BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) WORK SESSION
December 6, 2022

CALL TO ORDER – A work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Crystal Vanuch, Chairman, at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 6, 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 Allen (Arrived at 2:26 p.m.); Meg Bohmke; Thomas C. Coen; Darrell English; Monica Gary.

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

Ms. Vanuch called the meeting to order.

WORK SESSION

American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Work Session
Ms. Andrea Light, Director of Budget, stated that in terms of revenue replacement, staff requested the Board to consider whether they wanted to keep projects that had not yet been appropriated and whether they approved of the projects that had been removed. She said the same questions would be asked of restricted funds.

Ms. Light stated that during the previous work session, staff was requested to review all of the capital projects to determine whether ARPA funding could be used to reduce the burden on capital projects.

Ms. Light explained that restricted ARPA funds were restricted to a specific purpose. She said that there was $10M in revenue retention that could be used for government services, and there were not a lot of restrictions. She noted that the Board had already appropriated funding for a number of projects which they had discussed a number of times.

Ms. Light stated that staff sought continued Board direction on the projects starting on line item 17 in the report—the Sherriff's pay raise category. She stated that part of the Sheriff's pay raise that the Board considered in November was whether to use the least restrictive funds for future uses. She explained that in December 2021, the Board approved the use of ARPA funds for body-worn cameras (BWC) and a three-year ramp-up.

Ms. Light explained that the Board had considered additional message boards for the Sheriff's Department. She stated that during a prior work session, they had been directed to bring such an item to a future consent agenda.

Ms. Light said that a couple of projects had been removed based on the Board's direction, input from departments, and input from the County administration. She stated that the first was related to utilities. She said that the CEDC voted 3:0 to not recommend the funding for the airport for the pro-rata fees. She explained that the pro-rata fees were to be used to hook up the sewer system at the airport. She explained that when a party connected to the County's water and sewer utilities, there was a pro-rata fee.

Ms. Light stated that the next project was related to Fire and Rescue. She explained that it started as an economic development initiative with Germana Community College to help with program equipment for EMTs. She explained that the program moved to Fire and Rescue, and they were able to briefly review the project. She stated that it was not recommended to move forward at this time.

Ms. Light mentioned an economic development project called Connected Communities. She explained that the Connected Communities project funding was to hire a contractor to design a plan as to what a connected community looked like. She explained that the project would be part of a transportation master plan, so they expected to see it in the future.

Ms. Light mentioned the Brooke Fire Station repair project included necessary station repairs. She explained that staff had found funding within the volunteer Fire and Rescue fund that could be used for the project. She continued that the funding would only have to be augmented by a small amount from the CIP reserve. She said that staff believed the project could be funded in a different way rather than through ARPA.

Ms. Gary asked if the cost had changed or if it had always been $250K.

Ms. Vanuch said that it had always been $250K.

Ms. Light responded that she believed it had been $250K for the past couple of sessions.

Ms. Light explained that revenue replacement funds were less restrictive and could be used for projects that the Board wanted to be completed. She said that after they considered all of the projects that had been appropriated, they had an unappropriated balance of about $3.6M, and they had a remaining balance of about $98K after taking into consideration the projects the Board had provided guidance on. She said that the $98K balance could be used for almost any cost that was a general government service, and the funds were very unrestricted.

Ms. Light explained that ARPA funds had a significant number of restrictions. She said the fund requests had been reviewed by the consultant. She explained that the County had essentially $19.75M to spend in the category. She said that the projects listed were what the Board had already appropriated and authorized to spend.

Ms. Light stated that there was $13.2M of the restricted ARPA funds that the Board could use for other needs. She said that the items the Boards had given direction on included capital construction costs to reimburse the transportation funds. She said that project was the Patawomeck Tribe access drive, and the Board had instructed staff to bring it back on a future consent agenda. She mentioned the Commissioner of Revenue office security upgrades project. She mentioned that there was economic development funding for Riot, and the funding was being reviewed by CEDC. She said that the next project was wrap-around services, travel, daycare, and housing assistance funding to attract new employees. She explained that the project was recommended for funding by the CEDC and so was the targeted marketing to QCT.

Ms. Light stated that the next item was to continue to pay for the grants accountant from ARPA. She stated that there were also storage needs for Fire and Rescue. She said that several projects were marked with a bold "safety." She explained that during the previous work session, the Board had requested staff to review projects that had safety considerations. She explained that staff worked with departments to come up with items that they considered to be mitigating risks as part of the project. She stated that there was Fire and Rescue light and air apparatus, rehab apparatus, and hazmat apparatus.

Ms. Light stated that line item 32 was new. She explained that the Board had requested staff at the September 20 work session to determine the costs for a fueling station for Fire and Rescue as they were doing with public safety. She explained that staff had determined a cost and it was about $350K. She said the funding would provide two tanks—one in the north and one in the south—and the fuel capacity would last about two weeks.

Ms. Light noted that they had discussed the WIFI access points several times. She noted firewalls and generators at shelters. She mentioned that the Duff Park waterline was to come back as a future consent agenda item. She mentioned that there was the Sheriff's Department pay raise project. She said that the Sheriff's pay raise was split between restricted and less restrictive funding.

Ms. Light said that the water main transmission connecting the Enon Road water storage tank to the water main on Centerport Parkway was to come back before the Board as an item on a future consent agenda. She said that if the Board wanted to continue with all of the projects, they would have almost $4.8M to allocate to other capital projects.

Ms. Light said that some projects had been removed from the list. She stated that the first item was priority-based budgeting funding for Budget and Management. She said that the funds were appropriated with the FY23 adopted budget, but those funds could be reallocated to a different project. She explained that staff believed the changes would come forward organically as it underwent changes in leadership.

Ms. Light mentioned the future use of ARPA funds for the grants coordinator position rather than ramping up usage of the General Fund. She noted that there was remaining funding set aside for fiber connections, and the forthcoming telecommunications study would help guide the usage of the funds. She said there were several other costs. She mentioned that there were costs associated with HVAC repair and some economic development initiatives that were not recommended.

Ms. Yeung asked if the projects that had been removed had been assessed for safety.

Ms. Light responded that they did not review the projects that had been removed for safety considerations.

Ms. Yeung noted that some of the projects that were removed had safety implications. She suggested some of the projects be reconsidered for funding.

Ms. Light responded that was the type of direction staff was looking for from the Board. She said that they were looking to determine from the Board what items should continue to be funded and what items should not be included.

Ms. Light explained that there were base assumptions as they reviewed the capital items. She explained that they reviewed the items that were likely to be submitted for FY24 and FY25 so that the timing of the projects would align with the encumberment of the funds. She explained that they did not review items from the last five years of the CIP.

Ms. Light explained that transportation projects were not eligible for ARPA funds with the exception of the Brooke Road project. She explained that Brooke Road was only eligible for ARPA funds because of associated stormwater issues. She said staff considered possible 3R projects across the County, and some may have advanced timing.

Ms. Light explained that there was $98K in available funding from revenue replacement. She said that the available funding assumed that the items the Board had requested to return on the consent agenda were approved. She stated that the more restrictive ARPA funding of $4.8M was assumed after bringing forward all the projects which received Board direction.

Ms. Light explained that there was a total of about $4.8M in available funding if all of the budget assumptions held true. She noted that there was a need in the Sheriff's Department for a command staff vehicle replacement. She explained that the County paid for fire engines on a master lease so that engine replacement occurred on a cyclical schedule. She explained that the schedule was set up by Fire and Rescue based on a policy adopted by the Board.

Ms. Light explained that the station rebuilds and Embrey Mill Station funding were being reviewed by the consultant, and they had not yet received information. She mentioned the self-contained breathing apparatus, line item 15. She noted that at the December 5th CIP work session, they discussed the item as a necessary item for Fire and Rescue. She explained that the current equipment was old, and because it was no longer manufactured, it was no longer being serviced. She said the equipment was life-saving for Fire and Rescue personnel.

Ms. Light mentioned that there were various 3R projects—backup systems and server replacements—scheduled over the next few years. She said that the Aquia Landing parking expansion project was being reviewed by the consultants. She noted that there had been a significant uptick in outdoor activity since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and that ARPA funding could possibly be used for the parking expansion.

Ms. Light explained that Community Facilities had carpet replacement projects at both libraries, the courthouse, and the public safety building. She stated that there were HVAC systems replacements at the courthouse, the public safety building, and the IT server room.

Ms. Light stated that line item 12 was related to command staff vehicle replacements. She said that line item 17 was related to the command bus. She explained that the Sheriff's Department used the command bus frequently, and they used it at all of the major events held by the County. She said the command bus was used in case of emergency, and it was used as a backup emergency center.

Ms. Light stated that the Sheriff's Department was requesting a firearm building—a butler building that would be made of metal and located at the Sheriff's Department firing range. She said that they were requesting the consultant to review the proposal. She mentioned that at the December 6 CIP meeting, they discussed the Sheriff's Department's need for replacement radios. She said that the replacement radios were listed as a Sheriff's Department item, but the project cost would replace radios for the Sheriff's Department and Fire and Rescue. She explained that the Sheriff's Department was the responsible party for replacement.

Ms. Light stated that staff was looking for the Board's direction.

Ms. Vanuch stated that one of the requested items of information to be brought back for the capital projects was the impact on the tax rate of each project. She explained that using ARPA funding for some of the projects would alter the impact to the tax rate and could open up further opportunities to free up debt or lower the tax rate.

Ms. Vanuch stated that there were only three projects included in the presentation which affected the tax rate. She mentioned that those projects were line item 13, the engine and ambulance replacement, line item 15, the self-contained breathing apparatus replacement, and line item 19, the Sheriff's Department and Fire and Rescue radios. She noted that the tax impact of the radio replacement was $0.04. She stated that the combined tax impact of the projects was $0.09.

Ms. Light explained that staff had reviewed tax rates. She clarified that Ms. Vanuch incorrectly stated the tax impact of the radio replacement. She explained that the tax impact for the radio replacement was $0.004, or 4/10 of a penny.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that the total tax impact of the three projects was almost $0.01.

Ms. Bohmke asked for clarification regarding the command bus project. She noted it was listed both under the Sheriff's Department and under Fire and Rescue, and the costs were listed as $350K and $1.218M.

Ms. Light explained that line item 12 was the command staff vehicle replacement project for Fire and Rescue, and the project would replace the vehicles used by Fire and Rescue on a daily basis. She explained that line item 17 was the command bus, and the command bus was similar to a rugged RV. She said that the command bus could host emergency meetings, 911 operators, or other staff.

Ms. Bohmke noted that they were considering two types of fuel stations. She asked why the fuel stations for Fire and Rescue and the Sheriff's Department had to be at separate locations.

Chief Joseph Cardello explained that the Sheriff's Department would locate its fuel station at the public safety center, and there was not enough room to add any additional fueling sites. He noted there were also environmental considerations. He explained that instead of purchasing land, Fire and Rescue was considering using Station 14. He noted there was some area that could be used in the back lot of Station 12. He said that they wanted two stations in case they were unable to access certain parts of the County.

Ms. Allen joined the meeting at 2:26 p.m.

Mr. English asked if the County had considered contracting with fuel companies such as Shell to supply the fuel stations.

Chief Cardello responded that they had not looked into it. He said they had considered independent, 4,000-gallon tanks that would be operated by the County.

Ms. Bohmke said she had a question regarding the Carl Lewis Center. She noted the desire to rebuild the facility and that staff would get a maximum of $200K for insurance purposes. She noted that no other district in the County had a community center, and they often used fire stations or the schools when they needed a town hall. She said she wanted the Board to discuss at some point if the rebuilding of the Carl Lewis Center was a good use of County funds.

Ms. Bohmke asked whether Brooke Road was included.

Ms. Light responded that it was line item 10 on the possible capital projects sheet.

Ms. Bohmke said she could not justify spending the projected costs for the project given how much had already been spent on Brooke Road for improvements. She noted that there may come a time when they needed additional improvements, but they had already done enough improvements to Brooke Road. She noted the ARPA funding could be used for other projects.

Ms. Bohmke noted that the Gauntlet project had been appropriated the year before. She asked why that project had not been constructed and whether it had been accomplished.

Mr. Mike Morris explained that funding was appropriated the prior July or August. He said that they first went through the [JOT] contract first, but they discovered the contract could not do

ARPA-related work, so they went out for bid. He explained that the project was currently out for bid, and they hoped to start construction as soon as the weather broke, likely in March.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the project had been approved in the present or prior year.

Mr. Morris said it had almost been a year and a half. He noted that there had been several challenges.

Ms. Gary noted that they did not have community centers in the County, but they needed community centers. She said that she was not against the Carl Lewis Center rebuild. She said she wanted to know what the rebuild would provide since the cost of the rebuild was significantly higher than the insurance payment. She said that the fire station in her district received a lot of use as a community center.

Ms. Gary said that the Brooke Road project had already been approved, and the only matter was whether or not to use ARPA funds. She said that the improvements that were performed were only repairs. She noted that a pipe was replaced and they were able to raise the road, but it did not fix the problems. She noted that there were other issues with the road.

Ms. Yeung mentioned that it was not only about the community center. She said that they were supporting a field, but not the community center that was next to the field. She stated that the community center was not only for the immediate residents, but it served poorer families as well. She said that a nearby trailer park used the community center for parties, funerals, and other events, and a place to socialize. She said that ARPA funds should be used for community centers. She said that she supported the use of funds for the project.

Ms. Yeung asked how large of an area would be the subject of the carpet replacement project, line item 18. She noted the cost was $1.63M to replace the carpet.

Mr. Morris clarified that the carpet replacement covered three different buildings.

Mr. English noted that the Lewis family donated the property for the Carl Lewis Center, and he felt that the County was obligated to replace the community center. He said that he was supportive of rebuilding the facility because of an obligation to the Lewis family.

Mr. English asked if the costs for the command staff vehicle replacement and command bus replacement included trade-in values for the old vehicles. He asked if a trade-in value would make a difference in the figures.

Ms. Light said that the costs did not include any trade-in value. She noted that the command bus for the Sheriff's Department was fairly old, so there may be some residual value but not a lot.

Ms. Vanuch asked when the command bus was slated to be replaced.

Ms. Light responded that in the CIP, the command bus was fairly old and is scheduled to be replaced in FY26 or FY27.

Mr. English said he supported the breathing apparatus replacement. He asked for clarification regarding the different equipment replacement projects that were listed in the spreadsheet.

Chief Cardello explained that SCBA replacements were for the physical breathing air units.

[audio cuts 33:38 – 37:06]

Ms. Vanuch asked if any of the supervisors wanted to expedite any of the projects. She said she would want to expedite the command bus project. She asked if the Board had any other projects on the list that it wanted to expedite.

Ms. Yeung responded that she wanted to expedite the HVAC and carpeting projects.

Ms. Bohmke noted that the carpeting project would include the courthouse, the public safety building, and the library. She said they had no information as to how long ago the carpet was installed and whether carpeting was the best option for replacement. She mentioned that they may need to install hardwood and that it was easier to clean.

Ms. Gary said that she agreed.

Ms. Bohmke stated that the Aquia Landing parking expansion was not a project that was just added to the CIP. She clarified that the project had been in the CIP.

Ms. Light said that it could have been included, but there were a lot of projects in the CIP. She said she would check whether it had been included in a previous CIP.

Ms. Bohmke stated that she did not appreciate when projects suddenly appeared before the Board. She said she wanted to validate whether the project had been included in a previous CIP.

Mr. Morris explained that when the HPOF conversation began three years ago, Ms. Shelton had requested an item be added to the CIP related to expanding parking at Aquia. He said that it was added to the 3R project list about three years ago.

Ms. Bohmke stated that she appreciated the information from Mr. English regarding the Carl Lewis building. She said she had not realized that the building had been donated. She said that there were poor families in each of the County's districts. She said that there were two large trailer parks in her district. She said the reason the facility should be rebuilt is that it was donated. She noted that each of the districts had other facilities to use.

Ms. Vanuch said that the Board should have a conversation regarding the cost of rebuilding the facility as the project progressed.

Ms. Allen stated that her district did not have a County fire station to utilize. She said that she disagreed with the reasoning that the facility should not be rebuilt because other districts did not have community centers. She stated that the Carl Lewis Center was not designated for use by only Widewater residents. She said every resident in the County would be able to access the facility.

Ms. Allen said that they had wasted two days of strategic planning where they identified health and mental health wellness as a key strategic priority of the Board. She said that the community center would be an opportunity to address the priority, and the community feedback indicated a want for a community facility. She said that the County had the opportunity to deliver a community center irrespective of the district, and they should use their guiding principles to make decisions.

Ms. Bohmke said that they were missing a project category for health and mental health wellness. She said that if the project did not score well on the TRC, then the categories were not correct and they were not making the correct comparisons.

Ms. Gary stated that the VDH reported that the two most important items for mental health were recreational facilities and affordable housing. She said that the community center would be an opportunity to address some of those aspects. She said that the community center would help where there was a need. She noted the issues the Sheriff's deputies experienced. She noted that the facilities were not just for poor people, but they were helpful to poor people.

Ms. Gary stated that the report stated that people with higher socio-economic status needed community center facilities, and it was a regular request from constituents. She said that the community center would be for everyone in the County, and it would be beneficial for the community.

Mr. Coen stated that the Carl Lewis Center had merit to be rebuilt. He said that line items 15 and 19 were the most prescient—items relating to breathing apparatus replacements and radio replacements. He said he would prioritize the breathing apparatus over the radios.

Mr. English noted that the breathing apparatus and the radios were both needed, so it was hard to prioritize one over the other.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that the projects were already on the CIP for FY24, and they would happen in the budget cycle as they moved forward. She said that the question was whether the Board wanted to pay for the costs of the projects now and remove them from the CIP to free up tax revenue. She said that if they used the ARPA funding for items 15 and 19, there would be none left for other projects. She said she wanted to ensure the Board was focused on what had to be completed.

Mr. English said that he supported using ARPA funds for the radio replacement and breathing apparatus replacement to remove them from the CIP. He noted that the projects were critical and needed to be addressed.

Ms. Vanuch noted that was one strategy. She asked if staff could total up the cost. She noted that it was approximately $20M.

Ms. Yeung noted that they had discussed safety concerns, but they did not determine whether they had a backup plan to pay for the projects rather than keeping them on the CIP. She noted that Mr. Vosburg was considering a grant for Brooke Road. She asked if there were other projects that staff had identified alternative funding for to take them off the CIP.

Ms. Light responded that Brooke Road was currently all-cash funded, but they were considering a grant application to free up cash.

Ms. Yeung said that invalidating her comments was not validating others. She said that her perspective on certain items was her lived experience. She said that equity and equality were not the same for everyone and their body, and her perspectives were because she lived them.

Ms. Allen said that ARPA included guidelines to address needs for the community's benefit. She said that she could not see using the rest of the ARPA funds for Fire and Rescue when the projects had already been budgeted for. She said that the funding should be utilized for other projects. She said she agreed with Ms. Bohmke's comments regarding scoring and categorizing of TRC projects. She said that it was difficult to compare projects.

Ms. Allen noted that some projects which were necessary for the community did not score well under the current guidelines. She mentioned that the Carl Lewis Center had previously generated revenue, and a new center would also generate revenue from event rentals. She said that ARPA funds should not be spent on projects which were already funded. She said that irrespective of the Board's decision, by FY24 and FY25, many of the projects will have been completed.

Ms. Allen said she did not support using all $12M for two projects. She said that they should consider splitting up the ARPA funding. She said that they should consider prioritizing projects that did not score high on the TRC scale and then earmark funding for other projects to alleviate the cost burden. She suggested only using $3M of ARPA funding for the breathing apparatus replacement.

Mr. Vosburg noted that there seemed to be a desire to spend money on the capital budget. He said that if they went with both of the suggested plans, it would wipe out the list. He said that it was either a yes or no—and if it was a no, then the funding could be put toward capital projects.

Ms. Vanuch said that was her next step. She said she wanted to identify first what capital needs they were looking at.

Ms. Gary asked for clarification regarding the breathing apparatus and how often it needed to be replaced.

Chief Cardello said that they needed to be replaced every 10 years. He explained that if they did not replace the apparatus soon, it would cost more money to keep them in service every month.

Ms. Gary clarified that the replacements had already been budgeted, and the question was whether to use ARPA funds or not.

Ms. Vanuch stated that as long as the project was not removed to build a school, the replacements would be in FY24. She asked if it was suitable for the replacements to be ordered in FY24.

Chief Cardello responded that it would be suitable to order the replacements in FY24.

Ms. Vanuch asked when the radios would need to be replaced. She noted that they were included in the CIP for FY24.

Chief Cardello said that he did not know the exact replacement cycle, but he was sure it was around 10 years.

Ms. Light responded that it was. She stated that they were on a 10-year cycle.

Ms. Vanuch asked what year they were in.

Ms. Light responded that they were in year 12. She said that the radios were purchased in 2010.

Ms. Vanuch noted that she had consolidated the items which the Board wanted to use ARPA funding for. She said she would poll the Board for a general consensus.

Ms. Yeung asked if the ARPA spending deadline was FY26 for all of the projects.

Ms. Vanuch said that it was FY26.

Ms. Yeung said she believed there were some deadlines that were earlier.

Ms. Light explained that the funds had to be encumbered by FY25 and spent by FY26. She said that the listed capital projects were chosen because they were ready to move forward.

Ms. Yeung stated that there was a need for a staff member to assist the Board in determining that they had the correct documentation and were following ARPA guidelines. She said that the staff person should ensure that the items they deliver were in order. She asked if there was a line item for such a staff position.

Ms. Light explained that prior to the FY23 budget cycle, the Board added two positions with ARPA—the grant coordinator and the grant accountant. She stated that there was funding through ARPA appropriated by the Board for a consultant as well. She explained that all projects were reviewed by the consultant prior to approval by the Board.

Ms. Allen clarified that the ARPA funds were audited to ensure that they were in compliance.

Mr. Morris clarified that the actual appropriation was in December 2024, and the final expenditures were in 2026.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was incumbent upon the Board to look at the items which were safety related and to consider prioritizing those projects.

Ms. Vanuch noted that in the top column, the funding had already been appropriated. She said that the Sheriff's pay raises should be classified as a safety because it was what had been discussed.

Ms. Vanuch said that the first item was line item 28, storage needs, and the cost was $550K. She explained that the Board previously agreed that they would put the project on a future consent agenda item. She asked if the Board agreed that it was an item to continue to move forward with.

Ms. Yeung recommended that they go through items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 with the associated costs even though they did not have safety implications.

Ms. Vanuch said they would start with safety first. She asked if any Board member was against including the safety facilities.

Mr. English said he was against the storage facility.

Ms. Bohmke said she was not against the project, but she needed more information.

Mr. Granger explained that the Fire and Rescue Department did not currently have adequate space to store equipment and supplies which had led them to utilize unfinished space in the public safety center. He said that their materials were spread throughout the County. He said that the storage facility would be an interim solution. He explained that they would be able to construct a pre-fabricated metal building over the training center which would allow them to consolidate their equipment storage.

Mr. English noted that there were four different shelters where Fire and Rescue did vehicle repairs. He asked if one of the shelters could be converted into a storage area. He said it could save a lot of money.

Mr. Granger responded that through a job-order contract, they received an analysis of converting the lean-to bus shelters into storage. He explained that structurally, it did not work. He said that the storage facility project would be located in the same area, but it was not using the existing structures. He explained that it would be more expensive to do a conversion.

Ms. Vanuch noted that at least four Board members wanted to move forward with the item.

Ms. Gary asked what would be done with the storage structure once a permanent solution was determined.

Mr. Granger responded that the project would make an improvement to real property owned by the County. He stated that when they constructed the public safety training center and sold the property at 1326 Courthouse Road, the improvement would increase the overall value.

Ms. Vanuch said the next item was line item 29, light and air apparatus, and the cost was $721K. She noted the Board had agreed to include the item on a future consent agenda. She asked if a majority of the Board wanted to move the item forward or if a supervisor wanted to pull the item.

Ms. Vanuch noted that the item was to move forward.

Ms. Vanuch stated that the next item was rehab apparatus. She noted that the Board had agreed to include the item on a future consent agenda. She asked whether the Board wanted to keep it on for a future consent agenda or if they wanted to pull it. She noted that it would move forward.

Ms. Vanuch stated the next item was the hazmat apparatus. She noted that the item would move forward.

Ms. Vanuch noted that the next item was the refueling stations. She stated that the Board had requested further information previously. She noted that the Fire Chief had explained why it had been requested for a north and south unit. She asked whether the Board agreed or disagreed with the project.

Ms. Bohmke said she was satisfied.

Ms. Gary said she was good.

Mr. English said he wanted more information, so he was a no.

Ms. Vanuch said the next item was line item 33, WiFi access points. She clarified that the item had not been discussed by the whole Board. She noted that the item was discussed during the November infrastructure meeting.

Ms. Allen said she believed the Board should support it. She said that the County's WiFi infrastructure was terrible.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they voted on the item in the infrastructure committee.

Ms. Allen responded that they had.

Ms. Vanuch asked if it was approved 3:0.

Ms. Allen said that it was.

Ms. Vanuch noted that the item would move forward. She stated that the next item was related to network firewalls and the cost was $660K. She noted there was no objection.

Ms. Vanuch said that the cost of generators for shelters was $982K. She noted that it was to be included on a future consent agenda. She noted that there were no objections from the Board.

Ms. Vanuch said the next item was the future use of ARPA for Sheriff's pay raises. She noted that the item had already been voted on by the Board.

Ms. Bohmke asked why the Sheriff's pay raise was included on the list.

Ms. Allen explained that it was a held item.

Ms. Vanuch stated that the item had not been appropriated, they had only voted on what funds they would use. She said that the project costs had not yet been encumbered and appropriated.

Ms. Vanuch said that the last item for safety was the water main transmission project to connect the existing Enon Road water storage tank to Center Port Parkway. She said the cost was $2.4M.

Ms. Allen mentioned that they intended to do a business overlay where surrounding businesses would contribute to the maintenance of the water main. She asked if the maintenance funds were included in the cost of the project.

Ms. Yeung asked what other funding was available for the project.

Mr. Chris Edwards responded that the project would be funded through the utilities fund. He explained that the project was part of the Master Plan, so it was included in the pro-rata agreement. He said that as people connected to the water main, there would be associated pro-rata fees.

Ms. Vanuch asked why funding was coming from ARPA instead of from the utilities budget.

Mr. Edwards explained that the original cost was about $5M to $6M, and the cost had now increased to $9M which was outside of the budgeted amount. He said that they requested ARPA funds to make up the difference.

Ms. Vanuch asked why it was so much more expensive. She asked if they were hiring bad contractors.

Mr. Edwards responded that they were not.

Ms. Vanuch said that there were a lot of problems with the ARPA procurement process. She said she needed more information before approving the funding. She requested a breakdown of the cost estimates showing the cost increases.

Mr. Edwards said that they could provide a cost estimate. He explained that the project was intended to provide fire flow to the area.

Mr. English said he wanted more information.

Ms. Vanuch said the project should go before another committee meeting and be brought back before the Board with more information.

Ms. Bohmke noted that the Utilities Department had its own CIP. She asked where the water main project was ranked in the Utilities Department priority list.

Mr. Edwards said that the project was scheduled fairly far forward in the CIP. He stated that there was engineering funding in the current fiscal year, and there was construction funding in FY24. He explained that the project would create a conduit to provide water from Lake Mooney to the entire northern part of the County.

Ms. Bohmke said that they needed more information. She requested that the Board approve some use of ARPA funds for the water main project and fund the rest through the CIP.

Ms. Gary asked how time sensitive the project was and whether it would be able to begin without additional dedicated funding.

Mr. Edwards responded that they were likely still in the design phase for the next six months to a year, and there was funding for that part. He said that they would likely award the design contract at the end of the next calendar year, and that was when the funding would be needed.

Ms. Vanuch recommended that the project go before the infrastructure committee in January.

Ms. Allen clarified that the first infrastructure committee meeting was in February.

Ms. Allen noted that Smith Lake was becoming an issue for water supply. She noted that the northern parts of the County had an enormous dependency on Smith Lake, so it was better to complete the project sooner. She suggested using money from the fund that Center Port businesses contributed to offset the costs of the project.

Ms. Bohmke said that the Board needed to be educated on the risks and know where the cost changes were occurring before making a decision.

Mr. Vosburg mentioned that it was on the January retreat schedule to discuss the utility rates, and the offset would go directly to the issue. He said that the ARPA funding could offset a potential utility increase that the County was faced with. He explained that any funding to help offset the reliance on the utility fund would help with the utility rate increase.

Ms. Vanuch noted that columns 17, 18, and 19 were items on which the Board had already taken action on. She noted that if the items moved forward, the trailers would be included on the consent agenda of the next Board meeting.

Ms. Yeung said she was against funding for the BWC because there was no mechanism to connect them. She said that there needed to be an application to connect them.

Ms. Vanuch responded that there was.

Ms. Yeung explained that there was a project manager.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that Ms. Yeung was talking about the CAD systems, not the BWC. She explained that the officers were being fitted for their BWC.

Ms. Yeung thought that the cameras had already been purchased.

Ms. Vanuch said that they had, but it was a 10-year contract.

Ms. Light explained that when the Board adopted the BWC, it was a stepped-in approach so that General Funds would be gradually used over the course of a three-year period rather than relying on the General Fund entirely from the onset.

Ms. Bohmke said that Brooke Fire Station repairs should be categorized as a safety project. She said that the project needed to be done first.

Ms. Gary explained that the project would be funded with already available resources.

Ms. Bohmke said that she knew. She emphasized that safety needed to be listed next to the item.

Ms. Yeung clarified that staff did not review the projects which had been removed for safety considerations.

Ms. Vanuch said that the only item they were not moving forward with was item 38 because the Board requested additional information.

Ms. Vanuch noted that item 23 would be included on the consent agenda. She said that the first was the Patawomeck Tribe access drive at a cost of $75K. She stated that the item would move forward on the consent agenda.

Ms. Vanuch said that item 24 was an economic development project providing funding for Riot, and the total cost was $300K. She said that CEDC continued to review the project and did not make a favorable recommendation.

Ms. Allen noted that the project had not come before the full Board.

Ms. Vanuch said that they had covered the item previously during one of the first ARPA work sessions, and the Board had sent the item to CEDC.

Ms. Gary noted that she was the chair of CEDC. She said that she did not feel as if there was sufficient information. She said that the project was complex because they proposed new and innovative ideas. She said she did not completely understand the project, so she could not support funding the project at this moment.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the Board wanted the item to stay with CEDC before making a recommendation.

Mr. English said that he was a no.

Ms. Yeung asked if he knew anything about the project.

Mr. English said that he did not.

Ms. Bohmke said that the project was all about small entrepreneurship. She said that King George County and the City were providing in-kind contributions in the form of services, but she wanted those jurisdictions to provide cash funding. She said that the outcome of the Quantico Corporate Center was not good for the County, and she regretted voting in favor of it.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was also a no vote.

Ms. Allen said that she was not a no vote. She said that building the program only benefited the County, and the project was for a Stafford smart city. She said that not utilizing or investing in the available technology was a wasted opportunity. She suggested that the project be earmarked for a future conversation.

Ms. Gary said that she would like to leave the project with CEDC.

Ms. Vanuch noted that the project would stay with CEDC. She noted the project to provide travel, daycare, and housing assistance funding to attract new employees was recommended by CEDC. She said that she had not recommended that project, and she was on CEDC. She noted that CEDC had not reviewed the proposal.

Mr. English said that he was a no.

Ms. Gary noted that wrap-around services were discussed.

Ms. Vanuch said that she believed it was only related to childcare.

Ms. Gary responded that childcare was only one facet of the discussion.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that the state was aware of the reorganization of the dysfunctional workforce development boards. She said that there was a completely new structure, and there would be a full report presented to the General Assembly in January. She noted that the project would be good, but it needed a year or so for the workforce development boards to determine their new responsibilities. She suggested that the project be postponed.

Mr. Coen asked whether approving the project would incur any recurring costs to the County.

Mr. John Holden explained that the project would receive one-time funding for the projects that the workforce boards did not fund, also known as wrap-around services. He said that he had met with the County's workforce board executive directors, and they had discussed preparing a contract that would allow funding to flow to the Board to fund such projects. He said that they had been awaiting guidance from the Board.

Mr. Coen said that he would expect wrap-around services to be provided every year.

Mr. Holden clarified that it would be a one-time project.

Ms. Vanuch polled the Board as to whether to keep the project or recommend removal.

Mr. English said no.

Ms. Gary said yes.

Ms. Yeung said yes.

Ms. Bohmke said no.

Mr. Coen said no.

Ms. Allen abstained.

Ms. Vanuch said she was a no. She stated that the item was removed from discussion. She noted that targeted marketing for QCT was $72K.

Mr. Holden said that the idea was to use marketing to help attract workers to jobs available in the County. He explained that the qualified census tracts were defined in the ARPA regulations as census tracts around the country of which any individual in that census tract is eligible to be a recipient of funds. He said that they would market to those census tracts to attract workers to the companies which were seeking workers in the County.

Ms. Gary asked if the marketing project was intended to work in concert with the previously approved marketing project.

Mr. Holden responded that it was designed to work in concert, but it could work separately.

Mr. English said he was a no.

Ms. Allen said she supported the previous item and that she was a yes.

Mr. Coen said that he was a tentative yes.

Ms. Bohmke said she would support the measure if they were able to work with the new workforce stabilization employee from the consortium.

Mr. Holden said that was possible.

Ms. Bohmke said she was a yes.

Ms. Yeung asked Ms. Light to remind her what ARPA funds were to be used for.

Ms. Light explained that the federal government provided funding to localities to help them fiscally maneuver the pandemic, help citizens, and prevent future pandemics.

Ms. Vanuch asked Ms. Yeung if she was a yes or a no.

Ms. Yeung said she was a yes.

Mr. English asked what was wrong with the current practice. He said he did not understand why they were spending $72K if they already had HR. He asked if they were helping other businesses, and if they were, it was not the County's business. He said he was a no vote because the $72K could be used for something else. He said that he did not get it.

Ms. Gary said that she was a yes.

Mr. Holden responded that the project was to help attract workers for businesses in the County.

Ms. Vanuch noted that a majority wanted to move forward with the item, so it would be added to the consent agenda for the December 13 meeting. She mentioned the Duff Green Park water line project and that the cost was $150K. She said that the Board had previously agreed for the item to return on a future consent agenda. She asked if any supervisor would like to remove the item, line item 36.

Ms. Bohmke asked who would benefit from the water line and whether new houses would be able to connect.

Mr. Edwards explained that the project would include a small waterline crossing Route 3 to Duff Green Park. He said that they would likely be able to connect the tribe to the water line and connect Duff Green Park to take it off a well system. He noted that the project was consistent with the park's master plan.

Ms. Bohmke noted that the primary benefit was for the park and the secondary benefit was for the tribe.

Mr. Edwards said yes.

Mr. Coen clarified that the land was all County-owned, and there was no private land that could be turned into homes.

Mr. Morris responded that Mr. Coen was correct. He said that the water line would go into the old farm property and then route back to the existing park. He said that the water line would only be on County property.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that future field constructions would be able to connect to the water line.

Mr. Morris said that future fields would be able to connect their irrigation systems.

Ms. Vanuch noted that line item 27 was the grant accountant position. She stated that the Board had not previously provided direction, and the item would be considered as part of the FY24 budget. She said that the total cost of the grant accountant's salary would be $81,637. She noted that the item would move forward.

Ms. Vanuch said that it looked like there was $2.72M in projects that the Board would make decisions on at a later time. She noted that they had pulled off $250K that could be added to capital expenses.

Ms. Vanuch said they would review the capital projects for any that the Board wanted to accelerate. She asked what the total cost of money was that the County had left. She said she wanted the figures with and without the $2.7M.

Ms. Light responded that without the $2.7M, the County had $5,112,838 left, and with the $2.7M included, there was $7,832,838.

Ms. Vanuch noted that the $7.8M included the costs for [Riot] and the utilities project, and the $5.11M did not include those costs.

Ms. Vanuch noted that they had discussed needing more information on the carpet project. She mentioned the command bus, the HVAC, and the SCBA replacement at a combined cost of $5.280M, and the replacement radios were a cost of $6.934M.

Ms. Bohmke said that they did not have information on the HVAC system replacement. She asked for clarification as to what the issues were with the HVAC systems.

Mr. Morris explained that the HVAC was on a cyclical replacement schedule, and a unit was typically replaced every 15 years. He said that the units were at the time to be replaced in the 15-year cycle. He said the project had been on the 3R list for a number of years.

Mr. English clarified that if the HVAC system went down, it would have to be replaced.

Mr. Morris answered that the funding would have to be found.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the HVAC systems were at the end of the 15-year cycle.

Mr. Morris responded that they were in the 15th year. He said that they were scheduled every 15 years, and this was either the 24th or 25th year.

Mr. Coen said that it would have been helpful to know that the project had previously been included in the 3R list. He asked for clarification regarding the timing.

Ms. Light responded that the HVAC replacements appeared in the CIP over the next five years. She said she would find the specific dates for the HVAC and carpet replacements.

Ms. Vanuch stated that the SCBA replacement was a cost of $5.2M. She asked if the Board wanted to wait to address the item until the budget cycle or if it wanted to use the remaining ARPA funds.

Ms. Allen noted that the Fire Chief stated that it could wait until the budget cycle.

Ms. Gary said that the amount of time it would take to purchase the equipment provided the opportunity to wait even if they did not use ARPA funds.

Ms. Vanuch said that there were replacement radio costs. She noted that the radios were two years over schedule, but the County did not have enough money. She explained that the rest of the funds could be used for replacement radios, but the County would have no more ARPA funds.

Ms. Allen asked about the Carl Lewis Center.

Ms. Vanuch said that no one requested the Carl Lewis Center to be moved to use ARPA funding.

Ms. Allen said that she requested for the Carl Lewis Center to be moved over to use ARPA funding.

Ms. Gary said that she agreed.

Mr. Coen said they should discuss whether to remove one large project to complete another large project or accept that there would be large projects now and into the future. He said that he did not know which was the better financial option. He clarified that if they did not go forward with item 19, then the future impact on the tax rate would be $0.004.

Ms. Light stated that item 19 was a 3R project, so it was cash funded. She explained that it was part of the Board's policy that 3% of the expenditures were associated with the 3R projects. She explained that by moving 3R projects to ARPA funding, they were able to perform more 3R projects. She stated that the Board could direct some of the funding to SCPS for their 3R projects that were bond-funded. She noted that there were several options for the Board as they reviewed the projects.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that the Sheriff's Department firearm building was only $158K. She said that she did not have a reference for the condition of the building.

Mr. English noted that the project could wait.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that it was scheduled for FY24 which was the next budget year.

Ms. Bohmke stated that item 13 was for an engine and ambulance replacement, and the cost was $2.6M. She asked if the replacement cost was only for one ambulance and one engine.

Ms. Light responded that the cost was for three ambulances and one engine.

Ms. Bohmke asked where the ambulances would be located.

Chief Cardello said they would have to review which vehicles were being replaced.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that the replacements were part of a cyclical schedule.

Chief Cardello responded that they were.

Ms. Vanuch stated that it was just a project identified by staff to relieve cost burdens from the CIP.

Ms. Yeung said that she would consider several smaller items which were safety related rather than one larger project t. She said that there needed to be a ranking as to the safety implication. She asked if there was additional information that could be provided. She asked whether the list had to be completed at the work session.

Mr. Vosburg said that all of the projects were selected because they were within an imminent timeframe. He explained that the ARPA funding had to be used. He said the matter was not a question of whether to go forward with the projects or to prioritize them. He said that all of the projects listed, with the exception of the Carl Lewis Center, were included in the CIP and would be completed. He said that further decisions would have to be made as to what to do with the money that would be freed up in the CIP by moving projects to ARPA funding.

Mr. Vosburg explained that from a staff perspective, selecting a project was not an issue, but determining where to redirect the money was. He explained that all of the projects would happen within a relatively short time frame. He said that they hoped to have the SCBA ordered and acquired by 2026.

Ms. Yeung stated that if they freed up three smaller projects by using ARPA funds, then they could free up $7M in the CIP which could be used for a larger project. She said she wanted to ensure that the projects funded with ARPA money qualified.

Ms. Allen noted that the radios would be replaced regardless. She said that she agreed with Ms. Yeung's suggestion to target the ARPA funds to smaller projects. She suggested that the ARPA funds be used for the Carl Lewis Center, the ambulance replacement, and some Parks and Recreation costs. She suggested that the leftover money be earmarked for the radios to decrease the impact on the tax rate.

Ms. Vanuch said that the majority of the Board did not appear to be favorable. She said that they did not have enough funding to pay for all of the radios. She said that there was essentially only $5.4M available if they also did not do the Riot project. She noted that the Board had not yet taken action on the Riot project. She noted that the Carl Lewis Center was not included in the CIP, and if they were to fund it then they needed to discuss the costs. She said she would support earmarking ARPA funds for the Carl Lewis Center with the caveat that the Board would review the project.

Ms. Vanuch requested that staff return with more information at the December 13 meeting as to whether the HVAC systems replacement was necessary. She noted that they had spent a lot of money on HVAC replacement and they were breaking eminently. She requested that the command bus project be expedited because it was constantly used. She noted that the replacement would be moved up by four years. She stated that if they moved forward with the command bus replacement, the HVAC systems replacement, and the Carl Lewis Center rebuild, then they would only spend $4M.

Ms. Allen noted that there was a backlog of engine replacements.

Ms. Vanuch said that would put the cost over the available funds.

Ms. Bohmke noted that they could order one engine and one or two ambulances.

Ms. Allen asked for clarification regarding the prioritization of the engine and ambulance replacements.

Chief Cardello explained that if they ordered a fire engine that day, it would take approximately three years for it to be delivered.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that ARPA funds could not be used for fire engines if that was the timeline.

Chief Cardello explained that ambulances could probably be delivered in 12 to 14 months.

Ms. Vanuch asked how much money the ambulances were.

Chief Cardello responded that it was about $1.1M for three ambulances.

Ms. Vanuch said that if they included the $1.1M for ambulances, then the total would be almost $5.2M. She clarified that the projects included were the Carl Lewis Center, the HVAC replacement, the command bus replacement, and the ambulance replacement.

Ms. Gary suggested that some funding be committed to the Brooke Road project to reassure people that the project was still in progress.

Ms. Vanuch explained that the funding for the Brooke Road project was allocated and already existed. She said that the money was included in the transportation fund and the Board was not changing it.

Ms. Gary noted that it had been mentioned that the road was already fixed, so she was concerned that there would be backpedaling.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the Board agreed to support moving the projects totaling $5.2M to ARPA funding.

Ms. Bohmke said that she supported it.

Mr. Coen said that he supported it.

Ms. Vanuch stated that the command bus replacement, the HVAC replacement, the Carl Lewis Center rebuild, and the replacement of three ambulances would be included.

Mr. Vosburg clarified that the items would likely come back before the Board during the second meeting in January.

Ms. Vanuch requested that whatever could be included on the December 13 agenda be included.

Ms. Vanuch stated the Board would take a brief recess before entering into a closed session,

CLOSED SESSION
At 3:54 p.m., the Board entered into a closed session.

CERTIFY CLOSED SESSION
At 4:05 p.m., the Board certified the closed session.

ADJOURNMENT
At 4:05 p.m., Chairman Vanuch adjourned the December 6, 2022 American Rescue Plan Act Work Session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors.

Randal E. Vosburg

Randal E. Vosburg
County Administrator

Crystal Vanuch

Crystal Vanuch
Chairman