BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) WORK SESSION
November 15, 2022

CALL TO ORDER – A work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Crystal Vanuch, Chairman, at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 15, 2022, in Conference Room ABC, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

ROLL CALL – The following members were present: Crystal Vanuch, Chairman; Pamela Yeung, Vice Chairman; Tinesha O. Allen; Meg Bohmke; Thomas C. Coen; Darrell English; Monica Gary.

Ms. Vanuch called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

WORK SESSION

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA)
Mr. Randal Vosburg, County Administrator, explained the presentation would center around the provided spreadsheet. He said the left column of the spreadsheet represented the revenue retention, or the less restrictive dollars. He said it was funding which the Treasury determined the total allocation to be about $30M, and $10M could be used for revenue replacement.

Mr. Vosburg explained that technically, they could take the $10M and put it into the County's savings. He said instead, they decided to utilize some of the funding for projects. He stated that in the first box were appropriated projects. He said the data had been updated to reflect recent actions by the Board regarding pay-raise items.

Mr. Vosburg said the second box on the spreadsheet was the staff's recommendation, and the items included were the Sheriff's pay raise, the body-worn cameras, and the message boards. He said there was a remaining balance of $98K. He said the bottom box included projects that staff recommended be removed mainly due to funding limitations.

Mr. Vosburg stated that staff recommended the remaining $98K be rolled into the County's savings. He noted that the funds could be used for various costs and projects.

Ms. Yeung clarified whether the staff recommendations were staff following through with Board decisions.

Mr. Vosburg explained that in some cases, the Board requested more information or did not make a particular recommendation. He said the Board had entertained some of the economic development items but had not approved or denied any.

Ms. Yeung said she wanted clarification regarding what staff was recommending.

Ms. Vanuch said the only mention of staff's recommendation was as to what should be removed at the bottom of the spreadsheet.

Ms. Yeung noted that there were staff recommendations for projects at the bottom of the spreadsheet.

Mr. Vosburg explained that the staff recommendation was that funding come from ARPA sources. He said the Board had approved the action item, so staff was making a recommendation for funding based on the Board's approval.

Ms. Yeung said that should be clarified in the document. She said staff did not recommend the action item, and it was a Board decision.

Mr. Vosburg said it was a Board-approved action, which staff was now recommending funding come from ARPA.

Ms. Gary clarified that the Board approved the action to fund the item, and staff was recommending the funding source come from ARPA.

Mr. Vosburg said that was correct. He said when the item was presented to the Board, there was language that discussed the funding. He noted that there were some line-item funds that could be taken from ARPA for the raise.

Ms. Gary noted the cost of the Brooke Fire Station repairs could have changed. She asked if Fire and Rescue had a reserve fund for volunteer stations.

Ms. Light responded yes. She explained that at the end of every fiscal year, if the volunteers had savings in their budget, then it was set aside for volunteer fire station improvements. She said she believed there was about $600K available in the fund which would provide sufficient funding for the Brooke Fire Station.

Ms. Gary said she had not known the funding was available.

Ms. Bohmke noted the Falmouth Fire Station was being repaved using the volunteer reserve fund. She asked what the fund balance would be after the repaving project was completed.

Ms. Light responded that the initial amount was coming from the volunteer fire station, and the balance would be about $600K after the project was completed. She explained there was $300K available to do the repairs at the Brooke Fire Station.

Ms. Bohmke noted there was an outside consultant review underway. She asked how long the review would take.

Ms. Light responded that they often took a bit of time to respond. She explained the consultant had several clients requesting the same sort of services, so it sometimes took some time.

Ms. Bohmke said she was concerned about the health and welfare of the station.

Ms. Gary responded that she had been in discussions with people at the Brooke Station, and there were some opportunities to have the facility convey as a community center as well in the agreement with the County to do the repairs. She asked how much funding was typically leftover from the volunteer funds and what happened to the funds if they were not used.

Ms. Light responded that it varied year-to-year. She said they would be able to provide the Board with a review since they started.

Ms. Gary asked how many years back they would be able to get data.

Ms. Light responded that they had been doing it since FY18 or FY19.

Mr. Vosburg stated that if they adopted the staff recommendation and did not use ARPA funds for the Brooke Station but instead used the volunteer funds, they would no longer need to wait for the consultant review for the project. He explained the review was only necessary if the project was to be ARPA-eligible.

Mr. Vosburg explained the right column included restricted ARPA funding. He said there was approximately $19.7M that came into the more restrictive ARPA category. He said the top box included projects that had been approved by the Board and appropriated, and they had a combined cost of about $13M.

Mr. Vosburg said the next category was for projects that staff recommended continue to be funded. He said staff considered criteria such as whether the project would have to come before the Board and request a budgetary appropriation. He said many of the recommendations came from the Board's discussion as to what could be pulled from ARPA to fulfill a CIP or other budgetary need.

Mr. Vosburg said some of the projects had already been spent, so the funds would be reimbursed. He said the grant accountant would utilize staff funds that would otherwise have to be appropriated from some other source if not appropriated from ARPA. He said there were storage needs for Fire and Rescue. He said they would request an appropriation for light and air apparatus, rehab apparatus, and hazmat apparatus.

Mr. Vosburg said they prioritized some IT items, such as the WIFI access point and the firewalls. He said generators for shelters were included and were an absolute need to have at the shelters. He said the Carl Lewis Community Center had been removed from the CIP with the intention that ARPA funds would be used because of the eligibility based on the ability to administer vaccines at the facility.

Mr. Vosburg noted there was a utilities item of $150K for Duff Green Park.

Ms. Vanuch clarified the project was for a waterline that would serve Duff Green Park. She clarified that the column Mr. Vosburg was reading from was the projects staff recommended continuing. She stated that some of the projects the Board had taken action on, and others, the Board had not addressed.

Ms. Yeung said she had requested an ARPA meeting to better understand what was spent, the time frame left to spend the funds, and what funding was left. She asked for clarification regarding the remainder of funds that had to be appropriated or approved.

Mr. Vosburg responded that several of the items had come before the Board during workshops to contemplate further Board action. He said many of the recommendations were soft suggestions to move forward. He noted there were some exceptions and those had been noted. He said the Carl Lewis Community Center was one of the exceptions which had not been voted on by the Board and there had been no action.

Mr. Vosburg said that the first box represented appropriated projects and totaled almost $13M. He explained that Board action had been taken, and short of the Board undoing the action, the funds were considered spent. He said if that amount was subtracted from the total, about $19.6M, the County was left with about $6.7M, and that balance was what the Board could spend on projects moving forward.

Mr. Vosburg explained they were requesting the Board's feedback as to whether they wanted to move forward with the staff recommendation. He noted there were some items that staff did not weigh in on that were up for discussion. He noted that there were four projects at the bottom of the spreadsheet that staff believed could be removed.

Ms. Yeung asked for further clarification regarding the staff recommendations.

Mr. Vosburg explained that in some cases, the Board had weighed in.

Ms. Light responded that during the September 20 ARPA work session, the Board weighed in on the Fire and Rescue items, the IT items, discussed the Carl Lewis Center, and the Sheriff's pay raises.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the Board had voted on the Tribe Access Drive.

Ms. Vanuch responded that the Board had voted.

Ms. Bohmke noted that it was a reimbursement.

Mr. Vosburg said he believed it was during a work session, and the direction was to bring the item back before the Board during a meeting.

Ms. Bohmke said she did not remember the Brooke Road repairs being on the Board's agenda.

Mr. Vosburg said he had not gotten to that item yet.

Ms. Vanuch said staff had to go through each of the items and identify which the Board had taken action on and where there was consent.

Ms. Krauss responded that the Board had not taken action other than during a work session requesting the items be included on future consent items, other than the Sheriff pay raises. She stated that at the last meeting, the Board wanted the items to be on a future consent agenda.

Ms. Krauss noted that Mr. Vosburg had not discussed the grant accountant. She said all of the Fire and Rescue items were brought up during the work session, and staff noted the Board wanted to see the items on a future consent agenda.

Ms. Krauss said with the IT firewalls and fiber, the Board wanted to see the items before the Infrastructure Committee. She said that staff brought them before the committee and discussed them at the next meeting. She said the fiber project had been dropped and they decided to move forward with the WIFI access points and firewalls. She noted that the project had not received clear direction from the Board.

Ms. Krauss stated the Board wanted the generators included on a future consent agenda. She said that the Carl Lewis Center was up for discussion at a future Infrastructure meeting. She stated that Duff Green Park was to be included on a future consent agenda. She noted that the decision on the Sheriff's was already decided.

Ms. Light explained the water main transmission was from Little Falls to the Center Port area to bring water along another north-south path.

Ms. Vanuch asked what the total cost was for all the projects. She noted it was more than $6.7M

Mr. Vosburg said the total of the section was the remainder of what was available. He noted that the plugin was Brooke.

Ms. Vanuch noted that all of the projects added up to $6.7M if Brooke were removed.

Ms. Light said if they looked at the unappropriated balance, they were at $12.9M unappropriated. She said that the remainder of the projects, if Brooke was included, would spend the remainder of the funds. She said there were options for all of the projects.

Ms. Vanuch said she wanted to be clear as to how much ARPA funding was remaining. She clarified that there was $12.9M remaining.

Mr. Vosburg said that was correct and he had misspoken.

Ms. Gary asked which projects out of those staff had recommended continuing were related to safety. She asked which projects addressed safety concerns.

Mr. Vosburg noted that in terms of safety, Brooke Road could be included. He noted the Fire and Rescue items, such as the light and air apparatus, rehab apparatus, and hazmat apparatus. He stated that firewalls were a precautionary public safety item. He said generators for shelters were a safety item along with the pay raises for the Sheriff's Department.

Ms. Bohmke asked whether any County residents would receive service from the Duff Green waterline.

Mr. Mike Morris said the line into Duff Green Park would only service the Patawomeck Tribe. He said they hoped the line would be able to extend to the existing park which did not have water or sewer.

Ms. Bohmke asked why the developers were not requested to pay for the water main connections.

Chris Edwards, Director of Utilities spoke about connection from Lake Mooney to Centreport Parkway and increased inflation costs.

Ms. Bohmke asked how much of the $2.4M could be dedicated or allocated for the businesses. She asked if the funding would benefit any business that was not there.

[inaudible 01:10:45 – 01:11:05]

Ms. Bohmke asked if the item could become safety-related.

Mr. Morris said the primary reason was to balance the water supply. He explained that currently, they relied on Smith Lake, and the project balanced the supply so that there was some redundant capacity.

Ms. Yeung asked Ms. Bohmke to repeat her second question.

Ms. Bohmke said she asked whether the items were safety-related, and then whether there were any businesses that would directly benefit.

Ms. Yeung noted the $1.6M for the Cedar Lane utility extension. She asked if anybody benefited directly from the project.

Ms. Yeung asked if it was safety-related. She said if it was safety-related, then the whole Hartwood area would be safety-related because many residents in the area were on wells.

Ms. Yeung asked where the $2.9M in EDA funds were included in the spreadsheet.

Ms. Krauss explained that at the last work session when they presented the initial strategy, one of the funding sources was economic development. She noted that there was also citizen support as another source. She said that at the September 20 ARPA work session, the Board indicated that it was moving away from the strategy and looking at what was left and making determinations.

Ms. Krauss said $2M in projects were identified by the EDA, which were then reviewed by staff.

Mr. Morris explained it had originally been at $2.9M, but it had been reduced to close to $2M. He said just over $1M in actual projects had been approved by the Board. He said out of the $2.9M, only about $1M had been approved, and the remainder was included in the leftover funds. He noted the projects were contained in each category.

Ms. Vanuch noted that all but two of the projects in the second category had come before the Board. She said in discussions with the majority of the Board, they had become more hesitant about supporting some items. She said if there were $12M in ARPA funds and $16M in requests, then the Board needed to get on the same page with staff.

Ms. Vanuch stated that the Board needed to have a longer work session and invite the individuals responsible for the project requests to provide a background report and be present to answer questions. She stated that the Board needed additional information and to take its time reviewing items. She noted the two projects that were most recently added should be presented to a committee meeting.

Ms. Vanuch said the Board needed to have good background information, and if directors did not want to provide the information, then they would not get the funding. She said the Board had to evaluate what was ARPA-eligible on the CIP and what it would do to the tax rate if they were to use the full $12M.

Mr. English said he agreed. He asked what the time limit was to spend the funds.

Mr. Vosburg said the funds had to be encumbered by 2024 and spent by 2026.

Mr. English said he agreed that they needed to have a better work session.

Ms. Vanuch said it was a lot of information to cover in a short period. She stated that the Board needed more information on each of the items.

Ms. Gary said the Board needed more information. She said she wanted more information regarding Brooke.

Mr. English noted that the Commissioner of Revenues remodel may be a safety concern.

Mr. Vosburg said staff tried to take the Board's feedback and determine if there were projects that could use ARPA funding that would otherwise use regular County funds. He said when they reviewed the items staff was recommending, that was the answer to the question.

Mr. Vosburg explained that if they did not use the ARPA funds for the $525K cost of the light and air apparatus replacement, then the apparatus was still needed, so County funds would be used. He said the same concept applied to Brooke Road.

Mr. Vosburg explained there was $7M factored into the CIP for Brooke Road. He noted the road had also been deemed eligible for ARPA funding. He said the Board could approve the full $7M for Brooke Road. He explained staff took the items it believed it would be requesting for budgetary impact and took the remainder toward the Brooke Road project which freed up $4.769M from the CIP.

Ms. Vanuch asked for clarification on whether it was out of the CIP or the transportation fund.

Ms. Light responded that the Brooke Road project was in the transportation fund, and it was funded from unrestricted cash provided by the General Fund.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that it was not the CIP.

Ms. Light responded that it was the CIP—it was what was provided to the Board at the meeting. She said it was included with unrestricted cash, so the Board could use the funding for transportation projects or move it back to the CIP fund for other projects.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the unrestricted cash referred to the money saved from the interest rates.

Ms. Light explained that some of the funds were from the personal property tax dedicated to the project, and some was from year-end funding. She explained that there was about $3M accumulated from year-end savings. She stated that the Board had directed $1M to be added to the fund balance for transportation. She said the cash was unrestricted and could be used for any project across the County of SCPS.

Ms. Vanuch said they had to see the impacts of moving the funding if the cost was to be offset. She said they had to have a holistic review of what would meet the criteria.

Ms. Gary requested that staff return with indicators as to whether the projects were safety-related.

Mr. Vosburg said the caution point with staff was that there was debate among the supervisors as to what was included within safety.

Ms. Gary said the indication could be scaled.

Ms. Vanuch said that any road on the transportation study was safety-related and would meet the criteria.

Ms. Allen said [inaudible 01:24:40 – 01:25:00].

Ms. Vanuch responded that they were requesting additional information because some items had come forward that the Board did not have. She said they requested more information to provide a better background to determine whether the Board wanted to move forward with the projects. She said they wanted to determine if there were any projects on the CIP that they could move forward that could be ARPA-eligible.

Mr. Cohen said it was hard to delineate what the Board had requested go before a committee, what should be added to consent, and what they took issue with. He said he would like a holistic approach to the options. He noted there were other road projects that could qualify.

Ms. Bohmke said her concern regarding the Brooke Road project was that it was a safety issue. She said the Board had worked with VDOT and staff trying to figure out the issues with the road. She noted that the road had improved years back due to some work. She said she had not heard much information regarding Brooke Road over the past nine months and she did not know the status of the project. She said she needed more information.

Ms. Gary said Brooke Road had not improved until recently when VDOT performed repairs to the road, raised it, and installed a more permanent pump. She said she wanted to vote to determine not to construct the emergency access road, which would save closer to $2M. She said people were safe and the road worked enough, but the full project had to be completed. She explained a full report would be presented to the Board at the regular meeting.

Ms. Vanuch stated that the regular meeting would be a better time for Ms. Gary's comments because they would be discussing Brooke Road.

Ms. Gary stated that she would be brief. She stated that she did not want to evaluate every road and claim it was a safety issue. She said the Board had not heard more information about the road because it had improved from recent repairs. She noted that the repairs had been completed in the prior year.

Ms. Yeung said that the access road should remain as a backup plan until the road improvements were completed. She stated that Ms. Gary may have more information regarding the need for the access road that she would present at the regular meeting.

Ms. Gary stated that she did.

Ms. Allen said [inaudible 01:32:25 – 01:32:50]

Mr. Mayausky stated [inaudible 01:33:00 – 01:34:25]

Ms. Vanuch asked Mr. Mayausky to restate what he just said.

Mr. Mayausky said it would provide a level of security. He said it was in part of keeping with the County's mitigation strategy that was part of the security plan.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the item had come before the Board during the last ARPA work session.

Mr. Mayausky responded that it had.

Mr. Vosburg said that staff proposed taking $15K of ARPA funds to complete the engineering for the project.

Ms. Yeung asked if a company had been contracted and how they were selected.

Mr. Vosburg responded that they had not yet contracted with a company. He explained that they were only trying to secure the funding.

Ms. Gary asked how the front lobby renovations and any changes to security impact the rest of the building. She asked if the building would be more secure and whether the other renovations could be delayed or if they were still needed.

Ms. Krauss responded that Mr. Mayausky's need was more immediate because people were in the building working. She explained the concept for the lobby was a much larger project that would enhance the security overall.

Mr. English asked if it was possible to appropriate the funds immediately.

Ms. Vanuch said they would have to put the item on consent. She asked if staff had the resolution prepared at the prior meeting. She stated that she would poll the Board to determine whether to include the item on consent for the December 15 meeting.

Mr. English indicated his support.

Mr. Cohen indicated his support.

Ms. Allen indicated her support.

Ms. Bohmke indicated her support.

Ms. Gary indicated her support.

Ms. Yeung indicated her support. She asked whether the projects could be combined into one project as opposed to two different projects.

Ms. Krauss stated that Mr. Mayausky's office needed the renovations now. She explained that the lobby concept was a much larger project, was more complicated, and would require more money and time.

Ms. Yeung asked whether security was included in the project.

Ms. Krauss responded that security was included. She said she believed they should remain separate.

Mr. Morris said that the building was an open building, and even though the front would have security measures, people would be going to all parts of the building to conduct business, so security improvements had to be within all of the department offices.

Ms. Vanuch said they would move forward with Mr. Mayausky's project on consent at the December meeting. She said they had to schedule an ARPA work session before the December 13 meeting. She suggested they come in on December 6 to discuss the items in more detail and provide the offset to the CIP. She asked if that provided staff enough time.

Mr. Vosburg responded that it was enough time. He said that for most of the items, they provided background at the prior work session, so the meeting would just be pulling the information back together. He said in regards to the CIP question, most of the roadway projects would not qualify given the restrictive nature of the COVID-19 funds. He explained the Brooke Road project qualified because it related to stormwater.

Ms. Vanuch said they wanted to see how that would offset the tax rate. She said the Board wanted to know what would be freed up in the CIP if they spent ARPA funds on Brooke Road or another project.

Ms. Bohmke noted workforce development was included under the heading of the Board's direction. She said that at the VACO conference, Secretary Slater spoke at the education steering committee. She stated that they were revamping the whole program. She noted there had been issues, but they had stated the number one thing needed in the Commonwealth was a workforce development program.

Ms. Bohmke stated that the education steering committee included in its legislative platform working with the superintendent of schools as it related to the workforce with the fourth and fifth graders, middle school children, and high school students. She said if they were doing it at the high school level, it was almost too late.

Ms. Bohmke said workforce had been made one of the steering committee's top priorities. She said there would be a restructuring. She noted that there were workforce issues everywhere in the Commonwealth and everywhere in the nation.

Ms. Gary asked if there was a security element to the Fire and Rescue headquarters renovation. She said it was worth mentioning it was a safety issue, and they would likely need to complete the project sooner.

Ms. Krauss stated one of the items to come from the Infrastructure Committee related to IT was the fiber project. She said she would like to discuss the project with the Board separately. She explained there was some money the Board had already appropriated related to fiber, and that funding would be used for the engineering of projects to close the loops. She requested that the project be discussed with the Board at a separate time.

Ms. Vanuch said that was fine.

Ms. Krauss clarified that staff would be providing project descriptions and project costs at the next meeting. She asked if there were other specific items of information the Board wanted staff to provide for the project backgrounds.

Ms. Vanuch requested staff identify whether there were security issues. She said the biggest detail was in regard to the CIP items and how to balance them. She noted that the Sheriff's radios and breathing apparatus would have a different impact than a fire station.

Ms. Yeung said she was interested in the criteria as to whether a project was eligible for restricted or unrestricted ARPA funding.

Ms. Krauss said that they could include that information. She said if it had been to IEM, they would inform the Board, and if it had not been before IEM, they would review the status and inform the Board. She noted many of the economic development items were currently being reviewed.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they could receive a staff update on Brooke Road.

Ms. Gary explained that it was on the agenda for the regular meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2:45 p.m., Chairman Vanuch adjourned the November 15, 2022 American Rescue Plan Act Work Session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors.

Randal E. Vosburg
County Administrator

Crystal Vanuch
Chairman