-curve. He reiterated that staff anticipates bringing this proposal to the Board in March for approval to begin the project.

Mr. Owsiak stated that to keep the community informed on the progress regarding Brooke Road, both VDOT and County community engagement staff have created a website for Brooke Road for information and updates. He said the address for the direct link was so long it wouldn't fit on the page, so it's easiest to access it from the main Stafford County website and do a search. He said that before staff proceeds with finalizing the plats and begins the engagement with property owners regarding Windermere Drive and the emergency access road, staff is seeking the Board's reaffirmation of support for these two projects—with the understanding that the majority of owners along Windermere are not in favor of the project, and the use of the County's imminent domain powers may be necessary to acquire the right-of-way and easements needed for the projects.

Ms. Gary stated that there had been mention of forgoing the emergency access road and rolling those funds into the full six, which is not an option because that money is designated for the access road as reimbursement from VDOT. She said that she has been engaging with the community and homeowners and would be holding some meetings to speak with them before the meeting to vote on this, and she would take that input seriously to ensure she hears from everyone who wants to provide input. She stated that she was concerned that the construction wouldn't start until the following year, but there wasn't a lot they could do about that.

Ms. Gary asked staff if it was possible to do a temporary taking for the property where the emergency access road would be built, as that would give people a lot of peace. Ms. Gary noted there was concern that the other fix wouldn't get done.

Mr. Owsiak responded that staff is pursuing both options concurrently: the emergency access drive and a permanent fix to Brooke Road. He said there has been discussion about this being a permanent detour instead of just when Brooke Road was closed, but the County's intention is to make it a temporary roadway, with the access gates there to control access only when Brooke Road is closed. He said that the property acquisition for the emergency access drive would be within an easement rather than a permanent right-of-way.

Mr. English asked if all the traffic would go over to the emergency access when they start doing construction on the road.

Mr. Owsiak responded that where existing Brooke Road is now to raise and realign the road, they would be pushing the road further up into the slope from where it is now, and as they are constructing portions of the new raised road, they would be utilizing the existing road for traffic control.

Ms. Gary mentioned that people were already traversing the emergency access road by foot and were parking at the end of Windermere and traversing by foot to the other side to get through—so there was already some traffic through there, as the roads will sustain for parking.

Ms. Allen asked if the road would remain in the secondary road system once this was turned into the secondary road system for VDOT and the temporary status gets removed.

Mr. Owsiak confirmed that his understanding was once it was converted and brought into VDOT's state system, it would remain a public road.

Ms. Allen asked if this pushed the timetable out further from six months; for example, if someone wanted to fight this even if the County claimed imminent domain. She also asked when construction for the emergency road could begin.

Mr. Owsiak responded that it would be up to the Board whether to pursue that condemnation or not, and how long they waited to pursue that. He said that usually by law, for the Uniform Act, they had to provide at least 30 days for everyone to consider the offer before they could consider condemnation proceedings. He said that they have built that time into the window, which is why they were targeting a spring 2023 date to start construction; a lot of it would depend on how quickly the right-of-way process went.

Ms. Allen asked if they could take the County to court to sort that out and seek relief.

Mr. Owsiak responded that they can, but once the County files condemnation, it gives the County immediate access to start working on the emergency access drive while they work out the details.

Ms. Allen asked what the FEMA maps looked like in terms of impact, and whether elevating it to five feet was sufficient, or if they would make them have to come back in a few years when that road floods out.

Mr. Owsiak stated that it's a modeling, so nothing is ever 100% definite, but based on the results of this analysis, raising the road five feet would more than meet VDOT requirements and actually make the road passable under a 100-year storm. He said that he couldn't say the road would never flood again, but it would drastically reduce the likelihood of that occurrence. He stated that as part of that and looking back at the modeling, the environmental team is looking closely at raising the road in this section to ensure that it doesn't have adverse impacts on other areas of Brooke Road. He added that they are double-checking to make sure that would not be the case.

Ms. Allen asked if there were a timeframe for that aspect, because there may be financial implications for the Board to consider.

Mr. Owsiak said that he would have to circle back with John Saunders in the environmental division to get a better idea for timeframe and the initial analysis.

Ms. Yeung asked him to briefly repeat the three options.

Mr. Owsiak stated that they were the emergency access drive between Windermere and Crestwood, the raising and realignment of the S-curve to fix the problem in place, and to create a connector route between Courthouse Road and Brooke Crest Lane.

Ms. Yeung asked how much they had spent over the years for immediate fixes on this road.

Mr. Owsiak responded that the County had not expended any money towards these fixes, as VDOT has been responsible for maintaining Brooke Road and has spent about $500K in maintenance for the road, to his understanding.

Ms. Yeung asked about the timeframe for the current solution(s), and if "temporary" meant only when Brooke was closed versus when Brooke Road is raised five feet.

Mr. Owsiak said that once they constructed the emergency access drive, the thought is for it to only be used when Brooke Road is closed to traffic and flooded. He stated that once they have completed the project and raised Brooke Road to its current state, there won't be any need to use the temporary detour route, the emergency access drive between Windermere and Crest Wood, because the road would be raised and there shouldn't be any flooding now. He said only if there was a major accident or trees had fallen where the road had to be closed to traffic or vehicles couldn't pass, the County would then look to open the access road. He said that once the permanent solution is in place, they could go back and reevaluate whether they need to keep the access road in place or dissolve it.

Ms. Yeung commented that it didn't seem right to ask homeowners to give up their land only temporarily, and if they were going to do it, they should maintain the road as an access road.

Mr. Owsiak explained that the main homeowner who would be impacted by the emergency access drive, Mr. Bill Hoyt, has been supportive of the project.

Ms. Allen said that she would like to know the financial impacts of issues downstream from the S-curve before this comes back.

Mr. Owsiak stated that the report was still preliminary and was still under review, but some of the reports he has seen and discussed with Mr. Saunders seem to indicate that there are other problems on Brooke Road—so this particular project would fix the flooding issue at the S-curve on Brooke Road, but he can't say that it would prevent flooding on any other portion of the road. He said that as they have seen from their graphs and modeling, there are other portions of Brooke Road that become inundated with water under those conditions.

Ms. Gary said that she had spoken with Kyle Bates about Brooke Road, and it may help Ms. Allen and others to speak to him as well, as he was able to articulate that it wouldn't cause additional issues.

<u>Item 23. Appropriation of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Grant Funds for Duff Green House Repairs and Expenditures.</u>

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen to deem this item time-sensitive.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	

Ms. Bohmke stated that for the record the public needs to know the reason they were deeming this time-sensitive so they can move forward with it because they want to get the facility operating, and this moves us along that much sooner.

Deputy County Administrator Mike Morris said they have artifacts from the Smithsonian Institute, and to get those in time to do that, the road would be done by June and hopefully have all of that in place before the grand opening.

Ms. Yeung asked what the house was.

Mr. Morris said the house was donated by Duff Green and his family in 2010, and he had lived there most of his life; the property was built around 1930, and he donated the 126-acre farm to the County to be a park. He stated that the County has leased 17 acres and the house to the tribe to create a museum and what they are calling a living history village.

Ms. Yeung commented that this is a tangible reason for ARPA funds.

Mr. Coen noted that the reason for this is because of the storm that came through and damaged the roof, so rather than replace it with expensive slate, they were replacing it with tiles to get this moving faster. He thanked Mr. Morris and staff for all the work they have done, and stated the tribe has been very appreciative to the County.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen to approve proposed Resolution R22-51.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	

Resolution R22-51 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION APPROPRIATING AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) GRANT FUNDS FOR DUFF GREEN HOUSE REPAIRS AND EXPENDITURES

WHEREAS, on March 11, 2021, the Federal Government approved the American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA) and provided ARPA grant funds to support localities recovering from the COVID-19 public health pandemic; and

WHEREAS, in May 2021, the first tranche of two was received by the County in the amount of $14,847,768; and

WHEREAS, the Board has previously appropriated the following ARPA grant funds:

Resolution	Grant Amount	Purpose
R21-194	$80,208	Consulting services needed to administer the grant funding in FY2021
R21-231	$300,000	United Way to provide rent and mortgage assistance to Stafford County residents impacted by COVID-19
R21-262	$1,650,000	Extension of a gravity sewer line in the area of Cedar Lane
R21-265	$450,000	Installation of an access road at Old Duff House
R21-263	$3,000,000	County-wide telecommunications fiber and VITA match
R21-289	$100,000	Staff salaries for grant administration
R21-288	$142,935	Rehiring furloughed employees
R21-352	$41,616	Sheriff iPads and protective cases/keyboards
O21-47	$1,632,513	Loss Revenue Replacement used for Bonuses (actual amount used $1,475,780)
R21-390	$1,322,572	Sheriff: In-car cameras, pay differential, fueling project, camera trailer, message board Community Engagement: Citizen request management system County Admin and Finance: Grants Coordinator and Grants Accountant positions

; and

WHEREAS, in August 2019, the County leased the Duff Green House and 17 acres surrounding the house to the Patawomeck Indian Tribe (Tribe) to establish an educational museum and cultural center to educate citizens and visitors on the history of the Tribe within the County; and

WHEREAS, the lease agreement requires the Tribe to be responsible for all repairs and maintenance to the Duff Green House and surrounding property; and

WHEREAS, the original roof on the Duff Green House is leaking, and as determined by the Tribe's property insurance carrier, is beyond its useful life; and

WHEREAS, staff estimates that the cost to replace the roof, including construction contingency, is not anticipated to exceed $60,000; and

WHEREAS, these costs are beyond the current means of the Tribe to absorb, and the Tribe requested assistance from the County to replace the slate roof; and

WHEREAS, replacing the roof would aid in and advance tourism and travel to the County; and

WHEREAS, ARPA funds are available and may be used to speed the recovery of the tourism, travel, and hospitality sectors in the County;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the day of , 2022, that American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) grant funds be and they hereby are appropriated as follows:

Fund	Department	Purpose	Amount
ARPA Grant Fund	Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities	Duff Green House Roof Repairs	$60,000
		TOTAL ARPA Grant Fund Appropriation	**$60,000**

<u>Item 24. Planning and Zoning; Consider Granting a Time Limit Extension Request for Reclassification Application RC16151330 (Project Known as Willow Run).</u>

Mr. Harvey reported that the Willow Run application was originally scheduled for public hearing tonight but was postponed due to several current circumstances. He stated that the School Board has filed an application with the County to apply for a comprehensive plan compliance review to purchase a portion of the property that the applicant owns behind the property that is subject to rezoning. He said that property requires access across part of the property subject to the rezoning, so the applicant is requesting a postponement of the application until September 30. He stated that the current time limit for this application expires at the end of the month, so staff would ask that the Board consider this a time-sensitive matter and consider granting the time extension for consideration of the rezoning application.

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke to deem this item time-sensitive.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Ms. Vanuch noted that Ms. Allen had left the meeting room momentarily.

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke to approve proposed Resolution R22-55, the time extension for Willow Run

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(0)	

Absent: (1) Allen

Resolution R22-55 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION GRANTING A TIME EXTENSION REQUEST FOR A RECLASSIFICATION APPLICATION PURSUANT TO STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 28-162, "REVIEW AND REQUIREMENTS"

WHEREAS, on June 2, 2020, the Board adopted Ordinance O20-13, which established time limits for pending zoning reclassification applications; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County Code Secs. 28-162(h) specifies that any zoning reclassification application still pending more than eighteen (18) months from the date such application was filed shall be administratively closed by staff due to inactivity, but an applicant may request a time extension in writing prior to such deadline, which request must contain a definitive time for moving forward with or withdrawing the application, and the extension request may be granted by the Board; and

WHEREAS, an extension request was received for the following Application, the deadline for which is currently February 28, 2022:

Project Name	Application	Tax Map Parcel No(s).	Election District
Willow Run	RC16151330	36-29, 36-37A, 44-61 (portion) and 44-61A (portion)	Hartwood

; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that a time limit extension for the Application, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-162(h), is appropriate;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the day of , 2022, that time limit extension request, pursuant to County Code Sec. 28-162(h), be and it hereby is granted as follows:

Project Name	Application	Time Limit Extend To
Willow Run	RC16151330	September 30, 2022

Item 25. Add-on; Discuss Joining the Virginia Coalition of High Growth Coalition.

Ms. Bohmke stated that the High-Growth Coalition is comprised of counties that are in the "crescent," which starts in Arlington and includes all of those that parallel I-95. She said that Stafford used to be part of this coalition and was one of the founding members, and she recently received an email from Dave Bailey, who is instrumental in this group. She said that she asked if

Stafford could rejoin and what the cost was, which is based on population and for Stafford would be $4,000. She said that if the Board were interested, they could bring it back to the March meeting for new information, then action at the next meeting.

Ms. Bohmke explained that the biggest thing the coalition had done over the years was getting very involved in legislation to fight the homebuilders. She said it was basically Arlington County, Prince William, Fairfax, and James City County—and she felt it would be worth their while to rejoin, and the coalition was looking to have a meeting this summer to discuss some legislative issues that impact areas of high growth.

Ms. Yeung asked if the purpose of the organization was to fight homebuilders, as Ms. Bohmke had stated.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that it was to fight any legislation the Homebuilders Association was trying to get through Richmond that localities did not agree with, and she restated that for the record. She said that they could do a background report with what they've done over the years, and Stafford could likely participate in the Zoom call happening this Friday.

Ms. Yeung asked if Stafford would be grandfathered in and be in the position they were in before.

Ms. Bohmke responded that she didn't really know, and they would still have to pay the fee—but there aren't any other additional fees throughout the years.

Ms. Yeung said that she would like a list of what they do.

Ms. Allen agreed that it would be helpful to have more information, and she would love to know more about their initiatives related to legislation that affects homebuilders.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that the item could be added back to the agenda with more information at the next meeting under Unfinished Business, noting that the homebuilders have a strong lobby in Richmond, and often the counties find out after the legislation is filed. She said when the cluster ordinance happened in Stafford County, that impacted them significantly and seemed to be done specifically to damage the county—and legislation sometimes restricts them from stopping by-right subdivisions that may be harmful to the community.

CLOSED MEETING

At 8:33 p.m., Ms. Yeung motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt proposed Resolution CM22-08 to authorize closed session.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No:	(0)	

Resolution CM22-08 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) consultation with legal counsel pertaining to *Stafford v. Centrum-Stafford Limited Partnership*, where such consultation or briefings in open meeting would adversely affect the litigating posture of the Board; (2) discussion concerning a prospective business or industry where no previous announcement has been made of the business' interest in locating its facilities in the County; and (3) discussion and consideration of the acquisition of property for a high school, which is a public purpose, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position and negotiating strategy of the Board; 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 15th day of February, 2022, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

CLOSED MEETING CERTIFICATION

At 9:29 p.m., Ms. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to adopt proposed Resolution CM22-08(C) to certify the closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No:	(0)	

Resolution CM22-08(c) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON FEBRUARY 15, 2022

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 15th day of February, 2022, 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 15th day of February, 2022, 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 Board.

CLOSED MEETING AFTER ACTION

Ms. Yeung motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt proposed Resolution R22-60, authorizing the County Administrator to execute any and all documents that serve to settle Stafford County Board of Supervisors v. Centrum Stafford Limited Partnership, case number CL20-4371.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No:	(0)	

Resolution R22-60 reads as follows:

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. CENTRUM-STAFFORD LIMITED PARTNERSHIP,* CASE NO. CL20-4371

WHEREAS, the Board and Centrum-Stafford Limited Partnership, a Virginia limited partnership, are parties to the condemnation case, *Stafford County Board of Supervisors v. Centrum-Stafford Limited Partnership,* Case No. CL20-4371; 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 15th day of February, 2022, 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. Centrum-Stafford Limited Partnership,* Case No. CL20-4371, under the terms and conditions discussed in closed session.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:30 p.m., Chairman Vanuch adjourned the February 15, 2022 Stafford County Board of Supervisors meeting.

Frederick J. Presley
County Administrator

Crystal L. Vanuch
Chairman