BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 1, 2022

CALL TO ORDER – A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Crystal Vanuch, Chairman, at 3:01 p.m. on Tuesday, November 1, 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 (arrived at 3:12 p.m.); Meg Bohmke; Thomas C. Coen; Darrell English; Monica Gary.

The following members were absent: Tinesha O. Allen.

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

CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Ms. Vanuch extended her deepest condolences on behalf of the Board and County staff to the family and friends of C.M. Williams, Jr. She stated that Mr. Williams served as the County Administrator from 1984 to 2003. She said that he led the County through a major period of growth while ensuring the County preserved its historic resources at Ferry Farm and Government Island.

Ms. Vanuch said that Mr. Williams was a major force behind the construction of the George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center. She said that prior to the construction, County offices were in the Rowser Building. She said Mr. Williams was known for his ability to work effectively with the 20 different Board members he served over his 19-year career at Stafford County. She said that Mr. William's service was appreciated.

Ms. Vanuch announced that in regard to Crow's Nest, she and Ms. Gary had dedicated the addition of 58 acres, the Accokeek Bottomlands, to the Natural Preserve of Crow's Nest. She thanked, on behalf of the Board and the County, the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust, the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, the Virginia Land Conservation Foundation, the Conservation Fund, and the Bowling Family.

Ms. Vanuch said that the additional land would make the Crow's Nest Natural Preserve larger than 3,000 acres. She stated that the land was not to be disturbed by residential or commercial development. She encouraged people to visit the preserve.

Ms. Vanuch announced the plans for the Christmas Tree lighting. She stated that on December 2, from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m., there would be a Christmas market, food, and fun. She encouraged people to bring their families to the event.

Ms. Vanuch announced the Veterans Day Ceremony would be held at the Armed Services Memorial, on Thursday, November 10, at 10:00 a.m. She said Sergeant Major Jacquelin Townsel would be the keynote speaker for the ceremony. She said Ms. Townsel was the Sergeant Major for Security Battalion Marine Corps Base Quantico. She stated they would also be celebrating the Marine Corps birthday with carnations for attendees to lay at the memorial.

PRESENTATIONS

There were no presentations.

ADDITIONS - DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

Mr. Vosburg stated that there was a deletion of Item 8 on the Consent Agenda, related to the Falmouth Volunteer Station. He said the item would come back before the Board on November 15.

Mr. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to approve the Agenda with the deletion of Item 8 from the Consent Agenda.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC - I (3 MINUTES EACH)

Ms. Vanuch read the protocol for public presentations.

1. Ms. Shannon Fingerholz said she lived in the Hartwood district. She thanked the Board for attending the 7-on-7 and listening to the School Board. She said at the October 18 meeting, it was mentioned that Stafford Schools were the best in the region. She said that statement was true, and it was important to keep it true.

   Ms. Fingerholz said that the overcrowding in the schools would impact the quality of the schools. She said the overcrowding would impact emergency response times, making them slower. She said traffic in the hallways made it difficult for emergency responders to respond. She commented that evacuations became more challenging. She stated that there was a more assaultive opportunity from adults and students because of overcrowded hallways. She said the overcrowding caused more wear and tear on the buildings, shortening the lifespan of the materials, equipment, and infrastructure.

Ms. Fingerholz stated that the overcrowding caused there to be less time for learning which in turn caused more discipline issues. She said overcrowding allowed less time for teachers to notice the children left behind or those likely to do harm—to themselves or others. She said the threat of school shootings was real, and they were happening more than they would prefer.

Ms. Fingerholz stated that the overcrowded schools would impact test scores, teacher retention, and safety. She said the County should strive to have the best schools in the state.

2. Mr. Andrew Brennan said he lived at 25 Bismark Drive. He said he owned a business affiliated with the Amazon Delivery Center. He said the center employed about 450 warehouse employees in the building during the holiday season. He said he and nine other owners owned delivery companies, and each employed between 70 to 100 employees. He stated that the businesses brought a sizable amount of tax revenue to the County. He noted that the tax burden would be deferred for a period of time for Amazon.

   Mr. Brennan said he would speak on the issue of Shank's Towing. He noted that there was a Towing Commissioner for the County. He said that an employee of his, on her second day of work, had her vehicle towed. He explained that the towing company called the vehicle into the police because the vehicle had been sitting on the curb for six minutes. He said he had a digital footprint of the GPS tracker in the vehicle and that it was never stopped in any place for more than six minutes.

   Mr. Brennan explained that Shank's Towing called the vehicle into the police and followed it around the neighborhood waiting for it to stop so they could tow it. He stated that when he picked up the vehicle from the impound, the hazard lights were still flashing. He said that the vehicle was predatorily poached by the towing company. He noted that the towing company had a poor reputation on review sites such as Yelp.

   Mr. Brennan said that he had moved legislation through Congress at the federal level, and he had been a registered lobbyist in California. He said that the towing company should not have a license to do its business. He said he requested the Board to take three actions. He noted that the business was located at 500 Musselman Road. He said the Board should reach out to the business owner directly, Chris Shanks, and request clarification regarding the incident.

Mr. Brennan said he was not concerned about the cost of the impounding. He said the Board should consider passing some sort of amendment to the regulation allowing towing companies to tow vehicles once a phone call was made to the police. He said the towing business should not have a license to tow delivery vehicles. He requested that the Board notify the Towing Commissioner, as well.

3. Mr. Cliff Heinzer said he lived in the Aquia district. He said he would speak on the item of Downtown Stafford. He said the County was facing the challenge of building consensus as to what the downtown should be. He said some people saw opportunities to expand affordable housing, host a key venue, or build a transportation hub.

   Mr. Heinzer said it was a challenge for the Board to build consensus as to what Stafford's downtown should be in the future. He said there was space for Stafford to create something new, different, and special. He said many young people believed the most fun place in the County was Fredericksburg.

4. Ms. Dorothy Jackson said she was a lifelong resident of the County. She said she owned a piece of land on Old Fort Lane next to the Fort. She said the Board had heard her request to stop her from receiving an annual letter about what she could do for her home. She stated that her house did not sit on the piece of land she had purchased. She said the Fort had been in her family from 1904 through 1984. She said her uncle owned the land and died in 1947. She explained her uncle left the land to her sister.

   Ms. Jackson said they lived at the Fort in a four-room house from 1951 through 1963. She continued that they bought a piece of land next to the Fort and built a house on it. She said in 1984, her sister sold the land she owned, and a man named Brockman bought the land. She continued that Mr. Brockman partnered with Tom Mounts, and Mr. Mounts made the land into a historical landmark. She stated the land was in the Virginia Registry.

   Ms. Jackson explained that Mr. Brockman approached her family and said the piece of land adjoining their property seemed to belong to their parcel, so he encouraged them to purchase it. She said her family did purchase the additional land—not quite an acre. She said that over the years, the trees and shrubbery had become overgrown, and her house could not be seen from the rest of the Fort.

   Ms. Jackson said that after they received a letter last year, they decided to request the Board to remove their piece of land from the historical registry. She explained their house was not located on the piece of land which was on the historical registry. She stated she was 90 years old and her husband was 94 years old. She thanked the Board for hearing her request.

Ms. Vanuch clarified for the Board that Ms. Jackson was referring to Item 10 on the Consent Agenda.

5. Ms. Alane Callendar said she had worked for C.M. Williams at the County. She said Mr. Williams was a strong leader and a supporter of historic preservation. She said she lived at 622 Lancaster Street. She stated that there was an item added to the legislative agenda about protecting environmentally sensitive areas.

   Ms. Callendar said the topic of the protection of trees was a sensitive one for her. She noted that the land was stripped at the Courthouse Interchange and along U.S. Route 1. She said they could have done better to buffer the landscaped communities. She stated that there was a lot of degradation of the natural environment over the years.

   Ms. Callendar said in regard to Downtown Stafford, townhall meetings should be held with the public. She noted that the public had been left out during the pandemic. She said she believed in tree cover, wide and natural buffers, and open space.

   Ms. Callendar said she believed there was a need for Downtown Stafford. She said she was supportive of tall buildings and apartments to serve the employees who worked in the downtown area and the nearby warehouses. She said they needed to be set up for walking, biking, or bus transportation.

   Ms. Callendar said the Board should not let developers strip the land without completing construction. She said barren land eroded during storms and left the impression of plans gone bad.

6. Mr. Daniel Cortez said he lived at 19 Hidden Springs Lane in the Aquia district. He said there was an article in the *Richmond Times Dispatch* titled, "Latinos for Youngkin Official Raises Vega Integrity Concerns." He said the article discussed candidate Yesli Vega misrepresenting herself, stating that she served on the President's advisory commission for Hispanic prosperity. He stated that he was also included in the article.

   Mr. Cortez said he, along with 17 other Hispanic leaders across the country, served on the commission formed by former President Trump in 2020. He said that when nominated, the White House released a statement saying, as in his case, that, "The President intends to nominate Daniel P. Cortez to serve on the President's advisory commission on Hispanic prosperity." He explained that nominees were then vetted.

Mr. Cortez said that the last commission meeting before the election occurred on October 28, 2020 in Miami. He said an announcement for Ms. Vega's nomination came in December after that meeting, but there were no other meetings to follow. He explained that to be sworn and seated, a nominee must pass intensive vetting by the FBI, State Police, Secret Service, and the CIA to resolve any alleged character issues. He said he and the other commissioners were thoroughly vetted and sworn in prior to the first meeting. He continued that Ms. Vega called him several times after December 2020 asking when she would be sworn in.

Mr. Cortez stated that he informed Ms. Vega that she had to pass a vetting before any action was taken. He said he informed her that other commissioners questioned her Twitter posts stating she was a Trump presidential appointee during the primary when no member of the commission noted that notification that she passed vetting or had been sworn in. He said he informed Ms. Vega that he would help correct the record if she would provide proof.

Mr. Cortez stated that he wrote an Op-ed in *The Freelance Star* calling out Ms. Vega on integrity and other issues. He said that to date, she nor any member of her campaign had contested his claims to provide proof to the contrary. He said the issue during the election related to integrity, and experience must count. He said bipartisan experience mattered. He said they should not vote for a candidate who would say anything and do anything to get elected. He said that integrity mattered, even for Republicans.

Mr. Cortez expressed his condolences to the family of C.M. Williams, Jr.

<u>REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS</u>

<u>Ms. Yeung</u> – reported that she met with Milestone, the County, Mr. Vosburg, and AT&T. She explained AT&T wanted to rent a water tank in Garrisonville. She said she held a Zoom call and gathered information to compare what was done in Fairfax.

Ms. Yeung said that they worked with the Sheriff's Office to slow down traffic on Northampton Boulevard. She requested drivers to slow down because there was an elementary school in the vicinity. She noted that a young student was hit while riding a bicycle.

Ms. Yeung reported that on October 20, she attended the Office of Youth meeting and discussed the budget needs. She said there was a follow-up meeting on October 27, attended by the County administration staff, to finish the budget discussions and vote.

Ms. Yeung stated that the Board needed to continue to revise its strategic plan and consider what it wanted the County to look like. She noted that constituents wanted a livable space with trails, parks, and restaurants. She said she continued to meet with experts regarding affordable housing in Garrisonville. She said it was important that there was affordable housing for the teachers, public safety employees, and young people.

Ms. Bohmke – expressed her condolences to the family of C.M. Williams, Jr., stating that he served from 1984 to 2003. She said in 1984, the population of the County was 46,000. She said that she had worked with the family because they lived in her district.

Ms. Bohmke reported that she attended the annual prayer breakfast held at the Expo Center. She said former speaker Bill Howell and the County Sheriff were Prayer Warriors. She recounted a story about Mark and Ginger Whitaker. She explained that in the early 2000s, Mr. Whitaker worked for a company called ADM and lived an elite lifestyle full of international travel.

Ms. Bohmke explained Mr. Whitaker had been involved in a price-fixing scheme, and his wife had turned him in. She said that Ms. Whitaker blamed Mr. Whitaker for the increase in the price of groceries. She said it was the biggest price-fixing in U.S. history and changed how things were done throughout the world. She said the event involved lysine—a protein added to a lot of products.

Ms. Bohmke explained Mr. Whitaker was now part of a Christian men's group. She said he had served eight years in prison. She said there was a movie about the incident called "The Informant" or "The Undercover." She noted that he was only 32 at the time, and many of the senior executives were in their 70s and 80s.

Ms. Bohmke said that Mr. Whitaker gave his life to the Lord and that was the focus of the prayer breakfast. She said that material possessions did not make you happy and there was more than that.

Mr. Coen – extended his condolences to the Williams family. He congratulated Hannah Cranford, the general manager of McDonald's in Chatham, who earned her Business Administration associates degree through a program with McDonald's. He noted that the cooperation between corporations and their employees to make their lives better.

Mr. Coen reported that the Department of Social Services was preparing for its annual holiday program. He said community members could help by donating non-perishable foods and unwrapped new gifts for children of various ages. He said details could be found on the County website, or Erin Riley was the point of contact in the County. He said DSS was accepting non-perishable baskets, bags, and gift cards at the Regester Chapel UMC Youth Center on November 21.

Mr. English extended his condolences to the Williams family. He said the County flag would be taken down on Friday evening and presented to C.M. Williams, Jr.'s widow on Saturday at his funeral service.

Mr. English reported that Kelley Chapman Starks and Courtney Sikes worked in utilities and aided him in an incident with one of their customers.

Mr. English reported that there would be a telecommunications meeting on November 10 at 7 p.m. in the Board chambers. He said Comcast representatives would be present. He encouraged people to attend if there were questions related to the VATI grant or the cable service to Hartwood because Comcast would be able to address those questions.

Mr. English said he was receiving calls regarding Musselman Park. He said the County needed to address the issue sooner rather than later. He suggested a meeting be held in the next 30 days to provide an update on Musselman Park.

Mr. English reported that a couple of weeks ago, a convoy of charter buses appeared at different schools. He said there was an average of 20 charter buses. He said he investigated the buses and discovered SCPS hired 20 charter buses to take the senior high school students to the Expo Center for a job fair. He said $38K was spent to rent the buses.

Mr. English said the buses went one way, and the students returned on the regular school buses. He said it was an unacceptable amount to spend and there needed to be further investigation. He said the job fair could have been held at a location in the County. He said he was still in support of Hartwood Elementary and wanted it to be the second school built.

Ms. Gary – reported that on October 21, she was not well enough to attend the regular VRE Operations Board meeting, but she was able to listen via a virtual Zoom meeting. She said there were no votes directly relevant to the County. She reported that on October 24, she and Ms. Bohmke toured the Arbors at Culpeper. She noted that it appeared to be a well-run senior living development as they explored bringing similar development to the County.

Ms. Gary reported that on October 26, she held a townhall focused on obtaining feedback on the repairs to the 'S' curve. She said at the meeting, she provided updates as to the various items she was working on. She reported her next townhall would be held on November 17 in the Activities Room in the County building. She said she would send out a notification for the meeting and post an update to her Facebook page. She said her Facebook page was discoverable by searching @MGaryForthePeople.

Ms. Gary reported that she attended the prayer breakfast hosted by the Christian Businessmen's Connection. She said Ms. Bohmke provided an excellent description of the event. She said she and her husband participated in a road cleanup organized by #Enough. She noted that Supervisor Allen was instrumental in organizing the cleanup. She said a sign was installed due to two years of commitment from #Enough to keeping the community clean.

Ms. Gary reported that the November Community and Economic Development Committee (CEDC) meeting was held earlier that day. She said the information from the meeting would be available on the November 15 agenda.

Ms. Gary reported that 59 acres had been added to the Crow's Nest Natural Preserve. She said more details about the addition and the people and organizations involved could be found on the DCR website, the County website, and on her Facebook page.

Ms. Gary stated that they were still collecting donations with SERVE. She said there was a video with more information that was posted on the County's website. She said she would pin the video to the top of her Facebook page.

Ms. Vanuch deferred her comments.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY

Ms. McClendon stated she had no report.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Vosburg said there would be a short presentation from Ms. Anna Hash, County Registrar.

Ms. Hash noted that there was an additional backlog at the DMV and voter registration applications did not make it through the DMV and Department of Elections to the County. She said they were working through the backlog, and every one of the applications would be processed by Saturday in time for people to be registered in time to vote. She said there was a backlog of about 1,200.

Elections Update

Ms. Hash reported that they had begun to receive phone calls from voters who had received text messages from third-party organizations. She said the messages intended to get people to vote early and the listed polling location was the Government Center. She informed the voters that they did not vote at the Government Center on Election Day, but rather voted at their polling locations.

She said that only early voting took place at the Government Center, and Saturday was the final day for early voting.

Ms. Hash reported that the contracted company admitted to the mistake. She said it happened in five states, and Virginia was one of the states affected. She said early voting was available through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and Saturday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. at the Government Center. She said voters were to vote at their polling locations on Election Day. She said voters could contact the Registrar's Office if they did not know their polling location, or they could go to <elections.virginia.gov/citizenportal> and check their voter registration information.

Ms. Yeung asked how individuals would be informed that they were able to register.

Ms. Hash clarified that the voters had already registered. She said there was an issue between May and September with data getting back to the Registrar's Office. She said they found out Saturday evening that there were additional applications that did not come through to the Registrars. She explained they were able to begin processing those applications.

Ms. Hash explained that if applicants went to the DMV, they may or may not have been notified that they had been registered. She said if voters had not been notified, they may have the application. She noted that many people registered via an alternative method. She said people could check their registration status online through the citizen portal on the Department of Elections website.

Ms. Hash said if voters do not see their registration or needed to make a change, then they should call the Registrar's Office. She noted that same-day registration was available and could be an option for voters whose registration had not been processed. She explained voters could register at their polling location on Election Day and vote with a provisional ballot.

Ms. Yeung stated that there were people who registered to vote and were waiting for notification. She asked if the County was reaching out to those people to notify them of their voter status.

Ms. Hash explained that they were not reaching out to the 1,200 applicants in the backlog. She noted that many did not have a way to get in contact.

Ms. Yeung stated that some voters had been informed.

Ms. Hash explained that those voters received a card in the mail, they called and the County did not have the information, they went to vote early and discovered they were not registered, or they updated their registration another way. She explained the County did not have a mechanism to notify all 1,200 applicants. She urged voters to check their registration if they registered through the DMV.

Ms. Yeung asked if the County performed any other outreach if voter registration cards were returned undeliverable.

Ms. Hash said there was a process to try to reach the individuals through the state, but the County had no mechanism to contact the 1,200 applicants. She said their primary focus was to get the applicants registered so that they can vote. She encouraged people who had not received a card or registered through the DMV to check their status online or contact the Registrar's Office.

Ms. Yeung asked if that information was available on the County website.

Ms. Hash said there was information on the website about how to check voter registration information.

Mr. English asked if the County could post a notice to the website encouraging voters to check their status with the Registrar's Office.

Ms. Hash responded that they could post a notice.

Christmas Tree Lighting Event Update

Mr. Vosburg reported that the Christmas tree lighting event was scheduled for December 2 from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. He said there was a website for the event: staffordcountytreelighting.com. He said he was unable to attend the prior year's event, but he noted that there were more than 500 people in attendance. He said the goal for the upcoming event was to make it larger. He noted that several planning meetings were held with Parks and Recreation staff. He invited Deputy County Administrator Mike Morris to provide more details on the event.

Mr. Morris said the event would be held Friday, December 2 at 6 p.m. He said there would be time before 6 p.m. for a special function for the County employees, board members, and commission members. He said the event would be held in the parking lot, additional parking would be available at Courthouse Community Center, and there would be a shuttle to transport people as needed.

Mr. Morris said they would be bringing a tree, and they would have to purchase the tree. He noted that the tree would be transported, installed, and lit. He said that other festivities included carriage rides, gingerbread house contests, children's activities, music from local school choirs and church choirs, a visit from Santa Claus, food vendors, craft vendors, and a beer and wine tent.

Mr. English asked how much would the event cost to host.

Mr. Morris responded the cost was approximately $76K.

Mr. English asked how much the tree cost.

Mr. Morris said he believed the tree cost about $34K.

Mr. English asked why they were not using the Christmas tree already installed. He asked why they were spending $34K on a Christmas tree when there was already one.

Mr. Morris responded that they were purchasing the tree because the event was being moved to the side of the building. He said if the Board preferred the other tree be used, then it could be done.

Mr. English asked if the current tree had been lit every year prior.

Mr. Morris responded that last year was the first year that it was lit.

Mr. English said that the tree had been lit before. He said he did not support the item if they were to spend that much money on the tree. He noted that they were likely to light the original tree as well.

Mr. Vosburg said in the current plan, the current tree would not be lit.

Mr. English said he had an issue with the beer and wine tent. He said they should not have wine and beer at a family event. He asked if the County could be liable if an attendee left the event and had an accident.

Ms. McClendon said they could look into the questions from Mr. English. She said the topic was more appropriate for a closed session.

Ms. Vanuch asked if there were other County events where beer was sold.

Mr. Morris responded the County hosted two events a year that included alcohol, but they were not open to the public—the County picnic and the Board and Commission event.

Mr. English asked if the vendors would be charged a fee or if they would be able to sell their goods directly.

Mr. Morris responded that vendors would be able to sell their goods directly to the attendees.

Mr. English asked if there were sponsors for the event.

Mr. Morris responded that there were no sponsors to date.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that they had not tried to get any sponsors because the Board had to be informed. She noted that staff had only come up with the information over the past couple of weeks so that the Board could be briefed on the event. She said none of the websites had gone live and there had been no public announcement because they wanted to brief the Board first before seeking sponsors, including sponsors for the tree. She said the EDA had developed a list of people who typically sponsored events. She said they would be able to receive at least $35K in sponsorships to offset the costs.

Mr. English asked why the planning was last minute and why it was not addressed over the summer. He said the event was a good idea because County residents needed an annual event to attend, but he had issues with the cost.

Mr. Vosburg said moving forward, staff intended to include an item in the budget that could be fully vetted for a monetary allocation for events.

Mr. English noted that Fredericksburg had a Christmas parade, and the County needed its own event.

Ms. Gary mentioned that she had issues with alcohol at the event. She said she had asked interested parties if they would want to sponsor the event and noted that there was interest. She said she was confident the County would be able to get sponsors.

Ms. Bohmke said she was excited about the event. She said it was good to host an event locally in the County. She said they should try to gain sponsors for the event. She said she was not supportive of beer and wine at the family event. She said people could find other time to have alcohol.

Ms. Bohmke noted that Mr. Vosburg would have brought the item before the Board sooner if the information were available and if he had worked for the County longer. She said that Mr. Vosburg had a lot of other duties.

Mr. Coen asked what fund the $76K would be drawn from.

Mr. Morris explained the funding would come from the operating budget, so they would have to find savings from some other item in the budget.

Mr. Coen said when he first joined the Board, he thought it would have been a good idea to hold a concert on Memorial Day, but he met with staff, learned of the cost, and realized it was not the most pressing need. He said he only found out about the event a month ago. He noted that the proposed cost was $76K while the previous year's cost was $20K. He said that a starting salary for the deputies was $51K. He said he did not see the rationale for the tree.

Mr. Coen stated that the present tree had been lit in the past. He said there was a tree where they did the 9/11 ceremony, albeit it was not a Christmas tree or fir tree. He said there were other trees and the County did not have to spend $34K. He noted that the event was a month and a day from the meeting.

Mr. Coen said he was against alcohol at the event and he wanted to know the legal impacts. He said he had reviewed the list provided by staff. He noted that there were budget items of $3,500 for unspecified holiday props and $2,300 for cookies. He said he did not know if a photobooth and satellite parking were needed and that he was not thrilled about the food trucks. He stated that the carriage rides would go around the parking lot.

Mr. Coen said he liked the idea of the lighting. He said the focus at the prior year's event was on the school choir performances. He said schools, students, nor children were mentioned in the sample flyer provided to the Board, but the flyer did mention booze and food trucks. He noted that there were some activities for children, but the point of the prior event was centered around the children and the community.

Mr. Coen suggested the County use the program from the prior year and fix any remaining issues with the lighting. He said he was apprehensive about spending $76K one month before the event.

Ms. Allen said there could be inflation with the tree costs. She asked what would happen if they did not meet the sponsorship goal. She asked if they would end up covering the cost.

Mr. Morris said they would have to order the tree immediately to have it delivered in time.

Ms. Allen clarified they would figure out the reimbursement logistics afterwards. She said that the County needed its own Christmas event. She said she did not support paying so much for a Christmas tree. She suggested acquiring props to create a Santa Village or some other display so that there was an identity to the event. She said that a tree lighting did not have an identity.

Ms. Allen said she did not care one way or the other about alcohol at the event. She noted that the alcohol was not provided by the County. She mentioned that Jesus Christ turned water into wine. She suggested a different option than the tree but that the event should be held. She said the citizens needed a sense of identity.

Ms. Allen suggested the event be scaled back for the current year, but moving forward, the item should be included in the budget to provide more time for planning and input. She said they could use the Community Engagement resources to get people involved so that there was more community input. She said the event should be scaled back for the current year.

Ms. Yeung said she was a Christian, but she believed in religious freedom. She said the holiday should be for everyone. She said she loved community events—she hosted a Day of Caring and two Juneteenth celebrations. She said every supervisor should have an event included in the budget.

Ms. Yeung said that there should be a community event in the County, noting the comments on the beer and the cost of the tree. She said she was not sure the cost could be scaled down, but she wanted to see a scaled-down process, and staff had worked on the event since June. She said they should develop a scaled-down process that the Board could agree with.

Ms. Vanuch said she was supportive of the event. She said the County needed to host such an event to provide people with an event to attend in the County. She suggested they investigate what tourism funding could be used for the event because they would be pulling people from other localities. She said the prior year, there was concern from staff and public safety about having the event along the main road.

Ms. Vanuch said that a week prior to the tree lighting in 2021, a car drove through a crowd at a tree lighting in another state and killed eight people, including a child. She said they had worked with the Sheriff's Office and Fire and Rescue to shut down Route 1 and line the lane with fire trucks. She said the consensus was that the location was not ideal. She said they learned from the prior event that they also needed more lighting.

Ms. Vanuch said that there would be more school choirs participating this year, and every aspect would be centered around children. She said there would be a European market and a gingerbread house judging contest where the Board members would be the judges. She said there would be time for staff to enjoy the facility prior to its opening to the public.

Ms. Vanuch clarified the event was moved to the interior parking lot because of public safety concerns. She said because the event was moved and there was no tree in the back parking lot, they had to purchase one. She said trees cost a lot of money because of the transportation, installation, and decoration. She said restaurants did not have a liability in regard to alcohol when patrons left the business. She explained that the vendor had a vested interest in ensuring attendees were not overserved. She said the Sheriff's Office would also be present.

Ms. Vanuch said the event would support local businesses, and a local brewery would be catering. She said she fully supported the event, and she was confident the County would be able to find sponsors. She noted that in support of the event were Ms. Gary, Ms. Bohmke, and herself, and Ms. Yeung wanted to scale back the costs. She suggested the budget could be scaled back to $70K and the Board approve the Chair to seek $35K in sponsorship funds for the tree.

Mr. English said if Ms. Vanuch could guarantee that they would receive $35K in sponsorship funds, then he would support the event.

Ms. Vanuch said it was hard to guarantee, but she would try.

Mr. English said he would only support the event with a sponsor and if there would be no alcohol.

Ms. Vanuch said she would have to poll the Board because she had heard a mixed consensus.

Mr. English said having beer and wine at the event did not fit into the public safety aspect.

Ms. Vanuch said they had to ensure they were tallying the Board because there was a mixed position. She said they could email the County Administrator their opinions who would then make a decision based on the Board's direction.

Ms. Allen clarified Mr. English would not support the event if there was to be beer and wine, regardless of the tree.

Mr. English said he did not support it if the wine and beer were not taken out.

Ms. Vanuch said that was not how she interpreted it.

Mr. English said he would support the event if Ms. Vanuch got the sponsorship for the tree, but if beer and wine were included, then he did not support it.

Ms. Gary said that she was a Christian and a Baptist who believed in the separation of church and state. She said fundraising for the tree was simpler if it was broken down into many different donors.

Ms. Vanuch said if anyone was interested in sponsoring the tree, then donations could be made to the Stafford EDA.

Ms. Gary suggested they make ornaments and donors could sponsor a branch. She said they should make the event more communal for other faiths. She noted that there were people who celebrated Christmas who were not Christians. She said it was important to invite faith leaders of other organizations and provide them with a platform. She suggested they include non-Christian-specific crafts in the children's area.

Mr. Vosburg explained that the sponsorship would not come through the County and that the EDA had decided to take on the responsibility. He said all sponsorship discussions should be directed to the EDA.

Ms. Bohmke mentioned that Mr. Morris told her that when he worked in Portsmouth 10 years ago, the Christmas tree cost $25K. She said when compared to the inflation figures for the transportation projects, the cost of the tree was not a bad price. She said she was happy to spend the money on the tree. She said inflation was a reality.

Mr. Coen said he was in support of hosting an event. He said the flyer included in the Board's packet discussed horse-drawn carriage rides, holiday musical performances, arts and crafts, family-friendly activities, and beer and wine. He noted that "children" nor "schools" were mentioned in the flyer.

Mr. Coen said it was interesting that there would be a European market. He said the Board had not been informed that they would be judging the gingerbread contest. He said that was his problem—that the event costs increased from $20K to $76K and none of the Supervisors were consulted. He said he was reminded of another large sum of money that the Board was not consulted on.

Mr. Coen said that the County should host an event without spending $35K on a tree with the chance they would get sponsors. He said they could host the event through a more reasonable process and get public input. He said he supported Ms. Gary's ideas regarding other faiths, but it was late in the planning process. He said he did not drink and did not view wine as a family-friendly event. He said he did not recall wine or beer at his band concerts while in school. He said the County should host an event without spending $76K.

Ms. Allen asked Ms. Vanuch to poll the Board again as to who was in favor, who was against, and what level of funding was supported.

Ms. Vanuch asked if Board members were comfortable moving forward as proposed with the ability of the EDA to seek $35K in sponsorship funds.

Mr. English said he was in support if the sponsorship funding was secured. He noted the rising inflation and mentioned that there was a free tree at the front of the County property. He said he did not support the beer or wine.

Ms. Vanuch said they would poll on that separately.

Mr. English said he was in support if there was sponsorship for the cost of the tree.

Ms. Gary said she was confident they would be able to secure sponsorships for the tree.

Ms. Bohmke said she was in support.

Ms. Yeung said she was in support of the event with the sponsorship of the tree.

Mr. Coen said they would not know the sponsors of the event, so he was not in support.

Ms. Allen said she was in support of the event if there was sponsorship, and if there was no sponsorship, then the maximum funding she would support was $50K.

Ms. Vanuch said she would poll on the beer and wine tent.

Mr. English said he did not support it.

Ms. Gary said she did not support it.

Ms. Bohmke said she did not support it.

Ms. Yeung said she did not support it.

Mr. Coen said he did not support it.

Ms. Allen said she was indifferent.

Ms. Vanuch said she supported the beer and wine tent. She said they would move forward with the event. She said they would seek sponsorship for $35K. She requested that the cost be reevaluated and that staff try to decrease it.

Mr. Morris said they would be as frugal as possible. He noted that the numbers were budgetary figures. He said they would try to save funds as they negotiated final contracts.

Ms. Allen asked what the Board's direction would be if they could not receive the necessary sponsorships. She said her direction was clear in that she would only support a cap of funding at $50K.

Ms. Vanuch stated that it would cost $20K to decorate the building. She said they could remove that funding and still fund the rest of the event. She suggested that the building decorations be contingent on the sponsorship funding.

Mr. Morris said the cost could be reduced. He said that would reduce the cost to between $50K to $55K.

Mr. Vosburg said in the future, they would look to include a full proposal in the budget. He said alcohol would not be included. He explained a line item would be included in the budget that could be considered for similar events the following year.

Ms. Yeung requested that the proposal be provided to the Board earlier.

Mr. Vosburg explained it would be included in the budget as far as funding. He clarified that Ms. Yeung wanted to know the details of the event sooner. He said they would evaluate alternative tree options. He noted that there were supply chain issues and they were worried about delivering the tree on time.

Mr. Coen said the $35K cost for the tree was because it had to be delivered and planted. He asked if they would consider other tree options for future events.

Mr. Vosburg said he was referring to artificial options that were available. He said they were looking at alternatives.

Mr. Coen clarified that they were planning to spend $35K on a tree this year and then consider a less expensive option in the following years.

Ms. Allen asked if there would be a deadline by when staff had to bring the item before the Board. Ms. Vanuch said she would prefer staff bring the item before the Board in September to brief them on the event.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the item could be discussed at the Board retreat.

Ms. Allen said that was too soon because it had to go through the budget process.

Ms. Bohmke said the item could come up at a committee meeting.

Ms. Vanuch said they could work it out on the agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve the Consent Agenda.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Item 1. County Administration; Approve October 18, 2022 Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes.

Item 2. County Administration; Approve October 12, 2022 Board of Supervisors Public Safety Work Session Minutes

Item 3. County Administration; Approve October 18, 2022 Joint Board of Supervisors and School Board Work Session Minutes

Item 4. County Administration; Increase the County's Authorized Strength to Convert an Administrative Specialist II Position from Part-Time to Full-Time.

Resolution R22-289 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION INCREASING THE COUNTY'S AUTHORIZED STRENGTH FOR THE CONVERSION OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST II POSITION FROM PART-TIME TO FULL-TIME

WHERAS, the Stafford County Administration Office requested the conversion of a part-time administrative position to a full-time position to meet the growing needs of the office; and

WHEREAS, the Board recognized the office's needs and desires to approve this request and increase the County's authorized strength;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that the County's authorized full-time strength be and it hereby is as stated below, and recruitment and maintaining full-time positions up to the authorized strength is permitted. With approval of the County Administrator, the County's authorized strength may be temporarily exceeded for no longer than two weeks to allow training of a new employee by a leaving employee:

	FY2023	**Revised FY2023**
General Fund		
• Non-Public Safety	~~427~~	428
• Public Safety	526	526
Utilities Fund	164	164
Capital Projects Fund	2	2
Transportation Fund	3	3
Total	~~1122~~	**1123**

Item 5. County Administration; Authorize an Additional Four Hours of Holiday Pay on Wednesday, November 23, 2022 In Observance of The Thanksgiving Day Holiday.

Item 6. County Administration; Appoint Mr. Joe Brito To Represent the Hartwood District on The Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC).

Item 7. Community Engagement; Designate A New County Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Officer.

Resolution R22-283 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION DESIGNATING A NEW FOIA OFFICER

WHEREAS, the Records and FOIA Specialist is the County's FOIA Officer and is currently responsible for serving as a point of contact for members of the public requesting public records and coordinating responses to Virginia Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") requests; and

WHEREAS, the FOIA Officer duties and function closely align with the Department of Community Engagement; and

WHERAS, the FOIA Officer will receive full support and resources from the Department of Community Engagement; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3704.2(A), each governing body shall designate and publicly identify at least one FOIA officer; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to designate a new FOIA Officer;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that it be and hereby does designate and publicly identify Mali Savage as the County's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Officer effective November 14, 2022; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the FOIA Officer's name and contact information shall be updated on the County's website and other places to provide the public notice; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, is authorized to update the Rights of Requesters and Responsibilities of Stafford County under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and any other document he deems necessary and appropriate, to update the name and contact information of the County's FOIA Officer.

Item 8. Fire and Rescue; Authorize the County Administrator to Execute A Work Order for Facility Repairs to the Falmouth Volunteer Fire and Rescue Station, and Budget and Appropriate Prior Year-End Unspent Volunteer Fire and Rescue Funds.

This item was deleted from the Consent Agenda.

Item 9. Parks, Recreation, And Community Facilities; Budget and Appropriate Insurance Funds to The Carl Lewis Community Center's Fire Project for Improvements.

Resolution R22-271 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE INSURANCE REIMBURSEMENT FUNDS TO THE CARL LEWIS COMMUNITY CENTER FIRE PROJECT FOR IMPROVEMENTS

WHEREAS, the Carl Lewis Community Center (Center) has been one of the Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities Department's (Department) most popular use and rental sites by individuals, families, and groups throughout Stafford County for many years; and

WHEREAS, on July 25, 2022, the Center caught fire and was severely damaged and deemed a total loss; and

WHEREAS, the insurance reimbursement to the County for the fire damage was $203,726.84, which was deposited into the County's insurance fund; and

WHEREAS, to enable the Department to act to secure and demolish the building and plan to rebuild this site, the insurance reimbursement funds must be budgeted and appropriated to the Carl Lewis Community Center's Fire Project;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that the insurance proceeds received as a result of the fire and damage to the Carl Lewis Community Center be and they hereby are appropriated as follows to secure and demolish the building and plan to rebuild:

Fund	**Purpose**	**Amount**
County's Insurance Fund	Carl Lewis Community Center Fire Project	$203,727

Item 10. Planning and Zoning; Authorize the Initiation of a Reclassification Application to Remove the Historic Resource Overlay Zoning District Designation from Tax Map No. 40-32.

Resolution R22-276 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INITIATION OF AN APPLICATION FOR ZONING RECLASSIFICATION TO REMOVE THE HISTORIC RESOURCE (HR) OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT FROM TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 40-32B, LOCATED WITHIN THE AQUIA ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, Samuel and Dorothy Jackson (Owners) own Tax Map Parcel No. 40-32B (Property), zoned A-1, Agricultural; and

WHEREAS, in 1985, pursuant to Ordinance O85-08(R), the Board amended the Zoning Ordinance map to include the Property in an HR overlay zoning district; and

WHEREAS, the intent of the HR district is to protect against the destruction of and encroachment upon historic resources; and

WHEREAS, HR districts are areas containing buildings or places in which historic events have occurred or which have special public value because of notable architectural or other features relating to the cultural or artistic heritage of the county, the commonwealth, and the nation, of such significance as to warrant conservation and preservation; and

WHEREAS, the Owners of the Property believe there are no resources that would be impacted and desire to remove the HR district designation from the Property; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to consider a rezoning application and if approved, acknowledge that the Property no longer requires the HR district designation; and

WHEREAS, Article XII of the Stafford County Code requires that any amendments to the zoning maps must include an application for reclassification, with subsequent public hearings conducted by the Planning Commission and Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to initiate a reclassification application on behalf of the Owners;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that a reclassification application to reclassify Tax Map Parcel No. 40-32B by removing the HR overlay zoning district designation be and it hereby is authorized for initiation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Administrator is authorized to execute any documents that he deems necessary to effectuate the Board's desires expressed herein and this Resolution.

Item 11. Utilities; Authorize the County Administrator to Execute A Contract for Professional On-Call Consulting Services for Utilities System Planning and Modeling, Water Quality, And Project Management.

Resolution R22-280 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL ON-CALL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR UTILITIES SYSTEM PLANNING AND MODELING, WATER QUALITY, AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT

WHEREAS, the Department of Utilities requires various consulting services from engineering firms for multiple projects, such as the water and sewer modeling and water quality on an on-call basis; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 22-031-5001-SP, the County solicited proposals from qualified firms to provide on-call consulting services for three categories of utilities projects:

Category	**Project Types**
A	Utility System Master Planning and Modeling
B	Water Quality
C	Project Management Services

; and

WHEREAS, staff evaluated the proposals received and determined the most qualified firms for all categories; and

WHEREAS, negotiations have been completed and the final contract is ready for approval and execution with CDM Smith Inc.; and

WHEREAS, individual projects or task orders that meet or exceed $200,000 will require further Board approval; and

WHEREAS, funds for these services are available in the Utilities Fund;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract for one year with four optional one-year renewal terms with CDM Smith Inc. to provide professional, on-call consulting services for the Utility System Master Planning and Modeling, Water Quality, and Project Management Services; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that individual projects or task orders are authorized up to Two Hundred Thousand Dollars ($200,000), unless modified by a duly-executed contract amendment.

Item 12. Utilities; Authorize the County Administrator to Approve Expenditures and Ratify A Contract with United Rentals (North America), Inc. To Furnish and Deliver Equipment Rentals and Related Services.

Resolution R22-282 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
TO APPROVE EXPENDITURES AND RATIFY A CONTRACT WITH UNITED
RENTALS (NORTH AMERICA), INC. TO FURNISH AND DELIVER
EQUIPMENT RENTALS AND RELATED TRAINING SERVICES

WHEREAS, the Department of Utilities rents various types of equipment for use when existing equipment requires repairs and rents specialized equipment not owned by the Department; and

WHEREAS, these types of equipment include heavy, medium and light construction equipment, electrical tools, general construction tools, material handling and protection equipment, pumps, concrete and masonry equipment, tools, trailers, waste and debris handling equipment, safety equipment, temporary shelters, road barricades and signs; and

WHEREAS, the County executed a contract for these services with United Rentals (North America), Inc., Rider Agreement No. 22-035-5030-CO, which rides a contract awarded by a national cooperative, Sourcewell Contract No. 062320-URI for equipment rentals and related services; and

WHEREAS, the contract value is anticipated to exceed $200,000 in total costs and further Board action is required; and

WHEREAS, funds in the amount of $300,000 for the services are available in the Fiscal Year 2023 Utilities Fund Operations Budget, and costs in subsequent contract years are subject to an annual budget and appropriation by the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that the contract with United Rentals (North America), Inc., Rider Agreement No. 22-035-5030-CO, for an initial contract term October 6, 2021 to August 27, 2024, with one optional one-year renewal term, be and it hereby is ratified and approved; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to approve additional expenditures with United Rentals (North America), Inc. to furnish and deliver rental equipment and provide related services in an amount not to exceed Six Hundred Thousand Dollars ($600,000), for a total contract amount of $804,220, unless modified by a duly-executed contract amendment.

Item 13. Utilities; Authorize the County Administrator to Execute A Change Order to Task Order No. 26 With Sagres Construction Corporation for the I-95/Austin Run Sanitary Sewer Replacement.

Resolution R22-287 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ADVERTISEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE ISSUANCE OF FY2023 VIRGINIA PUBLIC SCHOOL AUTHORITY (VPSA) GENERAL OBLIGATION DEBT AND AN INCREASE IN THE FY2023 BUDGET

WHEREAS, the Virginia Code requires and the Board desires to hold public hearings to consider the proposed issuance of fiscal year (FY) 2023 Virginia Public School Authority (VPSA) general obligation debt, which would be used toward the construction of High School #6; and

WHEREAS, if the additional VPSA bonds are issued in FY2023, the FY2023 budget would increase by $44,500,000, necessitating a public hearing as required by the Virginia Code to consider increasing the budget by greater than one percent; and

WHEREAS, at such public hearings any member of the community may attend and state his/her views;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of October, 2022, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to publish notice and advertise public hearings on the proposed issuance of Virginia Public School Authority general obligation debt and the proposed increase in the FY2023 budget by greater than one percent.

Item 14. Utilities; Authorize the County Administrator to Execute Contracts with Univar Usa Inc. And Kuehne Chemical Company, Inc. To Furnish and Deliver Water Treatment Chemical, Sodium Hypochlorite.

Resolution R22-298 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE CONTRACTS WITH UNIVAR USA INC. AND KUEHNE CHEMICAL COMPANY, INC. TO FURNISH AND DELIVER A WATER TREATMENT CHEMICAL

WHEREAS, the Department of Utilities requires sodium hypochlorite for the treatment process of water; and

WHEREAS, sodium hypochlorite is a compound that can be effectively used for water purification; and

WHEREAS, the County solicited competitively sealed bids, pursuant to Invitation for Bid (IFB) #23-008-5040-SB, to furnish and deliver sodium hypochlorite for a one-year contract with five optional, one-year renewal periods; and

WHEREAS, Univar USA Inc. and Kuehne Chemical Company, Inc. were determined by staff to be to be the lowest responsive and responsible bidders to furnish and deliver the sodium hypochlorite; and

WHEREAS, funds for the chemical are available the Utilities Fund and subsequent contract renewal term costs are subject to annual budget and appropriation by the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract for one year with five optional one-year renewal terms with Univar USA Inc. to furnish and deliver water treatment chemical, sodium hypochlorite, in an amount not to exceed Six Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($650,000), unless modified by a duly executed contract amendment; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to execute a contract for one year with five optional one-year renewal terms with Kuehne Chemical Company, Inc. to furnish and deliver water treatment chemical, sodium hypochlorite, in an amount not to exceed Three Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars ($325,000), unless modified by a duly executed contract amendment.

CLOSED MEETING

At 4:24 p.m., Ms. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to adopt proposed Resolution CM22-23 to authorize a closed session.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM22-23 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for discussion and consideration of the acquisition of real property for recreational and fire facilities purposes, where such discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiation strategy of the Board,

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING - SEC. 2.2-3711 (A)

At 4:51 p.m., Ms. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to adopt proposed Resolution CM22-23(C) to certify the closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM22-23(C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON NOVEMBER 1, 2022

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 1st day of November, 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 1st day of November 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.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Item 15. County Administration; Consider Adopting Stafford County's Overall Legislative Program for the 2023 Session of the General Assembly.

Ms. Vanuch asked if Board members wanted Mr. Toigo to provide his presentation.

Ms. Yeung responded no.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the Board had any questions.

Ms. Yeung responded no.

Ms. Gary said it was not necessary.

Ms. Yeung said they could take action.

Mr. Anthony Toigo, Intergovernmental Affairs Manager, asked if the Board had any requests for edits to the program. He stated that the Board could pass a resolution with edits, and he would provide the edited version to the Board and the delegation.

Ms. Gary asked what the current standing was for the regional transportation.

Mr. Toigo explained that he brought back the materials in kind from the last meeting. He said that

Ms. Gary would have to request that the item be removed from the program.

Ms. Gary requested that the item be removed.

Ms. Yeung asked if there was a percentage for COCA or if it was open-ended.. She mentioned the value could be reduced if certain percentages were exceeded. She said she wanted to ensure SCPS was aware.

Mr. Toigo responded that the requirement could be kept open-ended. He said he had the COCA number as 2.46 for instructional staff and 5.67 for support staff. He explained the full COCA for the counties to the north was 9.83 instructional and 24.61 support. He said they could look into the number, but for program purposes, it was best to keep open-ended and adjust as needed.

Ms. Gary motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approved proposed Resolution R22-168 with the removal of the position against the Regional Transportation Authority.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R22-168 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING STAFFORD COUNTY'S OVERALL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE 2023 SESSION OF THE VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

WHEREAS, the Board is seeking enabling legislation and amendments to the Virginia Code to accomplish Stafford County's legislative initiatives for the 2023 General Assembly session; and

WHEREAS, the Board recognizes that Virginia and its local governments are partners in providing many services to our citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Board opposes efforts to reduce the authority or flexibility of the County to govern its citizens or shift responsibility for shared services to localities alone; and

WHEREAS, the Board opposes the implementation of any new unfunded state mandates or the expansion of any existing unfunded state mandates upon the County and County schools; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires that the Virginia Association of Counties offer its support for the initiatives contained herein;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that it be and hereby does adopt the document entitled, "Stafford Virginia 2023 Legislative Program Stafford County Board of Supervisors" (2023 Legislative Program) as the County's overall legislation program for the 2023 session of the Virginia General Assembly; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that staff and the County's legislative consultants will keep the Board appraised of legislative changes and other matters that may impact Stafford County, and its residents and businesses; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator or his designee will provide a copy of this Resolution and the 2023 Legislative Program to each member of the General Assembly delegation representing any portion of Stafford County.

Item 16. Budget and Management; Consider Approving a Salary Scale Adjustment for Sheriff's Deputies and ECC Operators, and Budgeting and Appropriating Funding for the Scale Adjustment.

Ms. Andrea Light said over the past months, the Board had contemplated several different pay increases for the Sheriff's Office and 911 operators to help with recruitment and retention. She said the proposed resolution would budget and appropriate the pay increases identified by the Board. She noted that several scenarios would be provided as requested.

Ms. Light said each of the scenarios assumed a January 1 start date. She said exempt employees—Lieutenants and above—were assumed to be at 50% on January 1, 2023, and the remaining 50% would take effect on January 1, 2024. She said the scenarios included step increases for FY24 and FY25.

Ms. Light said they requested the Board's direction as to the amount of the adjustment to the payscale and the source of the funds—ongoing, ARPA, or excess revenue. She said included in the packet was an attachment of options for the Board to consider approving proposed R22-292.

Ms. Light said that the meals tax was maximized in each of the scenarios. She said they estimated an additional $1M in meals tax in FY23. She said in the 5% plan, that was limited to $637K because it was the only cost. She said they used ARPA retention funding throughout the scenarios up to a comfort point. She stated that they also used ARPA revenue replacement.

Ms. Light said typically, in the final year of the proposals there would be a taxes amount. She said there was a tax implication or other revenue implication in the later years of the plan.

Ms. Light stated that in the 20% scale adjustment, additional tax revenue would be needed in FY24. She noted that the slide comparing the County to other jurisdictions did not include E-911 operators and only evaluated Sheriff's Deputy starting pay. She said the current deputy starting pay was $51,303.

Ms. Light said the Board had requested staff to provide comparative data on turnover. She said the slide provided the data when responses were available. She said when they considered the turnover rate of the County compared to other jurisdictions, the County seemed to be in the middle, but the vacancy rate was at the lower end.

Ms. Light said they sought the Board to provide the amount of the adjustment to the payscale and the funding sources to be used for a proposed payscale adjustment.

Mr. Coen clarified that the payscale pay increase percentages were for First Sergeants and below.

Ms. Light explained that each plan had First Sergeants and below at 100% of the payscale adjustment on January 1, 2023. She continued that Lieutenants and above would be at 50% of the payscale adjustment on January 1, 2023, and the remaining 50% would take effect on January 1, 2024.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that whatever the payscale increase, it was at 50%. She said if they did a 15% increase, there would be a 50% adjustment in year two.

Ms. Light said for the 15% increase, on January 1, 2023, the exempt employees would have a 7.5% pay raise, and the cost would be $103K. She said on January 1, 2024, the other 7.5% increase would take effect, and the cost would be $317K.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that if the Board decided to take action outside of the budget for only First Sergeants and below, then they would reduce the total figures by the exempt amount.

Ms. Light said they were only requesting the Board to appropriate FY23.

Mr. Coen clarified that every plan would require ARPA funding or an increase in taxes. He clarified that there were ARPA retention funds included for the next budget year.

Ms. Light said that was correct. She said staff had put the proposal together for the Board to have something to consider. She said any of the funding sources could be mixed.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve R22-292 with the scale adjustment from Option D for First Sergeants and below and for the E-911 operators.

Ms. Vanuch asked if there was further discussion.

Ms. Bohmke said that the Board had discussed this matter since the State Police and Governor Youngkin had revealed the new State Police salary of $64,383, which related to the northern Virginia compensation model for the State Police. She said that for the rest of the state, it was

$55,100. She said that the State Police were also receiving a $5,000 bonus for anyone who joined the force in northern Virginia, which was an issue that was not as important to her as the salary was. She said that it had been very challenging due to the amount of information regarding this and the unprecedented times in law enforcement across the nation.

Ms. Bohmke said that the primary thing that they serviced in the community was public safety, and it was how they protected citizens. She said that she did not take this vote lightly. She said that this was the right thing to do after studying the numbers, and everyone on the Board had multiple conversations with Andrea Light, Budget Director, their County Administrator, the deputies, the Sheriff, and the Sheriff's Office staff. She said that they had researched this to the best of their ability to get the data needed to make an educated decision.

Ms. Bohmke said that the unfortunate thing was that they were in northern Virginia and had to compete with northern Virginia. She said that no one liked it, but they were sometimes included in northern Virginia statistics and sometimes were only included in their regional statistics, and in this case, they were competing with all northern jurisdictions. She said that they knew that some of them were considering additional compensation, and she wanted their public safety personnel to know that they were very important to them.

Ms. Bohmke said that when she called 911, she wanted someone to answer the phone, and she wanted there to be a deputy available and an EMT available. She said that while she had said it was a difficult decision, she believed it was the right one to make right now. She said that while she would like to wait another two weeks or months to see what some of the other jurisdictions would do, they needed to make this decision and move on.

Ms. Yeung said that she believed in public safety, which included Fire and Rescue and not only the Sheriff's Office. She said that they were breaking it apart, and she wanted to see that this was done in their budget season. She said that Supervisor English was one of their Sheriff's deputies, and with full respect to the work that he did, this was probably something that he believed in strongly, but she could not agree with the use of ARPA funds for this purpose. She said that she believed in giving to those individuals that raised the E99 and dispatchers. She said this was a similar situation to paying the bus drivers.

Ms. Yeung said that she believed that if they gave a good-faith effort in providing a sum to the Sheriff's Office, he could then deliberately slice and dice what he needed and for whom, versus deciding to tell someone what percentage they would be given. She said that she did not know if this was sustainable, but she would not use ARPA funds and wait until the budget season. She said that if they would belong to northern Virginia, they should stay with them and not move around in comparison to other jurisdictions.

Ms. Gary said that she was glad that they were able to do something, because she had said that they needed to do something soon from the beginning of this conversation. She said that she was glad that this was what they landed on, because she did not want to wait until an emergency happened to say that there was an emergency within the Sheriff's Department. She said that it was unacceptable to her, and by doing this, they would be able to show that they were adaptive as a government in a situation like this. She said that she had spoken with her constituents across the political spectrum, and people were generally supportive of this, even by those who were not supportive of a tax increase that would result from this. She said that people understood that this was necessary in order to continue to protect their County.

Mr. Coen said that he had one overarching goal for this, which was to make sure that their Sheriff's Department employees, as well as all of their employees, were treated with respect and treated correctly. He said that he was disappointed with the process and some of the data presented. He said that at one of their work sessions, they were comparing the Sheriff's deputies to the salaries of people who worked at Northern Virginia Community College, which was not a respectful thing to do to their employees. He said that he and some of the other Supervisors had voiced the concern that they must do something significant to solve the issue they had with retainment and hiring of dispatchers.

Mr. Coen said that Supervisor Bohmke pointed out to him that the state was currently trying to do more to get dispatchers, so they would soon have an even harder time. He said that after having this conversation with the Sheriff ad nauseum, only offering a percentage increase in pay did not necessarily address their concerns. He said that he had been badgering for there to be mention of performing a study to address the problem and do something to help in that area, which continued to go unacknowledged. He said that they must show support for their deputies so that they knew the County cared about them, as well as the other public safety employees. He said that the process had been a far less cerebral process than it should have been, which was unfortunate. He said that they had discussed waiting to hear from other counties, but now were moving forward without doing so.

Mr. Coen said that he had repeated the problems he found with using ARPA funds. He said that one of the Supervisors on the dais said that it would be a great thing to take their ARPA funds to put toward something in the CIP so that they were not borrowing money over 20 years for something and did not have to raise taxes. He said that the more they spent out of ARPA, the less likely that was. He said that Ms. Gary mentioned that this initiative would result in a tax increase, and it would now be a twofer, because there would also be a CIP tax that had to increase. He said that he agreed with Supervisor Yeung that he would have preferred to give a sum of money to the

Sheriff and let him decide and run his department as an elected official who knew his organization, and it would have shown respect for him.

Mr. Coen said that throughout and beyond the discussion, anyone who did not agree with a viewpoint would be smeared, maligned, and attacked, and they already had been. He said that this was unfortunate, because that did not help their civic discussion, nor built trust or respect. He said that it was a difficult decision because he supported their public safety continuously throughout his time on the Board, which he had demonstrated in the work done as a Board to fix their payscale in a much more deliberative and rational process than this. He said that he was disappointed that they were getting to this in this way, and the most disrespectful thing that could be done to employees was to mislead in the way that things would be done, which was very unfortunate. He said that he knew how he would vote as someone who had been smeared, but it was very unfortunate that it had come down to this.

Ms. Allen said that she would not repeat what her colleagues had said. She said that regardless of what the votes came down to on this, if anyone took away from this conversation that no one on the Board cared about public safety, then they had not been paying attention to the Board. She said that their commitment to that aspect of the County had never wavered. She said that her stance had always been that they needed to do something, but she did not see why they could not do it through the correct channels, which in her opinion had always been the budget session. She said that earlier today in infrastructure, Mr. Owsiak stated that their projects were about $16 million over budget, from the road bond that they had not even borrowed from yet, that they would have to pay through taxes in subsequent years.

Ms. Allen said that they had a joint meeting with the School Board and had to build a lot of facilities for which the debt service had not even started. She asked if they would begin in January of 2023. She corrected herself and said that it was January 2024. She said that they were doing all of this as part of the budget cycle. She said that they had their own County staff to look at pay raises, because last year, many people on this Board fought against giving them more than 1% pay raises. She said that it was such a challenging discussion to have outside of the budget session because they did not have all of the information in front of them. She said they did not even know what the jurisdictions to the north would do or what the Governor's Office would do because all of this was so new.

Ms. Allen said that the worst part in all of this was that not once had the Sheriff come up to them and told them that this was something that he saw in his department. She said that the Sheriff did not bring this to their attention or come before the Board with a request to increase their salaries. She said that if he had done that, this would not be a discussion, so the fact that they were usurping his ability to run his department troubled her. She said that if the Sheriff wanted money to run and fix his department, he could ask the Board and the Board could allocate funds to him, but they should not be earmarking a percentage to him, because if he came back in a few months to request more funds because of new information, there would be a new issue to address.

Ms. Allen said that they were splitting up public safety, which, as Mr. Coen said, they had fought to fix. She asked what would happen if the Fire Chief came to the Board to discuss a significant recruiting issue and where they would get the funds to fix that. She asked if they would require them to wait through the budget season, because they had already set the precedent that if they had an issue, the Board could act outside of the means, and they would figure it out later. She said that she wished this had been done through the budget so the taxpayers knew the subsequent impacts this would have on them, not only for public safety but for infrastructure and schools, and then they would have a better-informed decision.

Ms. Vanuch said that she thanked staff and specifically Andrea Light, who spent hours putting together presentations. She said that she knew Mr. Vosburg and Ms. Donna Krauss spent a lot of time answering the hundreds of questions from Board members that came up over the last few months. She said that she wanted to acknowledge the work they had done on this and thank them for all of the information provided to the Board. She said that she wanted to thank the Sheriff's Office for highlighting issues and bringing them to the Board during the one-on-one meetings, discussing vacancy rates, recruitment and retention challenges, and the risks it would pose if and when it turned into an emergency situation.

Ms. Vanuch said that she also wanted to thank her colleagues who spent hours communicating on the phone with other Board members, talking with staff, and attending meetings to discuss this topic. She said that this decision was made to balance all of the fiscal needs the County had, the ARPA funding, and other issues, and they had ended in a decent place with a great negotiation, which was what public policy was meant to do. She said that when the Virginia State Police enacted their payscale changes and put Stafford County in the northern Virginia category for law enforcement officers when raising the starting pay to $65,000, it made it difficult for them to fill empty positions. She said that the Board had given the Sheriff's Office positions that they could not fill, and their vacancy rate was very high.

Ms. Vanuch said that this had created an unprecedented time which called for unprecedented measures and swift actions by the Board. She said that Stafford County was really good at public safety, and they should never waiver on that. She thanked the Sheriff's Office for their work over the past few months, which had been incredibly difficult on their quality of life due to the vacant positions, the number of mental health calls received every day, and the requirements of doing overtime. She said that this change would hopefully allow the Sheriff's Office to fill all the positions. She said that she was happy to be a part of a County that was setting a precedent as leaders in public safety and not waiting on other localities to make a change.

Ms. Bohmke said that they did a mid-year compensation raise for the bus drivers in the County, and they had to do that because it was a crisis. She said that this was not something they took lightly, and they did it when they had to. She said that these were tough decisions they had to make.

Ms. Vanuch asked for Supervisors to cast their votes on the 15% pay increase, effective January 1, 2023 for the Sheriff's Office and ECC 911 operators.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(5)	Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch
Nay:	(1)	Yeung
Abstain:	(1)	Allen

Proposed Resolution R22-292

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SALARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR SHERIFF'S DEPUTIES AND EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION CENTER (ECC) OPERATORS AND TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE ADJUSTMENTS

WHEREAS, the Board shares the Sheriff's concern with the recent increase in pay by the State Police and the impacts it would have on the County's Sheriff's deputies and with continued turnover of ECC operators; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to address these challenges by providing a salary adjustment to Sheriff's deputies and ECC operators, as detailed below; and

WHEREAS, staff has identified that the revenue generated from the meals tax is likely to exceed the projections in the fiscal year (FY) 2023 Budget by $1,000,000; and

WHEREAS, staff has identified that American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) grant funds in the categories of revenue replacement and retention are available and can be used for this purpose; and

WHEREAS, the Board requests staff to address salary adjustments for Fire and Rescue personnel on the Public Safety Step Plan as part of the annual budget process;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that it be and here by does authorize a pay scale adjustment of fifteen percent (15%) effective January 1, 2023 for nonexempt Sheriff's deputies and ECC operators; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) in excess meals tax revenue for fiscal year (FY) 2023 is budgeted and appropriated to provide the above referenced salary adjustments to the nonexempt and exempt Sheriff's Deputies and ECC Operators:

FUND	DEPARTMENT	AMOUNT
General Fund	Sheriff	$1,000,000

; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Three Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($350,000) in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) grant funds permissible for retention use is appropriated to provide the above referenced salary adjustments to the nonexempt and exempt Sheriff's Deputies and ECC Operators:

FUND	DEPARTMENT	AMOUNT
ARPA Grant Fund	Sheriff	$350,000

; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that Four Hundred Fifty-Three Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars ($453,250) in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) grant funds permissible as revenue replacement is appropriated to provide the above referenced salary adjustments to the nonexempt and exempt Sheriff's Deputies and ECC Operators:

FUND	DEPARTMENT	AMOUNT
ARPA Grant Fund	Sheriff	$453,250

Item 17. Parks, Recreation,and Community Facilities; Discuss Parking Fees at the Historic Port of Falmouth.

Mr. Brian Southall, Director of Parks, Recreation, and Community Facilities, stated that he would present to the Board of Supervisors the findings from the Parking Fee Pilot conducted at the historic Port of Falmouth. He said that he would like to first thank Supervisor Coen for visiting with staff, thank Captain Lee Peters from the Sheriff's Office for support and attention that his team gave to staff during the pilot. He continued that the slide shown represented the pilot data broken down by month.

Mr. Southall said that August was the only complete month in the pilot, September 5 was Labor Day and the only holiday during the pilot. He said that there were 1765 transactions, totaling $44,074. He showed a slide of the breakdown of weekly transactions. He noted that transactions for Saturdays and Sundays were very busy. He said that all the fees collected were to be used for improvements, and the bottom of the slide showed staffing costs per day compared to fees collected.

Mr. Southall said that the slide shown represented the visitation during the week, which was comprised mostly of residents. He said that they were unable to track this data on the weekends due to the heavy flow of patrons and trying to keep people off of River Road. He continued that the projections were shown, and the possibilities for continuing the program for a 7-day schedule versus a weekend and holiday schedule. He said that some of the benefits of the program were to provide control for parking and giving information to citizens.

Mr. Southall said that revenue could be used for cleanup, educational programs, river safety, environmental causes, and other improvements in the area. He said that a potential challenge was staffing. He said that the Board gave them several weeks to get staffed, but they were unable to hire during that time period and made a call out to staff. He said that they used over 50 different employees from Parks and Rec to complete the pilot program.

Ms. Gary asked to see Slide 5 again. She said that Supervisor English could make his remarks.

Mr. English said that the final outcome was that the pilot was likely better to continue only on the weekends than during the entire week, because there was not as much volume from Monday through Thursday. He said that it appeared the cost for staff would be more than the revenue.

Mr. Southall said that was the way they had looked at it. He said that they did not fill up the parking lot or open the upper parking lot during the week and had staff there to collect fees.

Mr. English said that the Aquia Landing area had a significant outcome of non-residents coming there too.

Mr. Southall said that there was a challenge in filling this pilot program, and they were doing spot-checking at Aquia Landing, where it was roughly 50/50 at times, with some days heavier in visitation and some days heavier with residents.

Mr. English asked if the program were to continue, if they could handle both Falmouth and Aquia on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. He asked if the staff could handle that.

Mr. Southall said that it depended on if they could provide adequate time for staffing the program.

Mr. English said that he understood.

Mr. Southall said that the biggest benefit would be there to help citizens.

Ms. Gary said that the program appeared less successful than they had hoped it would be. She said it was worth trying the program because nothing was happening and doing it only on the weekends was an option, but she would like to defer to Mr. Coen's opinion after seeing the results.

Mr. Coen said that the staff was great for accomplishing the last-minute work of the program, and the work of Parks and Rec and the Sheriff's Department for making sure River Road did not get backed up. He said that he was there every weekend except for one and talked to staff and the people who were there. He said that the attendees were mostly families, composed of a diverse group of people. He said that it did not make sense to continue to charge on the weekdays, which was an issue raised by staff. He said that the people who went there did not have a problem with a fee for parking, because other places also required parking fees, and the gasoline cost to go to another area made it a more cost-efficient option for families.

Mr. Coen said that many things were challenging about this, one being that a seven-day program was difficult to do, and the data showed that it did not really work. He said that another was that it would cost more to do that than raised, and the result was that it cost $5,000 more than they raised. He said the other element that was challenging in this was that the money could not go toward what the future use, because it cost more than it made. He said that if they would help him in working with Mr. Vosburg to come up with how they would spend the money, the future was the next step.

Mr. Coen said that they should work with the Wetlands Board and Friends of the Rappahannock. He said that he and Mr. Vosburg had discussed a large chunk of debris that would cost $140,000 to remove, and it likely had grown vegetation and acted as a natural barrier. He said that he hoped Ms. Bohmke would help with whatever process they came up with due to her knowledge and commitment in that area. He said that he was against doing the fee in the first place, and Mr. English raised a good point about other fees and knew of other parks that charged fees. He said that they would see what the Board decided to do now that they had received this data.

Ms. Bohmke said that she agreed with Mr. Coen. She said that the fact that the staff was able to pull the program together in such a short time was a major feat in itself, and she thanked them for that. She said they now had the data, and they could make decisions from there. She said that they would see this in a committee form perhaps. She thanked staff for their efforts again.

Ms. Gary said that she would like to see the fees be put toward safety, which was a large concern with keeping the area open in the first place. She said that people's lives were valuable to all of them, and that was part of her intention of voting to approve the fees for use of the park. She said that it would be good to look at that now that they had the data. She said that they were still waiting for quotes to come in on towing contracts. She said that they had over 30 signs that said, "No Parking, Towing Enforced" and were still working that out, so she did not want to throw it in as kept happening.

Mr. Vosburg said that no one had responded to the RFP that they put out, so they currently did not have a vendor. He said that they would have to amend that and see how they could get a response and receive a bid.

Mr. Coen said that he would like to see in some format a recommendation from staff after they looked at this process and knew what was going on to have an analysis for the next budget season on the program. He said that he would appreciate staff's recommendations, because they had received some issues without sufficient staff recommendations, which was not staff's fault.

Mr. English asked if they could see what other jurisdictions were charging.

Mr. Southall said that they had done that, and there were other parks that charged.

Mr. English said that they were not out of bounds by doing this by any means.

Mr. Southall said that it was a mixed bag.

Mr. English said that the weekend program would be good.

Mr. Southall said that he talked to the Director of Fredericksburg Parks and Recreation, and he said that he had the same experience they had.

Mr. English said that they charged much less.

Mr. Coen asked if Mr. Southall could send him the information about Fredericksburg.

Mr. Southall said that the Director would present those numbers on the 22nd.

Mr. Coen said that he would be curious to see their data.

Ms. Yeung asked if those people who were unaware of the payment were not allowed to come in.

Mr. Southall said that if they paid, they could come in.

Ms. Yeung asked if they came in and had no funds and said that they came from somewhere.

Mr. Southall said that very few were turned around. He said that they had turned away some people.

Ms. Yeung asked if they allowed anyone in and asked them to pay next time.

Mr. Southall said no.

Mr. Coen said that when he was there with the County Administrator, there was someone who was unaware. He said that they did everything with cards and did not take cash.

Ms. Yeung said that there was a group of people who carried cash and did not have a card.

Mr. Coen said that people were well aware that they could drop their family members off, go and park up at one of the parks that were free, and come down the trail safely. He said that staff was good at telling people which was the safest way to go.

Ms. Bohmke said that the flip side to what Ms. Yeung just said was that some people did not want to pay for it even if they had the means to, so while there were people who could not afford to pay, which was the group Ms. Yeung was talking about, there were also people who refused to pay $20 for parking on the principle of the matter.

Ms. Gary said that it was important to reiterate during this discussion that the citizens of Stafford were already paying taxes to cover the services provided at their parks and other services throughout their County, so this was not a tax, but an optional thing that people from outside of the County chose to pay if they wanted to come to the parks that the County was trying to make safer and better for people. She said that the majority of the Board had shown with the vote on this that it was fair, and they shifted and tried to make it better.

Ms. Vanuch thanked Mr. Southall.

Mr. Southall thanked the Board.

Item 18. Economic Development & Tourism; Consider Appropriating American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Grant Funds to Provide Matched Funds of $150,000 to Support the Langley Foundation Exhibit at Stafford Regional Airport.

Ms. Vanuch said that she recalled the only outstanding question from the Board on this item was whether or not the Foundation was able to get sponsors.

Director of Economic and Development John Holden said that he understood that the Foundation had received commitment for sponsorship but did not have the details in front of him and would defer to Mr. Hornung to answer that.

Mr. Chris Hornung of the Langley Flight Foundation said that yes, they had commitments for $151,250.

Ms. Vanuch asked to have the names of the sponsors.

Mr. Hornung said that the list was provided in the staff report.

Ms. Yeung thanked Mr. Hornung for his email correspondence. She said that she was interested in the educational component of this, which was one of the only true reasons they could use the ARPA funding for this initiative. She said that she spoke to Dr. Taylor, and prior to Dr. Taylor sending Mr. Hornung a letter, they had a conversation about an aviation program for Prince William that was interested, and she was unsure if they had reached out to him about getting into the school system. She asked if she could send Mr. Hornung that information so that neither he nor Dr. Taylor had to start from scratch.

Mr. Hornung said that they contacted Prince George's County in Maryland, which had a space and aviation department and had spoken to the school system about modeling and using existing curriculum to build one in Stafford.

Ms. Yeung said that he had an aviation school and students. She said she would like to see the list of sponsors.

Ms. Vanuch said she would look at that list.

Mr. Hornung reiterated that the list was included in the staff report.

Ms. Gary thanked Mr. Hornung for his hard work and for thinking of their students. She said that any time they could make things better for them was important.

Ms. Gary motioned, seconded by Ms. Yeung, to approve proposed Resolution R22-266.

Mr. English said that he had been against this from day one. He said that this was spending $150,000 on something that would not be beneficial to this County, and the numbers associated with potential tourism were not something he believed would happen. He said that the $150,000 could be used for another project such as for Fire and Rescue, so he would be voting against this item.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(4)	Allen, Bohmke, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(2)	Coen, English
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Resolution R22-266 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AWARDING A LOCAL LEVEL INCENTIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GRANT TO MERRITT-AR1, LLC AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION TO ENTER INTO A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE STAFFORD COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND MERRITT-AR1, LLC

WHEREAS, the Board and the Stafford County Economic Development Authority (EDA) are committed to facilitating new economic development projects within Stafford County that generate positive, net tax revenues and jobs; and

WHEREAS, Merritt-AR1, LLC (Merritt) has proposed to develop five buildings totaling 393,000 square feet within the Hartwood Election District on Tax Map Parcel No. 29-80C, zoned B2, Urban Commercial that is projected to generate $650,000 in new, net positive tax revenues and 400 new jobs (Development); and

WHEREAS, the first phase of the Development will consist of Merritt completing and having available for lease to commercial tenants of one building and the extension of sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements along Cedar Lane (Project); and

WHEREAS, in support of the Development, and to induce Merritt to make the capital investment in Stafford County, create new jobs, and assist in the retention, expansion, and relocation of existing businesses and industries within Stafford County, the County and EDA desire to offer a Local Level Incentive Economic Development Grant (Grant) to complete the Project in the amount of up to $1,650,000; and

WHEREAS, American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds may be used to replace public sector revenue loss for government services, which includes funding economic development and growth within the County; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to engage the EDA, and the EDA desires to assist the County, with the disbursement of the Grant to Merritt upon completion of the Project; and

WHEREAS, ARPA grant funds were previously appropriated pursuant to Resolution R21-262 to support sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements along Cedar Lane and the Board desires to repurpose those funds for the Project; and

WHEREAS, the award of the Grant to Merritt requires execution of a memorandum of agreement between the County, EDA, and Merritt specifying the requirements of the grant and the Project;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that it be and hereby does award a Local Level Incentive Economic Development Grant in the amount of up to One Million Six Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($1,650,000) of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to be disbursed to Merritt-AR1, LLC through the Stafford County Economic Development Authority (EDA) upon completion of one building for commercial use on Tax Map Parcel No. 29-80C, the extension of sewer improvements along Cedar Lane (Project), and any other conditions precedent as may be required in the below authorized memorandum of understanding (MOU); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that that County Administrator is authorized to execute a MOU with the EDA and Merritt-AR1, LLC, which sets forth the terms and conditions of the disbursement of Local Level Incentive Grant and the Project requirements.

<u>Item 19. Economic Development & Tourism; Consider Awarding A Local-Level Incentive Economic Development Grant Using ARPA Funds to Merritt-Ar1, LLC And Authorizing the County Administrator to Enter into A Memorandum of Understanding with The Stafford Economic Development Authority and Merrit-Ar1, LLC.</u>

Ms. Vanuch asked if this item had been on the Consent Agenda and was now on Unfinished Business. She said that Board members had had the opportunity to ask questions and gather information from staff, so she did not know if they required a full presentation. She said that Supervisor English wanted to read something.

Mr. English read the following disclosure statement: "I would like to disclose that I own property at 60 Cedar Lane. As a property owner, I am a member of a group of property owners which may be affected by the Board's actions on the proposed Resolution to approve an economic development incentive grant to Merritt-AR1, LLC to develop Stafford County Tax Map Parcel No. 29-80C and extend sanitary sewer along Cedar Lane. The Board's discussion, consideration, and vote on proposed Resolution R22-62 will not apply solely to my property, and will only indirectly benefit myself and my family by providing a future possibility to connect to the public sewer system. In accordance with Virginia Code Section 2.2-3112(B)(1), I am able to participate fairly, objectively, and in the best interest of the public. The clerk will please record my declaration in the record today and at any future meeting where the Board discusses or considers this matter."

Ms. Vanuch asked if the Supervisors had any questions.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. English, for approval of proposed Resolution R22-62.

Ms. Vanuch asked if there was any discussion.

Ms. Bohmke said that she met with Mr. Holden and Mr. Vosburg about this because the Board approved this last year, and she wanted to remind everyone that this was a $78 million investment in Stafford County of commercial development. She said that she appreciated the disclosure that Supervisor English read, but when the Board made this decision, it had no bearing on the fact that it would benefit anyone on Cedar Lane, but it happened to be where the pump station was located and was what was important there. She said that it would be a great project and was ceremonial for the Board, because they were putting in place what their previous Board had agreed to.

Ms. Yeung thanked Mr. English for his disclosure. She said that she had pulled the item the last time they were there because she had to do further research because she had not been on the Board when it was first before the Board in June of 2021. She said that Supervisor English was on the Planning Commission at that time, and Mr. Coen was also already on the Board, and he asked for an overlay of the tax map, and the only thing she thought was not totally transparent was that it was that the entire parcel was covered.

Ms. Yeung said that she required meeting with Mr. Vosburg to remedy her confusion and to understand that the sewer did not have anything to do with the property they were speaking of. She said that she was still standing on where she did before, which was that she would not vote to use ARPA funds for this to pass through the EDA, regardless of the financial benefits they had right now. She said that those funds could be used better, for sewage in Hartwood schools or on Brook Road, but not for this.

Mr. Coen said that his reason for voting against this last year was largely in part due to the extension of this to the sewer, they could theoretically put in more homes. He said that he was on the losing side of that, but he was very concerned about the impact of all of these theoretical homes, even by-right homes, particularly on the school system. He said however, this was a perfunctory vote today, and the majority of the Board voted last year that the economic benefit was worth the risk of theoretically having homes in the future, so he would support this this year, because once the Board voted, the feeling was that they should be supportive of what the members had said, but he would continue to be watchful of residential use creeping into that area.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(5)	Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch
Nay:	(1)	Yeung
Absent:	(1)	Allen

Resolution R22-62 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AWARDING A LOCAL LEVEL INCENTIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GRANT TO MERRITT-AR1, LLC AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION TO ENTER INTO A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE STAFFORD COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND MERRITT-AR1, LLC

WHEREAS, the Board and the Stafford County Economic Development Authority (EDA) are committed to facilitating new economic development projects within Stafford County that generate positive, net tax revenues and jobs; and

WHEREAS, Merritt-AR1, LLC (Merritt) has proposed to develop five buildings totaling 393,000 square feet within the Hartwood Election District on Tax Map Parcel No. 29-80C, zoned B2, Urban Commercial that is projected to generate $650,000 in new, net positive tax revenues and 400 new jobs (Development); and

WHEREAS, the first phase of the Development will consist of Merritt completing and having available for lease to commercial tenants of one building and the extension of sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements along Cedar Lane (Project); and

WHEREAS, in support of the Development, and to induce Merritt to make the capital investment in Stafford County, create new jobs, and assist in the retention, expansion, and relocation of existing businesses and industries within Stafford County, the County and EDA desire to offer a Local Level Incentive Economic Development Grant (Grant) to complete the Project in the amount of up to $1,650,000; and

WHEREAS, American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds may be used to replace public sector revenue loss for government services, which includes funding economic development and growth within the County; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to engage the EDA, and the EDA desires to assist the County, with the disbursement of the Grant to Merritt upon completion of the Project; and

WHEREAS, ARPA grant funds were previously appropriated pursuant to Resolution R21-262 to support sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements along Cedar Lane and the Board desires to repurpose those funds for the Project; and

WHEREAS, the award of the Grant to Merritt requires execution of a memorandum of agreement between the County, EDA, and Merritt specifying the requirements of the grant and the Project;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that it be and hereby does award a Local Level Incentive Economic Development Grant in the amount of up to One Million Six Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($1,650,000) of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to be disbursed to Merritt-AR1, LLC through the Stafford County Economic Development Authority (EDA) upon completion of one building for commercial use on Tax Map Parcel No. 29-80C, the extension of sewer improvements along Cedar Lane (Project), and any other conditions precedent as may be required in the below authorized memorandum of understanding (MOU); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that that County Administrator is authorized to execute a MOU with the EDA and Merritt-AR1, LLC, which sets forth the terms and conditions of the disbursement of Local Level Incentive Grant and the Project requirements.

Ms. Vanuch asked for a motion to table Item #20, the discussion of Downtown Stafford, until after the evening recess.

Supervisor Yeung motioned, seconded by Supervisor English, to table the discussion of item #20 until after the recess.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No:	(0)	
Absent:	(1)	Allen

RECESS

At 5:50 p.m., the Board recessed its meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

Item 20. Discuss Repeal of Zoning and Comprehensive Plan Aspects of Downtown Stafford and Associated County-Owned Property.

Ms. Vanuch said that she required a motion to untable the item for Downtown Stafford.

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to untable item #20.

Ms. Yeung asked the County Attorney if this item stayed tabled if she did not vote on it. She said that she would vote no to keep it tabled.

Ms. Vanuch asked why Ms. Yeung would do so if they specifically asked for it to come forward.

Ms. Yeung said that she did not believe that they would be speaking about it today.

Ms. Vanuch said that this was asked to be on the agenda, and Ms. Yeung specifically asked for this briefing in the Chair and Vice Chair meeting.

Ms. Yeung asked why it was tabled for today.

Ms. Vanuch said that was so that they could have their dinner break because they did not have their 7:00 p.m. meeting today. She said that otherwise, the Board would have had to take a vote to do it, so what the County Attorney recommended they do was to table it to come back after dinner.

Ms. Allen asked how many votes were required to take the item off of the table.

Ms. McClendon said a majority—or four votes—would be required.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(4)	Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch
Nay:	(1)	Allen
Absent:	(1)	Yeung

Mr. Harvey said that his presentation would hopefully clarify some information for the Board. He said that the Board asked on September 6 for staff to return to brief the Board about Downtown Stafford, possibly revisiting the current planning effort and looking at options and considerations for those options. He said that last year, the Board of Supervisors approved a comprehensive plan amendment for a small area plan for Downtown Stafford. He said they also amended the zoning code to change some of the densities in the urban development zoning category to accommodate higher density to support parking garage structures as well as rezoning of County-owned property to the urban development zoning category.

Mr. Harvey said that there had been discussion about creating a downtown for the County for the last 16 years. He said that a topic of discussion over multiple Boards was that several citizens as well as Board members had said that there was no Stafford in Stafford, where a series of suburban neighborhoods with commercial along their main roadways, and they looked like any other suburban locality with no sense of place. He said that in 2006, they began a community survey in which staff polled the community in the nearby area and asked what kind of development they would like around the courthouse, with pictures of density, pictures of dwelling unit types, pictures of streetscapes, and accepted feedback.

Mr. Harvey said that that led to community meetings where they designed more detail into it, coming out with the redevelopment area plan. He said that the General Assembly in 2010 said that localities now had to have urban development areas and higher density that could support transit. He said that they modified the comprehensive plan to have a small area plan, which was then known as the Urban Development Area Plan, which covered a part of what was called the Stafford Courthouse area. He said along with that, they also created their first Urban Development Area Zone. He said that the Board developed and adopted a Strategic Plan that gave further direction, and where they were today was the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Downtown Stafford as well as what was mentioned earlier about the rezoning of the County's property as a method to move forward Phase 1 of the Downtown Stafford concept.

Mr. Harvey said that he referenced the Urban Development Area Plan and displayed on the slide was a map image from the planning document that contemplated lower density than they currently had in their downtown plan. He said the residential densities would range from four units per acre for single family, six units per acre for townhomes, and 12 units per acre for multi-family. He said that there were several units allocated for the whole planning area, which was 3,186, with the breakdown of dwelling unit types and types of units. He said that overall, 2.7 million square feet of nonresidential development could be used for commercial, office, restaurant, and civic government uses.

Mr. Harvey stated that that fit into an overall scheme for the Targeted Development Area. He said that as they may recall from last year when they redid the entire comprehensive plan and adopted it in November, there was a concept called Targeted Development Area, which was meant to be where half of the future residential growth was occurring, and where they wanted significant amounts of commercial development. He said that the map on the slide and its current colors reflected that concept; the outer perimeters would be suburban, shown in yellow, composed primarily of two-story detached single-family homes, and mixed-use was shown in purple, allowing a variety of housing types and commercial activities interspersed. He said that the red area was highway commercial- and industrial-oriented along Interstate 95.

Mr. Harvey said that the diagram showed a red box where the Downtown Stafford area was. He said Downtown Stafford was a nested kind of development pattern. He said that the Targeted Development Area was a bigger area indicated on the slide, and the Downtown Stafford area was a subset of that, creating a nested level of sub-planning in which one built on top of the other. He said that it gave them a framework that was a vision for how things might look and a vision for people who potentially would like to invest in the County and build their community.

Mr. Harvey said that the Board of Supervisors adopted a Strategic Plan in 2018, and specifically written was an aspirational goal for Downtown Stafford. He read "Downtown Stafford, a vibrant cultural and commercial district with diverse restaurants, retail, and a myriad of housing types, is a focus of community life. Downtown Stafford features state-of-the-art amenities with a hometown feel, providing urban life at its best." He said that one of the priorities of the Strategic Plan was to begin construction of the first phase of Downtown Stafford through a public-private partnership.

Mr. Harvey showed a slide of the concept plan for the downtown area, shown on the right side, and a graphic prepared for the overall scheme. He said that the County had hired an architecture and engineering firm that was well known throughout the country as Stantec, a company focused on designing urban centers for cities and towns throughout the nation. He said that the rendering on the left showed a focus point for the overall Downtown Stafford plan, which was noted as a town plaza.

Mr. Harvey said that several Board members attended a tour in 2018 to see some nearby suburban town centers, and one of the things that attracted them was Rockville Town Center, which had an urban plaza framed by buildings and parking garages. He said that some of the buildings included a library and buildings that had ground-floor retail with restaurants and apartments above them. He said that that was part of what drove them to where they were going, and the concept shown was the urban plaza framed by several buildings, including a retail building, parking garage, and other buildings that may have multi-family with ground-floor retail.

Mr. Harvey said that the Comprehensive Plan Amendment that focused on that was an amendment to the text that described the land use concept plan he had just shown and identified some public facilities that were lacking in the current comprehensive plan. He said that notably, the comprehensive plan did not show the new courthouse that had been long planned and discussed by the County, and under state code, they must identify any public facility that they would put public dollars toward the construction of in the comprehensive plan. He said that it also showed a trail system leading from the intersection of Bell's Hill Road and Hope Road down through the County Complex to the downtown area and several features. He said that it also had recommendations for development densities, building heights, and design features for the community.

Mr. Harvey said that the concept plan was shown again on the screen and was focused between I-95 and Route 1. He said that it was different than the prior Urban Development Plan, because when that plan was being developed, they were unsure of how the interchange would come out, and that was one of the driving factors of looking at a new concept for the downtown. He stated that the focus for the downtown shifted a bit; in this plan, the focus for downtown had a highest-density area located along Courthouse Road near the courthouse in the segment of roadway circled. He stated that the EDA plan showed the higher density area being focused around Richmond Highway on both sides of the road.

Mr. Harvey said that similar to the EDA plan, there was a grid street network, which was necessary to make sure that the traffic kept flowing on Richmond Highway and provided convenience for the future residents and businesses in that area, as well as opening up other opportunities for additional businesses. He said that as he mentioned earlier, they understood that with building the courthouse they would be removing parking from this complex that was requiring them to have additional parking on the other side of Courthouse Road.

Mr. Harvey said that right now, the Phase 1 plan with the Fountain Park project was helping them build a temporary gravel parking lot, but the ultimate goal was, as the County Office use grew in this area, to construct a parking structure, which was identified on the plan in location 2 with ground-floor retail in front of it. He said that also, there was a long-standing discussion about establishing a museum and cultural center, which was identified in this vicinity, and as he mentioned earlier, there was a park shown as number 9.

Mr. Harvey said that the zoning ordinance amendments changed some things with the UD districts. He said that UD-1 was analyzed and decided that it was not giving value to their ordinance, so it was deleted as a sub-district. He said that UD-4 and UD-5 were modified, with UD-5 having the highest level of density, going up to five stories in height and 50 DU per acre. He said that the amendments also dealt with area ratio requirements as well as setbacks and allowed for more on-street parking and parking credits. He said that there was discussion and change of the code concerning street and block standards, because they found that the block standards in the code were too small.

Mr. Harvey said that the Planning Commission was interested in increasing the width of the sidewalks, because the Planning Commission at the time was focused on bringing restaurants and other businesses to this downtown area that could have spillover into the sidewalk and community, and especially in the context of what was seen now with COVID-19, it was important to allow people to interact outside and not need to be inside the building to conduct business.

Mr. Harvey said that for the County-owned property, there was a rezoning of 23 acres, and the intended purpose was for mixed-use development with residential office, retail, and entertainment uses possible. He said that this was County-owned property, so the Board of Supervisors was totally in control of what happened on the property. He noted that on the County property, the concept plan had proposed 673 total units, composed of 22 townhomes and 651 multi-family units. He said that the County-owned property was highlighted in red on the screen.

Mr. Harvey showed a Generalized Development Plan, which showed the property in red, and the Fountain Park property, labeled JPI, was to the right in blue. He said that the Board also rezoned the JPI property to the UD-5 zone to create an opportunity for more mixed residential, office, and retail space, and in exchange, the County swapped land with JPI so that the County could get right-of-way to improve Route 1 and Courthouse Road intersection, and they received land to expand a project to include more buildings and space for future development. He said he would now go through options and alternatives for the Board.

Mr. Harvey said that the first option, as with any planning study, was to do nothing or keep the status quo. He said that if nothing happened and they were at the status quo, developers would come to the Board to seek zoning reclassifications based on the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. He said that the Board was not obligated to rezone any property, but he would note that as they saw in a lot of situations in the County, it would likely be necessary to have some rezoning so developers could build the necessary infrastructure to service the planned vision for the area, including streets, sidewalks, utility lines, and stormwater management facilities.

Mr. Harvey said that another option was repealing the downtown area plan, which would require public hearings with both the Planning Commission and the Board because it was part of the Comprehensive Plan. He said that if repealed, there was a nested arrangement with the planning for this area, so it would default to the small area plan for the courthouse area, also known as the Urban Area Development Plan. He said that it would have 1,700 fewer dwelling units for the targeted development planning area, which was mainly a function of when the downtown area plan was developed, it was focused on a vision of some of the Board members who wanted to incorporate parking garages in the buildings so there would be higher-end residential dwelling units.

Mr. Harvey said that to do that and to make it cost-effective, they generally required a density of 40 to 50 units per acre to make structured parking a viable option, so overall, if they went in this direction back to the EDA plan, there would still be 1,386 units and 2.7 million square feet within the small area plan study area, and the overall Targeted Development Area would have almost 4,000 units and 4.5 million square feet of commercial use in the planning area on both sides of the interstate.

Mr. Harvey said that the current EDA plan had designated the County-owned property along Courthouse Road for civic or government use, and at one time, prior to the downtown plan being developed, and when the EDA plan was being developed, the courthouses were going to be on the south side of Courthouse Road, with a master plan for a general district court and a circuit court on that property, but the County chose to move the courthouse to the north side of the complex, which led them to what they should do with the County property.

Mr. Harvey said that option three was to create a new downtown plan that was focused solely on commercial development, which was something discussed at the last Board meeting in September and would require public hearings with the Planning Commission and Board. He said that it would also require review by VDOT, because state code indicated that if they were going to amend the Comprehensive Plan and land use recommendations, it needed to be reviewed for concurrency by VDOT to ensure that they agreed with the land use impacts on the transportation system.

Mr. Harvey said that from a staff perspective and in talking to Economic Development, if this were going to become a mostly commercially-focused area, it would probably have to be geared toward entertainment and hospitality venues, and one of the drawbacks was that it may not generate daytime activity, so it would probably not give the effect of a downtown. He said that they would need to hire a consultant to draw up the new plan, a market analysis to figure out the best source of entertainment or hospitality to attract there, and a traffic study to model the future impacts, because the traffic impact would be higher than what was anticipated for the current planning effort. He said that the positive impact would be that there would be no impacts on the schools if it were an entirely commercial area.

Mr. Harvey said that the fourth and final option for the planning aspect would be to take a look at a new downtown concept and potentially lower residential density. He said that this would also require public hearings with the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, as well as review by VDOT. He said that staff recommended again to hire a consultant to redraft the plan and perform a traffic study. He said that potential infrastructure impacts could be significantly altered if there were more or less intense development planned in regard to what was currently planned for.

Mr. Harvey said that concerning the County's property, the option of doing nothing was something that the Board could certainly consider. He said that the Board could consider the appropriate use for the property, and they could utilize the zoning for most existing government uses and other uses the Board may see fit, but if the use were not compatible with the zoning, at any time the Board could initiate a rezoning of the County's property. He said that if the Board did not want to move forward with government use, it could sell the property off to a developer to help them raise revenue to offset the funding for capital projects or work with the developer to construct public infrastructure as part of a sales agreement.

Mr. Harvey said that part of the thought process with Downtown Stafford and where they were today was that they would possibly have developers to build their town plaza, museum and cultural center, and parking garage. He said the County could pursue a public-private partnership or selling the County property because the Board was completely in charge of what happened on the property. He said that they could negotiate density and intensity of uses, what specific uses were allowed, and building and architecture. He said that if sold to a developer, the Board could also have influence on any school impacts on the property.

Mr. Harvey said that another option was to reclassify the property to something other than UD-5, which would require public hearings with the Planning Commission and the Board. He said that once the Board had the appropriate use for the property, they would decide the appropriate zoning to meet the Board's goals and evaluate infrastructure impacts on changing the zoning classifications.

Mr. Harvey said that some of the considerations from a staff perspective for downtown planning if proceeding in that direction were to ensure there was a mix of commercial, residential, civic, and community uses in a nearby vicinity to make it a vibrant area. He said that as an attraction, there must be open spaces that drew the community in, as well as serving the nearby community. He said multiple street connections for easy access was necessary to keep traffic flowing in this area and was not dependent strictly upon the existing traffic lights on Richmond Highway, which backed up quite a bit.

Mr. Harvey said that in his discussions with Stantec during development of the downtown plan, one of their recommendations was that they should have at least 1,000 households within ready walking distance of the commercial core to keep it vibrant. He said that staff looked at the 2020 census for guidance on that. He said that looking at the courthouse itself, because they had to set a physical address from which to do the search ring, they looked at a half-mile radius, and in 2020, there were 680 households, within a 1-mile radius there were 2,432 households. He said that generally, from a planning perspective, .25 mile to .5 mile was considered readily walkable for what were called pedestrian sheds.

Mr. Harvey said that there had been interest in Downtown Stafford. He said that in talking to Mr. John Holden this afternoon, they had received an inquiry from a national multi-use developer that was showing interest in Downtown Stafford. He said that the County had received a letter of intent from one group that was proposing a public-private partnership on the County-owned property. He said that he now sought guidance from the Board on the next steps.

Mr. English asked what the cost of a parking garage was in a redraw. He said that he would like the answer in the future.

Mr. Harvey said that the City of Fredericksburg had recently installed two parking garages, so they should be able to get relevant information from them. He said that in the budget request for the upcoming year, they were going to ask for $150,000 to do a small area plan. He said that the small area plan done in 2011 was done through a VDOT grant and cost $120,000.

Ms. Yeung asked if the Stantec design was performed in 2011.

Mr. Harvey said that it was done in 2019. He said the 2011 one was the urban area development plan, which had a different consultant that worked on it, which was Rhodeside and Harwell. He said that that firm was also a well-known architectural firm that designed urban downtown centers.

Ms. Yeung asked if they planned on getting a new commercial-only design, what kind of commercial would it be.

Mr. Harvey said that at the current time, staff believed it would result in commercial development focused on hospitality and some sort of event-type entertainment, because standard shopping center retail was no longer happening throughout the country and retail was changing significantly. He said that town centers were still attracting retail uses, but the standard shopping malls were becoming a thing of the past.

Ms. Yeung said she did not know what kind of events they would attract if they could not get restaurants in the area, especially if no one lived there. She said that during the time, if there was commercial space, she assumed people would be eating fast food because they could not get a restaurant. She said she did not know who would come for that entertainment and hospitality. She asked if there was quantifiable information about this. She said that she was more concerned about Downtown Garrisonville and uptown Embrey.

Mr. Coen said he had previously asked Mr. Vosburg if there were any details about plans being brought forward. He said that since at least two options were being floated out there, he would like to know if there was any idea of a timeline for getting information about that. He said he asked that because in some people's minds, it was an either/or situation, so it may make a difference to the discussion if it could move from theoretical to practical. He asked if they could receive information on something in November or December.

Mr. Harvey said that he was trying to process Mr. Coen's question.

Ms. Vanuch said that Mr. Coen was referring to the letter of intent and a separate request for information that was received today. She asked if that would be presented in a closed session.

Mr. Coen said that he would ask the County Administrator.

Mr. Vosburg said that he did not know how detailed the report received today was, but Mr. Holden might better speak to that. He said that they did receive the letter of interest, under a non-disclosure, but internally discussed the details and had not formally given it to the Board to consider.

Ms. Gary said that she would like to see more of the information going forward. She said that they may defer this until new information was received.

Mr. Holden said that the letter of intent was sent under a confidentiality agreement and could certainly be brought into a closed session. He said that there had been at least three others who had expressed interest, including a contact made today, about the plans and how to proceed with what the County wanted. He said that he had expressed the fact that they were having these discussions and would certainly be in touch with them once given more guidance.

Ms. Gary said in the original discussion, she had mentioned that she would like to see some of the density lowered for housing and still create a viable downtown, which was a good middle ground, but one that she did not want to affect any of the proposals coming forward. She said that she did not know what the recommendation at this point was.

Ms. Bohmke said that being involved in this, one of her reasons for apprehension was because of the density and the area. She said that she believed that they needed a Downtown Stafford and that was important for the community, but she would like to see the density greatly reduced. She said that they would be foolish as a Board to think that they could survive with just a commercial development, and she did not think that the proposals they were to receive from developers would be very strong unless there was some housing component of some type. She said that the number should be brought down, and she would like to consider what those proposals were, but not necessarily rely on them, because from her standpoint, they were in the best situation that the downtown of any community would want to see, which was that they actually owned their own land.

Ms. Bohmke said that usually in these positions, they were subjected to whatever the developer wanted to do because the developer was the owner of the land and therefore the driving force. She said that they had the ability to tell them what they would like to see in their community, and she hoped that there would be a lot of give and take during the process to achieve that. She said that she would like to look at what developers had proposed, which would get the Supervisors to talk and attempt to figure out what exactly they wanted, because no one really knew. She said that the timetable Mr. Harvey showed went all the way back to 2006, and they were still at this point today.

Mr. Coen said that he had always had concerns about the density for this project. He said that if individuals communicated that, it helped Mr. Holden and Mr. Harvey in their communications with entities to describe what they were and were not interested in. He said that he did not know what they had planned for their next few meetings, so he did not know if they would be able to have a closed session in which they discussed this. He said he would like to eventually hear about where it was, but he agreed with those who suggested deferral until more information was received.

Ms. Yeung said that they discussed wanting to be transformational, with cultural diversity and businesses and restaurants. She said they had a developer right now, but she did not want Mr. Vosburg to be involved in this because he knew the Supervisors' views of Stafford. She said that they needed to decide as a whole Board what they wanted the future of Stafford to be, because if they did not know and were not in agreement, then they were giving different information to developers who may not want to come here when the County was ready. She said that she did not want the developer to receive information that sounded like it was coming from the Board. She said that she would like to hear from the developers and how they saw it, because bringing one forward would allow them to directly hear a plan instead of hearing through staff.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was in agreement on the conversation of them deciding what they wanted to see. She said that she was curious about what Mr. Holden told developers about what the County wanted to see. She said that with the challenges in the Garrisonville and Aquia Town Center and getting anything done there made her nervous that without having a true, clear vision, all they would see were proposals to get a lot of residential development, which was reflected in her comments when the Board passed that at the 2021 meeting, and the biggest concern was that the developers that had been conferred with said that it could be up to 10,000 residential units for a vibrant downtown area to offset the aspects of the commercial development.

Ms. Vanuch said that she discussed with Ms. McClendon that the Board would like to see this at the next closed session and it did not sound like they would be able to discuss in a closed session what the Board would like to see and only discussions based solely on that, but she did not know if the next step was a Board meeting to have a work session, if they continued it on the next agenda, or if they set up a separate Board meeting, but the Board required staff's guidance on options on what they could ask the developers to present for downtown, because that might get more of them on the same page. She said that if there only had to be 800 residential units and they had already approved 373 at JPI, she might be more amenable to an idea, but her current view of the future plan was something she wanted repealed as quickly as possible.

Ms. Vanuch said that they needed staff's help to understand what to ask for, and then they needed to ask what was realistic and what was not. She said almost every Board member said that they did not want a lot of residential development to happen there, but some residential was required to offset the commercial aspects, and if a developer came to the Board and said that they needed 7,000 units, she doubted that many of the Supervisors would agree. She said she would like to take it off of the main agenda and set up a committee meeting where they discussed what they wanted to see and get community feedback. She said that the community feedback in 2006 was requesting a town center, and the current plan was much different than that, so she was unsure if the public input for this commercial and residential development had been adequately gathered. She said they perhaps should have a work session to specifically decide what they all wanted for Downtown Stafford.

Ms. Gary said that a work session was a fantastic idea for going into this. She said that conceptually, when creating a downtown area in a rural place, which Stafford still was in some parts, there must be an agreement in vision, culture, and community, so if they could get more agreement as a Board in a work session for what to do moving forward, it would be very helpful and not waste time because they would agree on a cohesive vision.

Mr. English said that he would like to see in a closed session what the developer would offer them and what road they would go down before even going to work session so they could have an idea of what a developer would request. He said there was a Publix in the area, but he was unsure of how it would fit into the plan.

Ms. Vanuch asked Mr. Vosburg to address when they could have a closed session on this item.

Mr. Vosburg said that the Board appeared to be open to a mixed-use development depending on the density, so it was a significant takeaway when there were developer inquiries and they might receive additional inquiries. He said that when Mr. Holden answered the question of what the Board wanted, right now it was that it had been adopted, so they could state that, but also knew that the current Board was conflicted. He said that to hear that the Board might be open to a mixed-use development meant that they could now go back to some of those who had inquired and tell them that the Board was interested in a mixed-use development and to give a proposal. He said that perhaps now they could get a couple of proposals to discuss in the closed session. He said that they could certainly go into closed session for the one that they had, and if they got more, they could do that again, or if giving more time after hearing what was floated today to get more ideas.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was unsure if the Board was bought in on the mixed-use development. She said that looking at the map, it already said that they had 2,400 walkable units, and the additional 300 apartment units on the corner, so they needed to see what it would require to make it viable. She said that they all needed to have a serious meeting about how many residential units would be acceptable and what the offset would be in terms of commercial development.

Ms. Vanuch said that she did not think any of them could do that, otherwise they would have another issue like Aquia Town Center, in which a developer said they wanted to do something and then during a work session they found it unacceptable. She said that they would waste Mr. Holden's time and the Board's time on something they understood would not pass, so they needed to see that proposal altogether at the next Board meeting in whatever state it was in, and understand what people were thinking, followed by a work session to work out details.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was interested in understanding where the Garrisons project was. She said that they had not been briefed on it in a very long time, and between that and Aquia Town Center, they had to ask why those projects were not moving forward. She said that there must be a conversation about that and understand it before moving forward with something about Downtown Stafford. She asked if those were insular things that the Board could not control and unrelated to the Downtown Stafford project.

Mr. Coen said that Ms. Bohmke brought up an excellent point. He said that type of information would be beneficial, because if the County had sole decision-making power on their own property versus another owner, the density argument was interesting, because they could always decline an offer and nothing happened. He said that when there was a closed session, it also gave feedback for staff to talk to other entities and the proposal.

Mr. Coen said that they had to be practical about the fact that they were heading into the season of holidays and scheduling a meaningful work session. He said that going into a closed session on the one they had given them good guidance on what was there and being talked about, and if the other entities had other information, they could see that and go forward from there. He said that the Board members wanted to do this the right way, so he was agreeable with doing a closed session and move forward from there.

Mr. Vosburg said that part of the timing of the work session would be dictated by what information the Board would like to see. He said that they had 16 years of information, and Mr. Harvey recounted the most pertinent information in his presentation, but he was hearing about different issues from the Board, so perhaps the Board could give feedback on what they would like to see, then staff could gauge the work involved with that and schedule that work session.

Ms. Vanuch said that it was fine so long as her colleagues agreed, but she knew that they had to have this figured out by March.

CLOSED MEETING

At 7:50 p.m., Ms. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to adopt Resolution CM22-24 to authorize closed session.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM22-24 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for discussion and consideration of the acquisition of real property for recreational and fire facilities purposes, where such discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiation strategy of the Board,

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 1st day of November, 2022, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING - SEC. 2.2-3711 (A)

At 8:29 p.m., Ms. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to adopt Resolution CM22-24 (C) to certify the closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Allen, Bohmke, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No:	(0)	
Absent:	(1)	Coen

Resolution CM22-24 (C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON NOVEMBER 1, 2022

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 1st day of November, 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 1st day of November, 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.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8:30 p.m., Chairman Vanuch adjourned the November 1, 2022 Stafford County Board of Supervisors meeting.

Randal E. Vosburg
County Administrator

Crystal L. Vanuch
Chairman