BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 18, 2023

CALL TO ORDER – A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Dr. Pamela Yeung, Chairman, at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18, 2023, in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

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

Also in attendance were Randal E. 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

Dr. Yeung stated that April was National Child Abuse Prevention Month, which encouraged communities to educate and increase about the importance of child and family wellbeing. She said the pinwheels in front of the Government Center represented the community's commitment to ending child abuse.

Dr. Yeung stated that National Volunteer Week was from April 16 to April 22. She said the County would not be able to provide customer service to the community without volunteers. She said in 2022, there were 169 volunteers serving in Fire and Rescue, the SCSO, the Government Center, and the courts, and they volunteered 14,000 hours of service, or about $540K in savings for the County.

Dr Yeung stated National Crime Victims' Rights Week was from April 23 to April 29. She said the Commonwealth Attorney's Office would host a reception to honor and recognize the resilience and strength of crime victims. She said the week sought to remove barriers for justice for crime victims. She said Earth Day would be celebrated April 24.

Dr. Yeung said on April 24, the Utilities department in collaboration with SCPS would host an educational, interactive exhibit at the Earth Day event hosted at Patawomeck Park. She said they developed a comic book featuring the County's water superhero, Captain Clog, and the information mascot, Blu the Blue Heron. She said the comic was available for download on the utility webpage, <utilities.staffordcountyva.gov>. She stated Winding Creek had a new outdoor classroom.

PRESENTATIONS

PRESENTATION OF PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING APRIL 23-29, 2023, AS NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK.

Dr. Yeung presented the proclamation to Mr. Eric Olsen, Stafford County Commonwealth's Attorney. She said Mr. Olsen was joined by the Victim Witness Assistance Staff, Marilyn Dufrat, Juanita Maley, Tracy Kenworthy, Teena Miller, and Jennifer Ayala. She said that the Victim Witness Assistance Office assisted people through the court process to ensure their voices were heard. She said the Commonwealth's Attorney hosted an annual reception to recognize the resilience of crime victims and award someone who represented courage and strength.

Mr. Olsen accepted the proclamation. He stated Ms. Deborah Love, Managing Paralegal and Office Manager, was also present. He said that the focus for this year's event was on the victims of the crime of drunk driving. He said there were three award recipients, the families of three individuals killed by drunk drivers. He said that the event would be held Thursday, April 27 at 6:15 p.m. in the Board chambers. He said the event would be open to the public, and the Chief Deputy Attorney General Eric Slemp was the keynote speaker while the sheriff would also be speaking. He said the event would last about an hour and fifteen minutes.

ADDITIONS - DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

Mr. Vosburg said there were two additional handouts for the Board—one item related to Item 18 under New Business with a corrected resolution number; and one related to Item 27 under Unfinished Business.

Ms. Bohmke requested moving Items 21 and 22 under Public Hearing to the end of the agenda of the 7 p.m. meeting in the interest of time for the public.

Ms. Allen requested the deletion of Item 20.

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

The Voting Board tally was:

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

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC - I

Dr. Yeung read the protocol for public presentations.

1. Mr. Lester Gabriel, 86 Smithfield Way, said the tax rate should be set to adjust for inflation and growth in the County.

2. Mr. Howard Rudat, Rock Hill, said 18 months ago, the Department of Justice settled its religious discrimination lawsuit against the County. He said the funds expended by the County for the lawsuit were enough to fund the six proposed SPOs or items 4 or 6 from the School Board request. He said the Board should consider the news headlines if it did not fund the School Board's or Superintendent's request. He said poor schools would stop people from moving to the County. He noted each Supervisor campaigned on support for the schools, and if they did not support the school request, then they lied.

3. Ms. Shelley Painter, 129 Bridge Water Circle, noted people on fixed incomes were experiencing higher costs and requested the Board modify the 38% advertised tax increase.

4. Ms. Harry Legs, England Run Lane, spoke about the several challenges faced by Stafford County Public Schools, the teachers, and the students. He said that the challenges were all related to the failure to provide schools with necessary funding to alleviate the issues.

5. Ms. Kristin Maxson said she had been looking for information about the lower Accokeek pumping system and found a typo of a name, Simenson, was misspelled Simenspn. She said she was interested in VDOT project 001089-525. She questioned how large the budget would be. She said that the school debt should decrease.

6. Ms. Alane Callander, 622 Lancaster Street, said she could no longer access agenda background documents by clicking on the item in the agenda, and she now had to scroll through the whole document to find the material. She spoke about the need to fund the Department of Social Services to provide benefits and support to people in the County.

7. Mr. Mathew Shiltz, 37 Serene Hills Drive, said the tax rate should be set at $0.82 and the fire levy should be set at $0.03. He said the County had not acted as a good financial steward. He said the golf course on Celebrate Parkway had been reassessed from $10M in 2007 to $1.6M presently. He said the school budget should be separate from the tax rate.

REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Bohmke – remarked she attended the Fire and Rescue Awards Banquet, and the guest speaker was Michael Jernigan, a U.S. Marine Veteran. She said Mr. Jernigan spoke about losing his eyesight and gaining a new respect for being alive. She said FAMPO received a presentation about the five options for the potential new Rappahannock River crossing. She said they discussed the vision priorities for the crossing, and at the May 15 FAMPO meeting, which would be held at the VDOT Residency, 86 Deacon Road, public comment would be received.

Ms. Bohmke said on May 8, additional public comment would be received at Germanna Community College for VDOT's six-year transportation plan at 4:00 p.m. She said she attended a court of honor for two Eagle Scouts, Brianna and Nick Futrell. She announced that former Supervisor Togie Payne died, and his funeral service was held the previous Friday. She said Mr. Payne would be missed.

Mr. Coen – remarked he had discussed with the sheriff about installing a satellite police station on Route 17. He said the sheriff had requested the matter be added to the June Public Safety Committee meeting. He said he attended the funeral for Mr. Togie Payne. He said he attended a ribbon cutting in Downtown Falmouth for Harkcon. He said he participated in the 5K run.

Mr. Coen said the animal shelter was hosting a rabies clinic, and he encouraged people to make donations. He said he visited the Berea fire station. He said Fire and Rescue was hosting a blood drive, and more information was available on the website. He said he attended the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance Meeting and the FAMPO meeting.

Mr. English – expressed condolences for Mr. Togie Payne. He said that he was unable to attend the 5K because of sinus allergies. He said the Soapbox Derby would be held on June 10 at 95 Reservoir Road by Rocky Run Elementary School.

Ms. Gary – remarked she had attended the PRTC Board of Commissioners meeting. She said she visited residents around the Celebrate community. She said she attended the Zoning Ordinance Ad Hoc Committee, and the Board should soon be receiving an updated document to improve the process for staff, developers, and taxpayers. She said she ran the 5K and thanked those who attended. She said she attended the FAMPO meeting.

Ms. Vanuch – thanked Stafford Hospital for hosting the Spring Fever 5K, and over 535 runners participated, raising more than $275K for the Stafford Hospital Foundation. She said the money would go to fund the purchase of medical equipment at the hospital and provided educational scholarships for associates and community nursing students. She said that the river crossing study was presented to the FAMPO policy committee.

Ms. Vanuch said the next FAMPO meeting would be May 15 at 86 Deacon Road at 6:00 p.m. She said staff had issued a letter to all of the Lake Arrowhead residents in the service district about updates to dam repairs. She said she would be seeking advisory board members for the service district in the coming weeks. She said Delegate Durant had introduced a bill in the General Assembly to get the County 50% of the Cost-to-Compete funding, but the bill had not progressed.

Ms. Vanuch said they had requested a meeting with the Governor to approve a budget amendment related to Cost-to-Compete, which was scheduled for April 19 at 9:30 a.m. She said the amendment would provide an additional $12M to $15M annually for teacher salaries. She said that the raises were unsustainable to support with the tax rate, and they required state assistance. She said she needed to pull Item 4.

Ms. Allen – remarked she attended the PRTC meeting. She said she attended a meeting with staff and NVTC concerning the proposed working group to issue and distribute the interstate toll revenue. She said they would decide an allocation at the next meeting. She said they planned that the Stafford D.C. commuter bus would be fully funded, and VRE services would be enhanced.

Dr. Yeung – remarked she visited Chicago to attend the American Education Research Association annual meeting. She said she was unable to attend the funeral for Mr. Togie Payne because she visited her daughter who had returned from Japan.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY

There was no report.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Vosburg reported that in the packet, there was a monthly Expenditure Listing Report and an April 4, 2023 Infrastructure Committee Action List for informational purposes. He said Ms. Andrea Light would present the FY2023 Third Quarter Financial Review.

Ms. Andrea Light, Chief Director of Financial Services, said at the $0.85 tax rate, revenues were anticipated to be slightly under projections by $1.2M, less than 0.6% of the budget. She said that any changes made to the tax rate would significantly impact the change. She said personal property taxes were anticipated to exceed projections by about $1.1M, or 2.1%.

Ms. Light said that sales and use tax was about $735K over budget, or 3.2%. She said consumer utilities was $1M over budget, or 19%. She said they typically saw a decline in consumer utilities. She said recordation was $4.0M under budget which was associated to a change in interest rates. She said the interest rate had increased, so people were not refinancing their homes. She said the deficit was offset by increased interest earnings of about the same amount.

Ms. Light said Parks and Recreation revenues had increased by 12% since the previous year, but levels were not at pre-pandemic levels. She said continued increased revenues were dependent on hiring more part-time staff.

Ms. Bohmke asked what was causing the consumer utility revenue to increase.

Ms. Light responded that part of the reason was because they reduced the budget in FY23. She said they considered consumer utility revenue a declining source. She said they were receiving more wireless fees for cellular service. She said cable subscriptions decreased—in 2018, it was about $1.2M, and now it was about $250K.

Ms. Allen asked what caused the decreased projections for the real estate revenue.

Ms. Light said that several assumptions went into real estate revenue, and a 0.6% variance was acceptable. She said that it could be due to variances in exception qualifications or different growth projections.

Ms. Light said ambulance service fees had increased 8% since last year. She said building permits and fees were 5% above budget, but they were declining from the prior year. She said they anticipated operating revenues to exceed the budget by about $4M, or 1.2%. She said they were anticipating health insurance savings of $300K. She said they projected a savings of just under $250K from the Juvenile Center.

Ms. Light said they anticipated debt service savings of about $750K, which was related to delaying debt service for Fire and Rescue apparatus. She said they assumed all school funds were 100% spent. She said there were about $2.5M in expenditure savings, and in conjunction with other revenues, there was about $6.5M in year-end savings for the County.

Ms. Light said water and sewer fees were on target with budget projections. She said pro-rata fees were under budget mirroring the slowdown in development. She said fuels tax and transportation were about 2% above the year prior, and they anticipated the revenues to exceed the budget, about $250K.

Mr. English asked how gas price projections would impact the revenue.

Ms. Light said it would help increase the fuel tax revenue. She said there was a floor for fuel tax put in place by the General Assembly.

Mr. English asked if increased gas prices would impact the County's usage.

Ms. Light said it could impact services in the County. She said there were expenditure fluctuation reserves for the County, so they could request the Board to approve one-time funds to address increased expenses.

Ms. Light said the revenues for the tourism fund were aligning with the budget. She said the Transient Occupancy Tax was almost on target. She said through the Board's oversight and financial leadership, prudent financial policies were followed, as evidenced in the year-end projections. She said in Q3, there was a conservative projection of $6.5M in year-end savings.

Ms. Bohmke asked when the Board would review and discuss the proffer designations for each project in the County.

Ms. Light responded Planning and Zoning typically reviewed the proffers in the spring, and Finance finalized the year-end financials. She said once they did an annual update, and once it was completed, they could bring the matter before the Board.

Mr. Vosburg said staff had taken the proffers out of the debt calculations. He said they had not reallocated the funds, so they needed to have a further discussion.

Ms. Allen asked if the updated projections would impact the projections moving forward.

Ms. Light said all of the figures were reprojected, and they were typically done by December. She said the projections were performed by revenue teams, and they would monitor the figures to make sure the projections in the proposed budget were accurate.

CONSENT AGENDA

Dr. Yeung noted that Item 4, County Administrator; Approve March 28, 2023 Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session: CIP and Project Status minutes was to be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

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

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Vanuch stated that she was not able to attend the March 28 work session, so she wanted to abstain from approval.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to approve Item 4, County Administrator; Approve March 28, 2023 Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session: CIP and Project Status minutes.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 1. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE APRIL 4, 2023 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING MINUTES.

ITEM 2. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE APRIL 4, 2023 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET WORK SESSION: GENERAL BUDGET OVERVIEW MINUTES.

ITEM 3. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE MARCH 29, 2023 JOINT BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.

ITEM 4. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE MARCH 28, 2023 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET WORK SESSION: CIP AND PROJECT STATUS MINUTES.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to approve Item 4, County Administrator; Approve March 28, 2023 Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session: CIP and Project Status minutes.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 5. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE MARCH 21, 2023 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET WORK SESSION: UTILITIES, TRANSPORTATION, AND OTHER FUNDS MINUTES.

ITEM 6. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND TRIBAL CONSISTENCY FUND (LATCF) ALLOCATION TO SUPPORT FY2023 GENERAL FUND SALARY COSTS.

Resolution R23-130 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND TRIBAL CONSISTENCY FUND (LATCF) ALLOCATION FROM

WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of the Treasury has provided Local Assistance and Tribal Consistency Fund (LATCF) allocation to Stafford County in the amount of $50,000 in Fiscal Year 2023 and the County anticipates to receive the remaining $50,000 in Fiscal Year 2024; and

WHEREAS, funds can be used to cover any cost incurred on or after March 15, 2021, for a governmental purpose other than a lobbying activity subject to award terms and certifications; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends the funds be used to cover payroll costs in the General Fund for any position(s) that are not funded by any existing grant;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that part one of the federal LATCF allocation be and it hereby is budgeted and appropriated as follows to support Fiscal Year 2023 payroll costs:

Fund	Amount
General Fund	$50,000

ITEM 7. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A JOINT PUBLIC HEARING WITH VDOT TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSED FY 2024-2029 SECONDARY SYSTEM SIX- YEAR PROGRAM.

Resolution R23-146 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A JOINT PUBLIC HEARING WITH THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSED VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FISCAL YEARS 2024-2029 SECONDARY SYSTEM SIX-YEAR PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Board sets priorities for the road improvement projects in the County for the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Secondary System Six-Year Program (SSYP); and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to receive the funding provided by the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-FY2029 SSYP, to complete road improvement priorities in the County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.2-331, the Board and VDOT are required to conduct a joint public hearing on the proposed FY2024-FY2029 SSYP; and

WHEREAS, the Board will consider the recommendations of VDOT and staff, and the public testimony, if any, received at the public hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to advertise a joint public hearing with the Virginia Department of Transportation for consideration of the proposed Fiscal Years 2024-2029 Secondary System Six-Year Program.

ITEM 8. COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY'S OFFICE; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO SUBMIT A GRANT APPLICATION TO THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES FOR THE VIRGINIA SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM FUND (VSDVVF) GRANT PROGRAM.

Resolution R23-139 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMISSION OF A GRANT APPLICATION TO THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES FOR THE VIRGINIA SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM FUND GRANT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) has implemented the Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Victim Fund (VSDVVF) to provide services to victims of sexual violence, domestic violence, stalking, and family abuse; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth’s Attorney’s Office seeks to apply for an award from the VSDVVF totaling $45,000 covering Fiscal Year 2024; and

WHEREAS, monies from the VSDVVF can be used to cover additional costs to assist with prosecutions of sexual violence, domestic violence, stalking, and family abuse; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth’s Attorney’s Office intends to use any awarded funds to cover the costs of additional staff salaries; and

WHEREAS, the VSDVVF applications are due by 12:00 p.m. on May 1, 2023; and

WHEREAS, by applying for VSDVVF, Stafford County agrees to meet the program's General Grant Conditions and Assurances;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this 18th day of April 2023, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to apply for the Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Victim Fund Grant Program for the purposes stated herein, in an amount not to exceed Forty-Five Thousand Dollars ($45,000).

ITEM 9. COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY'S OFFICE; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPLY FOR THE CONTINUATION OF VICTIM/WITNESS GRANT WITH THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2024.

Resolution R23-142 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPLY FOR THE CONTINUATION OF THE VICTIM WITNESS GRANT PROGRAM FROM THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES

WHEREAS, in 2021, Stafford County was awarded the Victim Witness Grant (VWG) through the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) in the amount of $194,753; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors authorized the County Administrator to accept VWG Grant #22-O1194VW19 pursuant to Resolution R21-323; and

WHEREAS, VDCJS awarded the VWG Grant as Grant #23-O1194VW19; and

WHEREAS, the VWG Grant is a two-year renewable grant spanning FY2022-2023; and

WHEREAS, VDCJS is accepting applications for the VWG and is projected to have a maximum award for FY2024 of $194,753 subject to modification in the state budget; and

WHEREAS, a completed application, including an itemized budget and budget narrative, must be received by the VDCJS on a date yet to be announced;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to apply to the Department of Criminal Justice Services for continuation of the Victim/Witness Grant, Grant Number 23-O1194VW, for Fiscal Year 2024 for the Stafford County Victim Witness Assistance Program in an amount not to exceed One Hundred Ninety-Four Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty-Three Dollars ($194,753).

ITEM 10. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT; A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING APRIL 23-29, 2023, AS NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK.

Proclamation P23-17 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO DECLARE APRIL 23-29, 2023, AS NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK

WHEREAS, the term "victim" is more than just a label and has legal standing and protections that go along with it; and

WHEREAS, crime victims' rights acts passed here in Virginia and at the federal level guarantee victims the right to meaningfully participate and use their voice in the criminal justice process; and

WHEREAS, victim service providers, advocates, law enforcement officers, attorneys, and other allied professionals can help survivors find justice by enforcing these rights; and

WHEREAS, the right to provide an impact statement ensures that victims' voices are considered in court during the sentencing and when applicable, restitution processes; and

WHEREAS, including and elevating the voices of survivors makes certain they are heard and seen and creates a path to forging and sustaining community trust; and

WHEREAS, engaging survivors creates responses and services that are credible, meaningful, and centered on individual needs; and

WHEREAS, survivors' lived experiences can serve as a catalyst for implementing innovative programs, shifting existing programs in new directions, and changing policies or practices that prevent survivors from accessing services or pursuing justice; and

WHEREAS, National Crime Victims' Rights Week provides an opportunity to recommit to listening to crime survivors in every space where decisions are made that could impact them; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County is hereby dedicated to amplifying the voices of survivors and creating an environment where survivors have the confidence that they will be heard, believed, and supported;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors, on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that it be and hereby does proclaim the week of April 23–29, 2023, as Crime Victims' Rights Week, reaffirming this County's commitment to creating a victim service and criminal justice response that assists all victims of crime during Crime Victims' Rights Week and throughout the year; and expressing our sincere gratitude and appreciation for those community members, victim service providers, and criminal justice professionals who are committed to improving our response to all victims of crime so that they may find relevant assistance, support, justice, and peace.

ITEM 11. FIRE AND RESCUE; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE CONTRACTS WITH LAAKE ENTERPRISES, INC. D.B.A. FESCO EMERGENCY SALES FOR THE PURCHASE OF THREE AMBULANCES AND ADDITIONAL AMBULANCE EQUIPMENT.

Resolution R23-89 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE CONTRACTS WITH LAAKE ENTERPRISES, INC. D.B.A. FESCO EMERGENCY SALES FOR THE PURCHASE OF THREE AMBULANCES AND ADDITIONAL AMBULANCE EQUIPMENT

WHEREAS, the Department of Fire, Rescue, and Emergency Services (Department) operates emergency response vehicles as part of its all-hazards approach to emergency, fire and medical response; and

WHEREAS, three of the Department's ambulances have surpassed their recommended service life of ten years established by the Department's Fleet Replacement Plan; and

WHEREAS, funding in the amount of $1,035,000 for the purchase of three replacement ambulances is available through the fiscal year 2023 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the remaining funding in the amount of $136,872 is available in Capital Projects Reserve funds; and

WHEREAS, Laake Enterprises, Inc., doing business as FESCO Emergency Sales, is the authorized dealer for Emergency Vehicles, Inc. in Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Department evaluated the prices for the ambulances and find the costs to be reasonable for the type of ambulances and related equipment desired; and

WHEREAS, the Department desires to cooperatively procure three Horton Model #603 ambulances through Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC) contract number AM10-20 with FESCO Emergency Sales; and

WHEREAS, the purchase of additional ambulance equipment not under the cooperative contract has been approved as a sole source purchase through Laake Enterprises, Inc. by the County's Director of Finance, in accordance with the County's Procurement Policy;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute contracts with Laake Enterprises, Inc., doing business as FESCO Emergency Sales, for the purchase of three ambulances in the amount of One Million One Hundred Thirty-Five

Thousand Nine Hundred Fourteen Dollars ($1,135,914), and additional ambulance equipment in the amount of Thirty-Five Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty-Eight Dollars ($35,958), unless amended by a duly authorized contract amendments; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Capital Projects Reserve funds held in the General Fund are budgeted and appropriated as follows:

Fund	**Purpose**	**Amount**
General Fund	Transfer to Capital Projects Fund from Capital Projects Reserves	$136,872
Capital Projects Fund	Funding for the Fire and Rescue Ambulance	$136,872

ITEM 12. PLANNING AND ZONING; REQUEST FROM THE DEVELOPER OF EMBREY MILL THE DEDICATION OF SCHOOL AND LIBRARY SITES BY MAY 19, 2023 IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROFFERED CONDITIONS.

Resolution R23-149 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE DEDICATION OF PROPERTY BY MAY 19, 2023 FROM THE DEVELOPER OF THE EMBREY MILL NEIGHBORHOOD IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROFFERED CONDITIONS, LOCATED WITHIN THE GARRISONVILLE ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, on March 19, 2013, the Board adopted Ordinance O13-22 with proffers entitled “Embrey Mill Revised Proffers,” dated December 14, 2012 (Proffers), which amended proffered conditions for the Embrey Mill neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, the Proffers stipulate that the applicant shall dedicate two school sites and one library site to the Board, after the same are requested for dedication by the Board; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Proffers, Section 3.a., the two school site dedications are also contingent upon mutual approval by the Board and the applicant of an alternate design for the site, as the proffered proposed School Elevation is no longer a viable option; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Proffers, Section 19.a., the library site shall be used for a library or other appropriate public use, and said dedication is also contingent upon the applicant’s prior approval of the building architecture for the library and site design; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to request the dedication of the sites and to consider entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the developer of Embrey Mill for the building architecture and site design of the future public uses on the property pursuant to the Proffers;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that it be and hereby does request dedication of proffered school sites and the library site, in accordance with the proffered conditions accepted with Ordinance O13-22 (Proffers); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board expresses its desire to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to be entered into with the developer of Embrey Mill to provide mutually agreed upon building architecture and site design for the school and library sites, as required by the Proffers; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board requests the applicant dedicate these sites by May 19, 2023.

ITEM 13. PROCUREMENT; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH THE GORDIAN GROUP, INC. FOR JOB ORDER CONTRACT CONSULTING SERVICES AND MULTIPLE JOB ORDER CONTRACTS FOR GENERAL CONTRACTING CONSTRUCTION WORK.

Resolution R23-145 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH THE GORDIAN GROUP, INC. FOR JOB ORDER CONTRACT CONSULTING SERVICES AND MULTIPLE JOB ORDER CONTRACTS FOR GENERAL CONTRACTING CONSTRUCTION WORK

WHEREAS, the Department of Finance, Procurement Division (Department) desires to contract for job order contracting consulting services and job order contracts for general contracting construction work on an as-needed basis for any County department needing these services; and

WHEREAS, the County may cooperatively procure consulting services with The Gordian Group, Inc. through a state cooperative contract with the Commonwealth of Virginia, Division of Purchases and Supply (DPS) contract #CTR005989; and

WHEREAS, the County participated in a joint procurement with Stafford County Public Schools for job order contracts through Stafford County Public Schools Invitation for Bid #23-SCPS-022; and

WHEREAS, Centennial Contractors Enterprises, Inc.; The Matthews Group, Inc. d.b.a. TMG; FHP Tectonics Corp.; and Brown & Root Industrial Services, LLC were found to be the lowest responsive and responsible among those submitting bids to perform construction work for the County; and

WHEREAS, any County department needing general contracting construction work will use these contracts, using appropriated funds; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Virginia Code § 2.2-4303.2, no job order shall exceed Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000), and no term of job orders shall exceed Six Million Dollars ($6,000,000) per contractor;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April 2023, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract with The Gordian Group, Inc. (Gordian), pursuant to Commonwealth of Virginia, Division of Purchases and Supply (DPS) contract #CTR005989, to provide job order contracting consulting services on an as-needed basis for any job order in an amount not to exceed 5% of each job ordered, paid directly to Gordian by the County, unless amended by a duly executed contract amendment; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to execute job order contracts for one year, with two optional one-year renewals with the following contractors for general contracting construction services:

- Centennial Contractors Enterprises, Inc.
- The Matthews Group, Inc. d.b.a. TMG Construction Corporation
- FHP Tectonics Corp.
- Brown & Root Industrial Services, LLC

; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, pursuant to the authority granted in this Resolution, is authorized to execute job orders pursuant to the Stafford County and Stafford County Public Schools Joint Invitation to Bid #23-SCPS-022 up to Two Hundred Thousand Dollars ($200,000) per job order.

ITEM 14. SHERIFF; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE EXPENDITURES AND RATIFY CONTRACT WITH HOWARD UNIFORM COMPANY, AND APPROVE CONTRACT AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES WITH AMERICAN UNIFORM SALES, INC. AND GALLS, LLC FOR THE PURCHASE OF UNIFORMS FOR THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE.

Resolution R23-140 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE EXPENDITURES AND RATIFY A CONTRACT WITH HOWARD UNIFORM COMPANY, AND APPROVE A CONTRACT AMENDMENT AND ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES WITH AMERICAN UNIFORM SALES, INC. AND GALLS, LLC FOR THE PURCHASE OF UNIFORMS FOR THE STAFFORD COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

WHEREAS, the Board adopted Resolution R23-32 which budgeted and appropriated $412,293 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 year-end funds to the Stafford County Sheriff's Office to replace uniforms; and

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Sheriff's Office currently purchases uniforms through a cooperative contract with Howard Uniform Company, Stafford County Rider Agreement No. 22-072-3120CI; and

WHEREAS, due to the volume of uniform items to be ordered, the Sheriff's Office will exceed $200,000 in expenditures with Howard Uniform Company, necessitating Board approval of the contract; and

WHEREAS, the County has contracts with American Uniform Sales, Inc. and Galls, LLC, both under Contract No. 22-022-3220-SB-R, to purchase uniforms for the Fire and Rescue Department; and

WHEREAS, the Sheriff's Office also desires to purchase uniforms from American Uniform Sales, Inc. and Galls, LLC, and anticipates spending over $200,000 on both contracts, which would exceed the authorized purchase amount approved pursuant to Resolution R22-268; and

WHEREAS, FY2022 year-end funds are available for the current contract year costs and funding for subsequent renewal years is subject to annual Board budget and appropriation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the contract with Howard Uniform Company, Stafford County Contract No. 22-072-3120CI, commending on March 14, 2022 and ending on February 2, 2026, if all renewals are exercised, be and it hereby is approved, and the County Administrator, or his designee, is authorized to approve expenditures in an amount not to exceed Six Hundred Forty-Seven Thousand Dollars ($647,000), for a total contract amount of Six Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars ($680,000), for the purchase of uniforms for the Stafford County Sheriff's Office, unless amended by a duly-authorized contract amendment; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, is authorized to execute a contract amendment to authorize the purchase of uniforms for the Sheriff's Office on Stafford County Contract No. 22-022-3220-SB-R with American Uniform Company Sales, Inc., and authorize expenditures in an amount not to exceed Three Hundred Twenty-Three Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($323,500) for the Sheriff's Office; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, is authorized to execute a contract amendment to authorize the purchase of uniforms for the Sheriff's Office on Stafford County Contract No. 22-022-3220-SB-R with Galls, LLC, and authorize expenditures in an amount not to exceed Three Hundred Twenty-Three Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($323,500) for the Sheriff's Office.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ITEM 15. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE INITIATION OF AN APPLICATION TO RECLASSIFY FROM THE R-1, SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL TO THE B-1, CONVENIENCE COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT, COUNTY-OWNED TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 20-136A (FORMER MONCURE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SITE).

Ms. Kathy Baker, Director of Planning and Zoning, said the Board discussed the item at the March 21, 2023 meeting. She said the Board recommended consideration of the application, and if the Board authorized the resolution, it would be up to staff to develop the application, and then it would go through the standard rezoning application process. She said the Board could impose proffers on the property, and a traffic impact analysis would be required. She said there was an option to rezone the property to B-1 or B-2. She noted most of the properties along Garrisonville Road were zoned B-2.

Ms. Vanuch said she supported B-2 zoning. She asked whether the Planning Commission would review the application before the Board.

Ms. Baker said the application was for a standard rezoning, and they did not refer to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that it would allow the Planning Commission to offer recommendations to the Board about what should not be allowed on the site.

Ms. Baker responded that the Board was the applicant, so the Commission would ultimately be making a recommendation to the Board, and the Board would ultimately set the proffers.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that the Planning Commission could provide feedback on the proposal before it came before the Board.

Ms. Baker said when they advertised, they typically included proffers.

Ms. McClendon responded that when they advertised, they included proffers. She explained the proffers at the topic of discussion would be more restrictive on the property. She said they would evaluate the proffers and send them back if needed, but overall, restrictions on the property would be allowed.

Ms. Vanuch said restricting the allowable uses would narrow the types of applications received when they advertised the project.

Mr. Coen asked if a proffer could require the applicant to perform the traffic study.

Ms. Baker said the traffic study was a required part of the rezoning application, and they typically received it at the beginning of the process.

Ms. McClendon said that the application could not move forward for consideration by the Commission without the TIA.

Dr. Yeung asked for clarification about the impacts of the rezoning.

Ms. Baker said if the Board rezoned the property to B-1 or B-2, then it would be limited to those uses.

Ms. Allen asked if the schools had future plans for the use of the property.

Ms. Baker said she had not had discussions.

Ms. Allen said she would want to know the plans before she supported the measure. She noted there was a need for a middle school in the northern part of the County.

Ms. Baker said the site was only 10 acres, so it would likely not support a school.

Ms. Allen said they would have to reconsider school sizes as the population continued to grow.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to defer the matter.

Ms. Vanuch made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. English, to approve resolution R23-127 to rezone the property from R-1 to B-2.

Ms. Gary said she did not support the motion because Supervisors were requesting more information.

Ms. Bohmke said the reason the Moncure school was moved was due to safety reasons and proximity to the highway.

Ms. Vanuch said the schools dedicated the site back to the County because they did not have a use for it.

Dr. Yeung said the reason the Moncure school was redeveloped was due to the condition of the building.

Mr. English said they had to address the matter, and rezoning was the best route forward.

Ms. Gary said she supported the request for more information, and she did not want to rush the decision.

Mr. Coen said the rezoning would allow many beneficial uses on the site. He said approving the resolution would begin the process, but the Board would have other opportunities to review the application. He said that he supported moving forward.

Ms. Allen said she was not against the rezoning. She said schools could be built differently, and safety concerns could be ameliorated. She said she wanted more information from the schools about future uses for the site. She said rezoning may not attract developers.

Ms. Bohmke said that they should move forward with the resolution. She said the school division did not own the property, the Board owned it. She said that they had discussed the matter multiple times.

Ms. Baker said a school was still permitted in the B-2 zoning.

Ms. Gary clarified that there was the potential for a trade school on the site.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (5) Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Vanuch
Nay: (2) Gary, Yeung

Ms. Allen said she wanted to revote.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to reconsider the vote.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(5)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Vanuch
Nay:	(2)	Gary, Yeung

Ms. Vanuch stated the motion was to approve Resolution R23-127, to rezone the Moncure school site from R-1 to B-2.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R23-127 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INITIATION OF AN APPLICATION FOR ZONING RECLASSIFICATION FROM THE R-1, SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT TO THE B-2, URBAN COMMERICAL ZONING DISTRICT ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 20-136A, WITHIN THE GRIFFIS-WIDEWATER ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, Stafford County owns Tax Map Parcel No. 20-136A (Property), zoned R-1, Suburban Residential; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to allow redevelopment of the Property as a potential business use; and

WHEREAS, the Board acknowledges that redevelopment of the Property could result in additional investments and jobs, and generate tax revenue; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to authorize the initiation of a zoning reclassification application for the Property from the R-1 to B-2 Zoning District to facilitate business development;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that a reclassification application to reclassify Tax Map Parcel No. 20-136A from the R-1, Suburban Residential to the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District 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 16. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; AUTHORIZE A VIRGINIA OPIOID ABATEMENT AUTHORITY INDIVIDUAL GRANT PROGRAM APPLICATION FOR DATA ANALYTICS SOFTWARE FOR OPIOID ABATEMENT AND AUTHORIZE APPLICATION FOR THE VIRGINIA OPIOID ABATEMENT AUTHORITY'S GOLD STANDARD INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

Mr. Anthony Toigo, Intergovernmental Affairs Manager, said there were two grant opportunities, one was opening, and the other would open in October. He said they could use OAA funds for naloxone, also known as Narcan.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that the funding was from the lawsuit.

Mr. Toigo responded that it was money withheld by the OAA. He said there was a separate fund for the lawsuit payout.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the funds could be used for the Narcan line-item allocation in the schools.

Mr. Toigo responded the funds could be used for Narcan. He said the only limitations were that the funds could not be used to supplant other funds, and it could not be used for indirect costs. He said they could use the funds for new Narcan purchases. He said the County had to be the sole applicant, and it could not be passed to the school division.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the County could purchase Narcan and deliver it to the school division.

Ms. Krauss said this was their first opportunity to work with the OAA. She said there were other ways to utilize the funds. She said they should have conversations with the School Board about using the funds. She said that they identified eligible projects in the workgroup. She said they were planning for multiple years. She said that the County was one of the first to apply for OAA funds. She said that they could likely achieve Ms. Vanuch's request.

Ms. Gary made the motion, seconded by Mr. Coen, to approve Resolution R23-122.

Ms. Allen asked for more information about using the application and software.

Mr. Joe Grainger, Assistant Fire Chief, said the data integration software would allow them to pull and pool information from a number of different areas and make more informed decisions. He said that narcotic and overdose responses were complicated. He said the software would allow them to review trends over time and historical responses. He said that they wanted to address the root cause of narcotic overdoses.

Ms. Allen said she did not agree with the abatement policy. She said they had to figure out how to fund and supplement the methods to solve the problems.

Mr. Grainger said many of the challenges were in parts of the community where they had little information. He said there would be multiple opportunities to distribute Narcan to the community. He said if they wanted to solve the root cause, they had to identify it, and they hoped the software would help identify the causes.

Ms. Allen asked if they would be able to use the funding to treat the identified causes from the data analysis.

Ms. Krauss said there was another process to apply for regional opioid abatement funding. She said that funding would provide the treatment aspect—mobile treatment, crisis intervention, detox chairs, and other services.

Mr. English suggested that AED receptacles should be stocked with Narcan dosages.

Mr. Grainger said it could be possible, but he did not know the implications of stocking Narcan with the AEDs.

Mr. English suggested stocking Narcan in the high traffic corridors.

Ms. Bohmke asked what the cost was for Narcan.

Mr. Grainger said he was not sure. He said he assumed the costs had not changed significantly.

Ms. Vanuch asked for information about the organization developing the software.

Mr. Grainger said the company was called First Watch. He said that they had worked through the security and technological complications they may encounter. He said the company performed data analytics for public safety agencies across the country.

Ms. Vanuch asked how they learned about the program.

Mr. Grainger said First Watch was known in the industry. He said they aggregated information.

Ms. Vanuch asked how they learned to apply for the program and use First Watch.

Mr. Grainger said they were a known program. He said the program was one of the items worked on by the team, and it met the requirements for the grant application.

Ms. Vanuch asked how it was different from the data that could be collected through RMS.

Mr. Grainger said RMS was only one component. He said the First Watch program would allow them to aggregate information from different areas of reporting into one dashboard and review trends over time to better inform decision making.

Dr. Yeung asked for clarification about the software.

Mr. Grainger said it was a software that pinged existing data sources. He said interfaces would relate to existing platforms that they already had operating.

Dr. Yeung asked if they would be able to integrate it with CAD in the future.

Mr. Grainger said yes, it would be part of the implementation.

Dr. Yeung asked if the County was required to provide a local match.

Mr. Toigo said match funds were not required, and the funding was provided by formula.

Mr. Coen said the program was important.

Ms. Gary asked if they planned to implement more preventive measures.

Ms. Krauss responded that the initial pipeline included five projects. She said there was an opioid taskforce with the health department, and they were working on different opportunities to apply for funding. She said they hoped to receive funding for several years. She said they had to ensure they followed the funding requirements for eligible projects.

Ms. Allen asked if the health department was part of the data sharing.

Mr. Grainger said they would not share specifically protected health information. He said they were not able to directly input health department information into First Watch. He said they would leverage the community paramedicine program and the mobile integrated health which routinely worked with the health department.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the data collected for the program would be public and subject to FOIA.

Mr. Grainger said it would not.

Dr. Yeung asked if they had a data analyst hired or if they planned to hire a data analyst in the future.

Mr. Grainger said it would primarily be Deputy Chief Frankel in the EMS division. He said Mr. Frankel would be the primary, and he oversaw the community paramedicine program.

Dr. Yeung asked if he had a medical background.

Mr. Grainger said yes.

Mr. English clarified Mr. Grainger had an OMD.

Mr. Grainger said that was correct.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R23-122 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO SUBMIT A VIRGINIA OPIOID ABATEMENT AUTHORITY INDIVIDUAL GRANT PROGRAM APPLICATION FOR DATA ANALYTICS SOFTWARE FOR OPIOID ABATEMENT

WHEREAS, the Virginia General Assembly established the Virginia Opioid Abatement Authority (OAA) as an independent body with the purpose of abating and remediating the opioid epidemic in the Commonwealth of Virginia through financial support in the form of grants, donations, or other assistance; and

WHEREAS, the OAA's Individual Grant program reserves a portion of state-allocated opioid settlement funds for city and county projects in the form of a non-competitive grant program; and

WHEREAS, the OAA has invited each city and county in Virginia to submit proposals for grants to support efforts to treat, prevent, and reduce opioid use disorder and the misuse of opioids in the Commonwealth; and

WHEREAS, the Board seeks to mitigate and abate impacts of the opioid epidemic in Stafford County, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County's OAA Individual Grant Program request for the data analytics software for opioid abatement seeks to abate the opioid epidemic in Stafford County, Virginia through prevention, education, and connection to care; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County's OAA Individual Grant Program request for data analytics software for opioid abatement for fiscal years 2023 and 2024 seeks a total of $124,754.72 in grant funding from the OAA; and

WHEREAS, the Board designates signatory authority for this OAA grant application and associated materials to the County Administrator; and

WHEREAS, by submitting this grant application, Stafford County agrees to the terms & conditions of the OAA Individual Grant program;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to submit a Virginia Opioid Abatement Authority Individual Grant program application for data analytics software for opioid abatement.

Mr. Toigo explained the Gold Standard provided an additional 25%, or about $40K, if they followed the reporting requirements. He said the Gold Standard applied to FY23 and FY24 only because the settlements ran until FY39.

Mr. Coen made the motion, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve proposed Resolution R23-123.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

<u>Resolution R23-123 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION AUTHORING APPLICATION FOR THE VIRGINIA OPIOID ABATEMENT AUTHORITY'S GOLD STANDARD INCENTIVE PROGRAM

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 2.2-2374(D)(2) requires the Virginia Opioid Abatement Authority's (OAA) Board of Directors to allocate a specific portion of the Opioid Abatement Fund to Counties and Cities participating in opioid litigation; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County is participating in this opioid litigation; and

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 2.2-2370(A) details statutory requirements for Opioid Abatement Fund allocations received by participating Counties and Cities, known as the "Gold Standard"; and

WHEREAS, the OAA's Gold Standard Incentive Program encourages participating Counties and Cities to utilize 100% of their direct Opioid Abatement Fund allocations for opioid abatement and remediation activities; and

WHEREAS, the OAA's Gold Standard Incentive Program provides a 25% increase over a participating County or City's direct distribution in a given Fiscal Year; and

WHEREAS, agreeing to follow the OAA's Gold Standard Incentive Program for Fiscal Years 2023 and 2024 will result in an increase in Stafford's Individual OAA Grant program allocation of $33,603 and $5,653 respectively; and

WHEREAS, the Board seeks to mitigate and abate the impacts of the opioid epidemic in Stafford County, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the mission of the OAA is to abate and remediate the opioid epidemic in the Commonwealth through financial support in the form of grants, donations, or other assistance; and

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Board of Supervisors designates signatory authority for all OAA grant applications and materials to the County Administrator;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that application for the Virginia Opioid Abatement Authority's (OAA) Gold Standard Incentive program be and it hereby is authorized; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Stafford County voluntarily agrees to meet the OAA's "Gold Standard" requirements in return for a 25% increase in OAA funding eligibility during Fiscal Years 2023 and 2024.

ITEM 17. UTILITIES; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH CDM SMITH INC. FOR AN ASSET MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF UTILITIES.

Mr. Chris Edwards, Director of Utilities, said the matter was before the Infrastructure Committee in March and before the Board on April 4 under New Business. He said the County issued an RFP for asset management services, which was qualifications based. He said the intention of the Asset Management program was to help reduce the maintenance costs and make the 3R program more efficient.

Ms. Bohmke said the program would only work if implemented properly. She said the Board should receive quarterly milestones related to the organization. She asked what the cost was.

Mr. Edwards said it was $3.5M over five years.

Ms. Bohmke said that they should have quarterly reports or six-month reports for public transparency. She said it would impact user rates for water and sewer.
Mr. Vosburg said they could program periodic updates. He said he wanted to review the deliverables to determine a schedule.

Mr. Edwards said it would take the first year or two to get the system assembled and the data input.

Mr. Coen requested that updates should be provided in person to the Board, not in a written report.

Dr. Yeung asked for information about the project managers.

Mr. Edwards said there would be two project managers from staff, and there would be another staff member working on IT implementation.

Dr. Yeung said they should hire an asset manager. She said she wanted the project managers to present the regular reports.

Mr. English asked if the Board could stop the program at a later date.

Mr. Edwards said yes. He said that they planned on issuing smaller tasks, and if they believed the project was no longer successful, they could stop it.

Ms. Bohmke made the motion, seconded by Mr. Coen, to approve Resolution R23-71.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R23-71 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH CDM SMITH INC. FOR ASSET MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF UTILITIES

WHEREAS, an asset management program is needed to identify the current condition of utility assets in accordance with standard business practices for the Department of Utilities (Department); and

WHEREAS, a consultant is needed to assist the Department in developing and implementing an Asset Management (AM) program to include Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) software evaluation, procurement assistance, and solution implementation, as well as general AM process and program development; and

WHEREAS, the consultant will focus initially on processes and tools to assess the condition of the Department's water distribution and wastewater collection systems assets; and

WHEREAS, the County solicited competitive proposals pursuant to Request for Proposals (RFP) #22-030-5001-SP to provide consulting services for an asset management program for the Department of Utilities; and

WHEREAS, CDM Smith Inc. was determined by staff to be fully qualified and best suited among the firms that submitted proposals in response to the RFP; and

WHEREAS, funds for these services are available in the Utilities Capital Improvement Program Fund and future contract years 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 18th day of April, 2023, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a five-year contract with CDM Smith Inc. for asset management program consulting services for the Department of Utilities in an amount not to exceed Three Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($3,500,000), unless modified by a duly-executed contract amendment.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 18. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER TIME LIMIT EXTENSION REQUESTS FOR ZONING RECLASSIFICATION AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS FOR A PROJECT KNOWN AS BELMONT PARK.

Mr. Mike Zuraf, Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning, said the request was to extend the project deadlines to November 1, 2023. He said the project was initially submitted in April 2020, and two prior extensions were granted for the projects—in February 2022 and October 2022. He said the project was approximately 180 acres on the southside of Route 17.

Mr. Zuraf said the applicant considered industrial uses on portions of the site and the inclusion of a large recreational facility. He said VDOT was considering using the unused portions of the commuter lot for a salt dome which would impact the entrance to the site, and the traffic study had to be redone. He said staff supported the extension to November 1. He said the applicant had acted in good faith, and actions beyond their control had caused the delays.

Mr. Coen clarified that there would be no residential uses.

Mr. Zuraf said that was correct.

Mr. Coen said that one of the proposed options presented to FAMPO for the bridge crossing went through the subject parcel. He said the project would have to wait until VDOT had settled the route for the crossing.

ITEM 19. CAPITAL PROJECTS UTILITIES; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH RISING SUN INC. FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF 342-06 PRESSURE ZONE UPGRADE.

Mr. Bryon Counsell, Chief Director of Infrastructure said that the project was associated with service at the Lake Mooney facility, and it was created as part of the Lake Mooney project. He said the project was further supported by the 2018 Master Plan, and it had been on the CIP for five years. He said the project was ready to go to construction, and the bids were within the budget approved for the project.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the Board should deem the matter time sensitive.

Mr. Counsell said it would help, but it could wait until the next meeting. He said the bids were viable for three months, but they could increase the term in the future contracts. He said that they vetted bidders after receiving the bid.

Ms. Bohmke requested to deem the matter time sensitive. She asked if it would expedite matters for staff.

Mr. Counsell said it would.

Ms. Bohmke made the motion, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to deem the matter time sensitive.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Bohmke made the motion, seconded by Mr. English, to approve proposed Resolution R23-144.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

R23-144 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH RISING SUN INC. FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF 342-06 PRESSURE ZONE UPGRADE

WHEREAS, the 342-06 Pressure Zone Upgrade (Project) is in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and is required to extend transmission pipeline approximately 8,200 linear feet from Truslow Road to Enon Road Elevated Storage Tank; and

WHEREAS, the Project is intended to improve the overall distribution and storage system from Lake Mooney Water Treatment Facility into the 342 Pressure Zone; and

WHEREAS, the County solicited competitively sealed bids pursuant to Invitation for Bid (IFB) No. 23-015-9401-SB to construct the Project; and

WHEREAS, Rising Sun Inc. is the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, submitting a bid in the amount of $5,208,430; and

WHEREAS, funds are available and have been appropriated in the Utilities CIP;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract with Rising Sun Inc. in an amount not to exceed Five Million Two Hundred Eight Thousand Four Hundred Thirty Dollars
($5,208,430) for the construction of the 342-06 Pressure Zone Upgrade project, unless modified by a duly authorized change order.

ITEM 20. DISCUSSION ON SUPPORT OF REGIONAL JUNETEENTH EVENT; REQUESTED BY SUPERVISOR TINESHA ALLEN.

Item was deleted from agenda.

RECESS

At 5:05 p.m., the Board recessed .

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

PRESENTATIONS

There were none.

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Dr. Yeung read the rules for public comment.

1. Ms. Ruth Cady Bell, 651 Lancaster Street, said she had four children in SCPS—two sons with IEPs and one daughter with a 504 plan. She said that the Board should protect special education students' right to equal educational access. She said that her children were in general education classrooms and served by special education resources, but the staff was overworked. She said many in the County relied on public schools. She requested the Board fully fund the public schools to ensure quality access to education.

2. Mr. David Ulrich, 2 Brookshire Drive, said that the district did not run a successful special education program, and the Board was to blame. He said the Superintendent released a letter claiming that 47% of County funding went toward SCPS while 67% was the average allocation across the state. He asked why they did not meet the 20% differential. He said for four straight years, the County was in the bottom percentile for special education testing. He requested that the Board not cut funding to the school district.

3. Mr. Eric Pacheco, 76 Carriage Hill Drive, said he was a parent of three children in SCPS, the spouse of an educator, and an IBEW Local 26 union member. He said the County had not fully recovered from the 2008 financial crash, and the schools were not fully funded. He said SCPS needed full funding. He said he was able to provide funds to his wife's class because of his union wage. He said the County was one of the wealthiest in the state, yet it was ranked 112 out of 133 school divisions in per-pupil spending. He said they needed new schools to decrease density and provide more resources to students.

4. Mr. Stephen Cohen, 63 Settlers Way, said he did not support the $1.14 tax increase. He said the Board had failed to assess the effects of the proposed tax rate. He said the tax increase would have a negative impact on local businesses. He said homeowners on a fixed income would be impacted by the tax increase. He said the Board should compromise between the $0.94 proposed rate and the $1.14 advertised rate.

5. Ms. Yannie Rivera, 101 Bancroft Drive, said paraprofessionals were essential for daily physical and emotional support. She said that it was essential to provide competitive salaries and benefits to special education teachers and paraprofessionals. She suggested additional training for school staff and a review of how needs would be met, inclusivity, and how to integrate with general classroom activities. She said depriving students of resources and funding would impart irreversible damage to their development at an early age.

6. Mr. Keith Lockett, 230 River Road, said education was important to him. He said he had lived in the County for 30 years and had two children grow up through SCPS. He said he

supported the passage of the advertised tax rate. He said that they should consider funding for the schools as an investment in the future of the County.

7. Ms. Kristen Barnes, 11 Temple Drive, said many of the issues were caused by increased development, and there was a direct cause and effect of residential development and rising taxes. She said when the comprehensive plan was updated in 2021, they calculated that each residential development would cost the taxpayer $185K in infrastructure costs, prior to historic inflation. She said there were over 5,000 homes approved for development.

   Ms. Barnes said school, transportation, public safety, emergency services, government services, and medical infrastructure was stretched beyond capacity. She said she did not support raising taxes under historic inflation. She said people on fixed incomes would be impacted, and the Board should reconsider residential developments.

8. Mr. Daniel Cortez, 19 Hidden Springs Lane, spoke about the need to determine a fair tax rate with decorum. He noted that County representatives would meet with the Governor regarding Cost-to-Compete. He said that it was his financial responsibility to educate his children, and the Board should make a responsible decision.

9. Ms. Kristin Maxson, 1816 Richmond Highway, suggested that the time sensitive vote for Item 18 during the 3 p.m. meeting should be adjusted. She suggested fewer data centers and reconsidering expediting infrastructure items.

10. Ms. Michele Wickman said that the Board was discussing a tax rate that would not fund the keep-the-lights-on proposal by the Superintendent. She said that the Board should not use one-time funds for recurring costs. She said that public safety officials received a 15% mid-year raise, but the Board was not willing to provide similar funding to Fire and Rescue. She said that the children in the County would suffer the most.

11. Ms. Molly Denham stated that she was a resident of the Hartwood District. She said that at the last meeting, the Board made comments about the School Board's CIP in such a gross, negative manner. She said that the Board was correct that Elementary School #19 was not on the CIP for 2017, but many other items had been on the CIP list since as early as 2007 and were only now being discussed for funding. She said that she was in favor of the tax increase at the full advertised rate of $1.145, but the proposed rate of $0.94 was not at the average for the state of Virginia, which was $0.99.

12. Ms. Jo Knight stated that she lived at 103 Nautical Cove, Stafford, Virginia. She said that it was extremely important to fairly and completely fund their schoolteachers so that they

were competitive. She said that the School Board had not been a good steward of the funding they received. She said that teachers should be funded, but they did not need so much acreage for schools. She said that private schools were modest and had teachers who were paid well. She said that they had not done all that they could with the funding of the schools, there must be a direction and targeting of funds, and things did not need to be done as they had been in the past.

13. Mr. Al Watkins stated that he lived at 12 England Run in Fredericksburg, Virginia. He said that there were several factors that went into establishing the tax rates and the budgets that seemed to be unique this year. He said there were questions remaining, including whether the VDOE shortfall would be replenished, and if the legislative push with the Governor's meeting tomorrow about whether there would be an additional $12M or $15M, and discussion of the pay disparities between Stafford and Prince William Counties.. He said that $0.94 did not fund the amount requested by the Superintendent.

14. Dr. Abram Marsh stated that he lived in the Hartwood District. He thanked the school district for celebrating the military this week. He said that competitive salaries would allow for teachers to be retained and teach well. He said that well-funded schools would yield positive responses in parent and student survey and infrastructure to accommodate growth. He said that it was not a debate about funding teachers or first responders, because teachers were responsible for developing their students who would become their future deputies, business leaders, and government leaders. He requested the Board of Supervisors to fully fund the schools and their children.

15. Ms. Shannon Fingerholz stated that the Board of Supervisors should be held accountable. She said that after attending and learning from so many Board work sessions and meetings, she found it concerning how many times the same questions were asked over and over of the staff, and the same answers given. She said that Supervisors who would not say their opinions at these sessions made it impossible to work through a public solution. She said that the need for Elementary School #19 had been expressed publicly at least since the Board was at a CIP town hall meeting with her on August 30, 2022. She noted that on pages 10 and 13 of that CIP, Elementary School #20 was described, so it should not come as a surprise to the Board in the future.

16. Mr. Namir Perez stated that he resided at 17 Rubins Walk. He said that he was a Marines veteran and a father of three children who attended Falmouth Elementary School. He said that his oldest son was seven years old and had autism and was very reliant on IEP services. He said that he did not want his children to endure the hardships that he had faced himself to become a functional member of society, and he asked the Board to not take away money

from children. He said that a society grew great when all men planted trees that they would never see grow. He said that the Board of Supervisors were the decision-makers, and they should not shatter the dreams of all children before they had a chance to fight for those dreams.

17. Mr. Cliff Heinzer stated that he was a resident of Aquia Harbor. He said that the right vote for the tax rate tonight was $1.145. He stated that last year, there was a 13% cut. He said that the tax rate of Stafford had been around $1 since 2019, and in that time, there had been 19% inflation. He said that they could at least fund to the level of where Stafford was a decade ago, but if they did not do that, they could only see further decline. He said that Stafford was fifth in household median income in the state and 112th in per-pupil spending. He said that the investment must be made in order to attract employers to the County. He said that the correct number for the tax rate was $1.145.

18. Ms. Dana Brown stated that she lived in the Rock Hill District at 41 St. Williams Way. She said that she did not approve of a large tax increase. She said that taxes were other people's money and it was up to the Board to decide how to fairly distribute it. She said that she would like to see their paraprofessionals get some extra money, and they needed to fund the debt service for the new high school and the new elementary school. She said that there had been a lot of money mismanagement in the 20 years she had children in Stafford County Schools. She said that the County gave over half of its budget to the schools.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM 23. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER AMENDING AND REORDAINING THE COUNTY CODE TO INCREASE THE TAX EXEMPTION FROM $3,000 TO $3,500 FOR THE ELDERLY AND DISABLED PERSONS TAX RELIEF PROGRAM.

Ms. Donna Krauss stated that this public hearing was proposed Ordinance O23-11, which would expand the real estate tax relief for the elderly and disabled from $3,000 to $3,500. She said that potential impact from the Commissioner of Revenue's Office was approximately 381 accounts and would reduce the real estate tax revenue by $115,000.

Ms. Andrea Light said that she was available to answer any questions about this item.

Mr. Coen asked if Ms. Light could give more information on the state guidelines and parameters of this item.

Ms. Light said that the County was limited by the Code of Virginia to tax relief that can be provided. She said that they were able to provide elderly and disabled people that tax relief, and what this did was stretch that annual tax relief from $3,000 to $3,500 annually. She said that that was on 30% of their tax bill, so it was not 100% tax relief, but could impact approximately 381 homes.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they were also looking at their net income. She asked how this impacted people who had large farm properties and limited incomes.

Ms. Light said that there was a limitation on income within the ordinance, and people must be reevaluated by the Commissioner of the Revenue's Office every year, and the office tried to ensure that they reached all of those citizens.

Dr. Yeung opened the public hearing. She asked if there were any public speakers for this item. Seeing none, she closed the public hearing and brought the matter back before the Board.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt proposed Ordinance O23-11.

Ms. Gary said that it was unfortunate that this program could not include more people, but that may be a problem for the state to fix. She said that it upset her that they were not funding some of their partner agencies who needed it and the numbers were very similar.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ordinance O23-11 reads as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 23-57, "GENERAL PROVISIONS" TO INCREASE THE ELDERLY AND DISABLED PERSONS TAX EXEMPTION

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-3210, the County is permitted to exempt or defer taxes for elderly and disabled persons; and

WHEREAS, the Board implemented this exemption in Stafford County Code Chapter 23, Article III, Division 2, "Elderly and Disabled Persons;" and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to amend the elderly and disabled persons tax exemption to address the higher assessment values, costs of living, and inflation rates; and

WHEREAS, the Board considered the recommendations of the Commissioner of the Revenue and staff, and testimony from the public, if any, at the public hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that Stafford County Code Sec. 23-57, "General provisions" be and it hereby is amended and reordained as follows, with all other portions of the County Code remaining unchanged:

Sec. 23-57. - General provisions.

a) Real estate owned by and occupied as the sole dwelling of a person or persons who are not less than sixty-five (65) years of age or who are determined to be permanently and totally disabled is exempted from county real estate taxes up to three thousand five hundred dollars ~~($3,000.00)~~ ($3,500.00) a year, subject, however, to the following restrictions and conditions, in addition to those set out elsewhere in this division:

b) Real estate owned and occupied as the sole dwelling of a person or persons who are not less than sixty-five (65) years of age or who are determined to be permanently disabled is exempted from fifty (50) percent of their county real estate taxes up to three thousand five hundred dollars ~~($3,000.00)~~ ($3,500.00) a year, subject, however, to the following restrictions and conditions, in addition to those set out elsewhere in this division:

; and

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this ordinance shall be effective for calendar year 2023 taxes.

ITEM 24. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER ISSUING THE FY2024 VIRGINIA PUBLIC SCHOOL AUTHORITY (VPSA) GENERAL OBLIGATION DEBT.

Ms. Light stated that on Resolution R23-78, for this public hearing the Board was being asked to consider the Virginia Public School Authority issuance of debt for the year 2024. She said that this did not bind the Board to a decision, and this would come back to the Board in the fall and spring to approve the application and accept the funds. She said that the VPSA was anticipated to support Elementary School #18 and some 3R projects in the schools that included mechanical systems, switch gear, and interior finishes. She reiterated that this did not bind the Board to a decision.

Ms. Allen asked how much of the $33M was going toward Elementary School #18.

Ms. Light said that the amount was approximately $23M.

Ms. Bohmke said there were some 3R projects in this resolution. She asked if those would be a part of the $6 to $8M from bonds issued each year or in addition to that.

Ms. Light said that these three projects would be supported by bonds.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they were at $10M.

Ms. Light said that it was approximately $6.8M for these projects. She said that the Board also provided $1.4M for ongoing 3R projects.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they would not be issuing any others for 3R this year.

Ms. Light said that was correct.

Mr. Coen asked how Elementary School #19 was related to this, as it was not mentioned in this item.

Ms. Light said that Elementary School #19 was in the CIP to begin in FY2025, and there were no costs in FY2024. She said that staff had not received consistent direction on moving that up or leaving it where it currently was, so it remained as the proposed budget.

Ms. Bohmke asked if it was accurate that the school division had not decided on land for Elementary School #19 yet.

Ms. Light said that she understood that they had not.

Ms. Gary noted that this Board had budgeted for things that they did not have land for yet, including two fire stations in her own district, so that was not a reason to not move up Elementary School #19, and when they could be saving beyond $2M.

Ms. Allen asked if Ms. Light could give the standard industry cost for 3R projects.

Ms. Light said that in the School Board's adopted CIP, they needed 2% to 3% of their facility costs every year for annual 3R maintenance to do this kind of work, which would be between $18M and $20M per year.

Ms. Allen asked how much this was giving toward that.

Ms. Light said that it was about $6.5M.

Ms. Allen stated that that was about one-third of their budget.

Ms. Light said that was correct. She reiterated that there was an additional $1.5M in funding, so it was nearer to $8M in total.

Dr. Yeung asked if future applications for borrowing could be brought forward in the fall or spring.

Ms. Light said yes. She said that the current public hearing was for issuing the VPSA. She said that if the Board decided that they were ready to move forward with projects, there could be discussion this summer. She said that it would require another public hearing to be held, then the Board would authorize the issuance of the debt in working with the School Board.

Dr. Yeung asked if this item would return to the Board in the spring when they were ready to issue it.

Ms. Light said yes. She said that they could use this to move Elementary School #19 forward so that they had opportunity to do that in the budget process, and they would also have this brought to the Board in the fall or spring when debt was typically issued.

Dr. Yeung opened the public hearing. She asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing and brought the matter back before the Board.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve proposed Resolution R23-78.

Ms. Gary said that she did not support this item because it was not put together as well as it could have been.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(4)	Bohmke, English, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(3)	Allen, Coen, Gary

<u>Resolution R23-78 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF NOT TO EXCEED $33,000,000 GENERAL OBLIGATION SCHOOL BONDS OF STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA TO BE SOLD TO THE VIRGINIA PUBLIC SCHOOL AUTHORITY

WHEREAS, the Board has received a request from the Stafford County School Board (the "School Board") to contract a debt and issue general obligation school bonds (the "Bonds") of the County in an amount not to exceed $33,000,000 to finance (a) capital school improvement projects for public school purposes (collectively, the "Projects"), including, but not limited to, (i) costs of constructing and equipping Elementary School #18, (ii) costs of replacing the mechanical systems and finishes at Hampton Oaks Elementary School, (iii) costs of replacing the switch gear and related items at North Stafford High School, and (iv) costs of repairing and improving interior components of Rockhill Elementary School, and (b) costs of issuing the Bonds; and

WHEREAS, the Board has determined that it is necessary and expedient to issue the Bonds to finance the Projects; and

WHEREAS, the Board held a public hearing on April 18, 2023, on the issuance of the Bonds in accordance with the requirements of Section 15.2-2606, Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended (the "Virginia Code"); and

WHEREAS, the Board has determined that it may be necessary or desirable to advance money to pay the costs for the Projects and to reimburse such advances with proceeds from one or more series of Bonds;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Stafford County, Virginia:

<u>Authorization of Bonds and Use of Proceeds</u>. The Board hereby determines that it is advisable to contract a debt and to issue and sell the Bonds of the County in the aggregate principal amount not to exceed $33,000,000 for the purpose of financing the Projects. The issuance and sale of Bonds to the Virginia Public School Authority ("VPSA") in one or more series is hereby authorized and approved.

<u>Declaration of Intent</u>. The Board hereby adopts this declaration of official intent under Treasury Regulation § 1.150.2. The Board reasonably expects to reimburse advances made or to be made by the County or School Board to pay the cost of the Projects from the proceeds of the Bonds.

<u>Submission of Application to VPSA</u>. The Board hereby authorizes and directs the County Administrator of the County (the "County Administrator") to submit an application to VPSA in order to sell the Bonds to VPSA at such sale or sales of VPSA as the County Administrator may determine in his sole discretion, subject to the limitations set forth in paragraph 1 above.

<u>Form of the Bonds</u>. Each series of Bonds shall be in such form as may be attached to any subsequent resolution that approves the details of such series of Bonds.

<u>Payment</u>. All payment terms of a series of Bonds shall be set forth in a subsequent resolution that approves the details of such series of Bonds.

<u>Execution of the Bonds</u>. No Bonds shall be executed until the Board adopts a subsequent resolution approving of and setting forth the details of the Bonds.

Pledge of Full Faith and Credit. For the prompt payment of the principal of, and the premium, if any, and the interest on the Bonds as the same shall become due, the full faith and credit of the County are hereby irrevocably pledged, and in each year while any of the Bonds shall be outstanding there shall be levied and collected in accordance with law an annual ad valorem tax upon all taxable property in the County subject to local taxation sufficient in amount to provide for the payment of the principal of, and the premium, if any, and the interest on the Bonds as such principal, premium, if any, and interest shall become due, which tax shall be without limitation as to rate or amount and in addition to all other taxes authorized to be levied in the County to the extent other funds of the County are not lawfully available and appropriated for such purpose.

Filing of Resolution. The appropriate officers or agents of the County are hereby authorized and directed to cause a certified copy of this Resolution to be filed with the Circuit Court of the County.

Further Actions. Subject to the limitation on the execution of Bonds set forth in Section 6, the County Administrator, the Chairman of the Board, and all such other officers, employees and agents of the County as either of them may designate are hereby authorized to take such action as the County Administrator or the Chairman of the Board may consider necessary or desirable in connection with the issuance and sale of the Bonds and the filing of any application with VPSA and any such action previously taken is hereby ratified and confirmed.

Effective Date. This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

The undersigned Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Stafford County, Virginia (the "Board"), hereby certifies that the foregoing constitutes a true and correct extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Board held on April 18, 2023, and of the whole thereof so far as applicable to the matters referred to in such extract. I hereby further certify that such meeting was a regularly scheduled meeting and that, during the consideration of the foregoing resolution, a quorum was present. The front page of this Resolution accurately records (i) the members of the Board present at the meeting, (ii) the members who were absent from the meeting, and (iii) the vote of each member, including any abstentions.

WITNESS MY HAND and the seal of the Board of Supervisors of Stafford County, Virginia, this _____ day of __________, 2023.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

ITEM 25. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER SETTING THE CALENDAR YEAR (CY) 2023 TAX RATES.

Ms. Light said that the three resolutions could be considered in three separate motions. She said that for the personal property and other taxes, the personal property was set at $5.49 for vehicles. She said that for all service districts listed for this resolution, there was no change to the tax rate from the prior year. She noted that the effective rate on vehicles was $2.75 because vehicles were assessed at 50% of the value.

Mr. Coen stated that this item was advertised at $6.10.

Ms. Light said that was correct.

Mr. Coen said that if memory served him, they were saying that when they got closer to this date, they would have a more realistic figure.

Ms. Light said yes.

Mr. Coen asked if the revenue from this went anywhere in particular, and if there was an explanation why it was advertised at a rate but effective at a different rate.

Ms. Light said that out of personal property tax in total, approximately $8M went to the transportation fund to support all of those transportation road projects. She said that there was a $67M shortfall on the projects currently in the transportation CIP due to the changing costs in inflation. She said that the assessed value in personal property, especially for vehicles, could be very confusing, because each County assessed at that value they chose, which in Stafford was 50%. She said that the total tax rate was $5.49, but the effective tax rate was half of that.

Ms. Light said that R23-124 asked the Board to consider the real estate tax rate. She said that in the Board packet, it was provided at the advertised rate of $1.145. She said that the average assessed home change was approximately a $40 change in the tax bill for every change in the penny on the tax rate. She said that Calendar Year (CY) 2022 tax rate was at $0.85.

Ms. Light said that the chart on the bottom of slide 4 on the screen showed what property types in the County were typically provided through this budget season, the median assessed value, the proposed budget, and advertised rate increases to bills. She said that for a median assessed home, the assessed value was $386,000, the change from the proposed budget would be $347, and the change from the advertised rate would be $1,139, broken into two years.

Mr. English asked if $1,139 was for one year or half a year.

Ms. Light said that it was for one year. She continued that R23-135 was the Countywide Fire and Emergency Services levy, which was provided as advertised at $0.03. She said the intent was to use these funds for capital needs of Fire and Rescue and associated debt service, however the resolution did not specify that. She said that in work sessions, Board members stated that they wanted to ensure that the resolution specified that it was for capital and debt service and did not include any operating expenditures. She said that the County Fire and Emergency Services Levy provided a source of revenue for the Fire and Rescue stations in the ten-year CIP, and also pulled those stations out of competing for debt capacity with other projects, mainly schools and a new courthouse.

Ms. Gary recommended the Board consider deciding on R23-125 first because it would potentially impact the real estate tax.

Dr. Yeung asked if Ms. Gary was talking about R23-125.

Ms. Gary motioned to approve potential R23-125.

Ms. Vanuch made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. English, to approve the items in the sequence as written.

Ms. Gary said that whatever they did with the fire levy would have an impact on what they did for the real estate tax rate, so it would make sense to do this first. She said that she did not know why they would not vote on this item unless it was to decide not to do it after deciding the real estate tax.

Ms. Vanuch said that they all understood well the implications of the different rates. She said that it was fair to citizens to vote on them as proposed.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(5)	Bohmke, Coen, English, Vanuch
Nay:	(2)	Allen, Gary, Yeung

Dr. Yeung asked if there was a motion for R23-74.

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve R23-74, personal property and other taxes.

Ms. Light clarified that there was a typo on the presentation that said this resolution was R23-77, but this resolution was actually entitled R23-74, personal property and other tax rates. She said that this rate was for the personal property including vehicles and all service districts. She said that all other personal property rates were staying static with Calendar Year 2022.

Ms. Gary clarified that this was Resolution R23-74.

Dr. Yeung asked for clarification about how the service districts were paid in.

Ms. Light said that certain service districts covered a certain area of the County and were formed for specific purposes. She said that Garrisonville Road collected real estate tax revenue primarily for the repayment of debt service on the bond issuance for the expansion of Garrisonville Road that was already completed.

Ms. Gary asked if the motion on the floor was for the amount recommended by staff.

Dr. Yeung said yes. She called for the vote.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R23-74 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE CALENDAR YEAR (CY) 2023 PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX RATES AND OTHER CERTAIN TAX RATES

WHEREAS, the Virginia Code requires the Board establish a levy for certain taxes each calendar year; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the proposed calendar year 2023 tax rates was held on April 4, 2023, at the 7:00 P.M. meeting, at the George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, located at 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Commissioner of the Revenue and the Treasurer require the timely establishment of tax levies to allow time for tax bills to be processed and received by citizens; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the following tax rates be and they hereby are established for the calendar year beginning January 1, 2023:

Classification	**Rate Per $100 of Assessed Value**
Tangible personal property (Section 58.1-3500, Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.) Includes all other classifications of personal property not specifically enumerated.	5.49
Personal property—classification of vehicles provided in Section 58.1-3506(A)(48), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.* *(Category only authorized through December 31, 2024.)*	~~4.49~~ <u>5.49</u>
Boats or watercraft (Section 58.1-3506(A)(1.a), (1.b), (12), (28), (29), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.0001
Motor vehicles specially equipped for the disabled (Section 58.1-3506(A)(14), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.10
Personal property—Fire & Rescue volunteers (Section 58.1-3506(A)(15), (16), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.0001
Camping trailers and recreational vehicles (Section 58.1-3506(A) (18), (30), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	5.49
One motor vehicle owned and regularly used by a veteran who has either lost, or lost the use of, one or both legs, or an arm or a hand, or who is blind or who is permanently and totally disabled as certified by the Department of Veterans Services. In order to qualify, the veteran shall provide a written statement to the commissioner of the revenue from the Department of Veterans Services that the veteran has been so designated or classified by the Department of Veterans Services as to meet the requirements of this section, and that his disability is service-connected. For purposes of this section, a disabled veteran is blind if he meets the provisions of § 46.2-100 (Section 58.1-3506(A)(19), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.0001
Motor carrier transportation involved in interstate commerce (Section 58.1-3506(A)(25), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.0001
All tangible personal property employed in a trade or business other than that described in Virginia Code §§ 58.1-3503(A)(1) through (A)(18), except for subdivision (A)(17) (Section 58.1-3506(A)(26), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	5.49
Programmable computer equipment and peripherals employed in a trade or business (Section 58.1-3506(A)(27), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	5.49

Personal property—Sheriff's Deputy volunteers (Section 58.1-3506(A)(32), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.0001
Machinery and tools (Section 58.1-3507, Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.0001
Merchants' capital (Section 58.1-3509, Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.) Includes all other classifications of Merchants' capital not specifically enumerated.	.50
Merchants' capital of wholesale distribution centers that have warehouses over 100,000 square feet (Section 58.1-3510.01, Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.0001
Merchants' capital of pharmaceutical wholesalers (Section 58.1-3510.01, Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.0001
Computer equipment and peripherals used in a data center (Section 58.1-3506(A)(43), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	1.25
Aircrafts (Section 58.1-3506(A)(2), (3), (4), (5), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.0001
Garrisonville Road Service District (Section 15.2-2403(6), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	0.068
Warrenton Road Service District (Section 15.2-2403(6), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.000
Lake Arrowhead Service District (Section 15.2-2403(6), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	0.07
Lake Carroll Service District (Section 15.2-2403(6), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	0.24
Hidden Lake Service District (Section 15.2-2403(6), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	0.28

Hartlake Special Service District (Section 15.2-2403(6), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	.00
Lynhaven Lane Service District (Section 15.2-2403(6), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	0.12

* The tax rate for personal property is based on the assessed value, which is established at 50% of the estimated fair market value. The effective tax rate for vehicles would be stated as $3.05 per $100 of the estimated fair market value.

Ms. Light said that for R23-124, the real estate tax rate in the Board packet was as advertised at $1.145, and for every change in the penny, it changed tax bills annually by just under $50.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve a real estate tax rate of $0.94, as recommended by the Stafford County Administrator.

Ms. Vanuch made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Bohmke to approve a real estate tax rate of $0.91.

Ms. Gary asked what budget items would be included in that $0.91.

Ms. Vanuch asked if Ms. Light had a resolution prepared.

Ms. Light said that a resolution was not prepared, but there was a list of items that could be discussed today about the changes if appropriate.

Dr. Yeung asked if Ms. Light had reviewed this information with the Board members.

Ms. Light said that many Board members had been meeting about different scenarios about what a comfortable tax rate was. She said that at $0.91, they would be removing from the funded positions in the County Administrator's budget the Fire and Rescue Emergency Management training coordinator, the long-range planner from Planning and Zoning, and a reduction to purchase all deputy sheriff and school protection officer vehicles at one time.

Ms. Light said that this removed the Fire and Rescue safety officers, of which there were three, and would reduce Fire and Rescue command staff's salary scale adjustments for lieutenant and above from 8% to 5%. She said that it would reduce general government from 8% to 6%, and would remove the market pay. She said that it would add the investigator for Homeland Security for the sheriff, five additional school protection officers for all elementary schools.

Ms. Gary said that the Homeland Security position had been previously discussed as being one of the lowest priorities. She asked if Ms. Light knew why it was included.

Ms. Light said that it was on the sheriff's request list, but she did not know what its priority was.

Ms. Gary asked if that position would be kept in this proposed rate.

Ms. Light said that under this plan, this was how they could get to $0.91. She said that there were many different ways they could do this. She continued that the plan would add in the legal analyst, the budget and management analyst, it would reduce community events by $60,000, reduce the tree lighting by $25,000, reduce the school's transfer increase by $4M, reduce clothing allowance of $5,000, and reduce community engagement in the schools by $353,000. She said that with these items, they could get to approximately $0.91.

Ms. Allen asked if the reduction in the school transfer was a reduction of the County Administrator's proposed amount for the transfer.

Ms. Light said that was correct. She said that there was $253,220 in the Superintendent's budget that would be eliminated as well, so the total was $4.25M below the County Administrator's proposed budget.

Ms. Allen asked how farther below it was what the Superintendent was asking for.

Ms. Light said that it would be $12.5M below the Superintendent's proposed budget, which assumed that the VDOE error was corrected.

Ms. Bohmke asked about the one-time funding in FY23 because of increasing the real estate tax rate above $0.85, so if they anticipated going to $0.91, they would have approximately $7M of one-time funding, which could be used for apparatus, schools, cars, and the sheriff. She said that the Board did not have to make decisions on that today if they were not comfortable with that, and those could be used in planning for future CIPs.

Ms. Gary said that she assumed that there were other items that would not be included in this budget, such as additional positions such as development services, tech, and Planner II priority. She said that those were important for their streamlined processes that they had been working hard on to fix their commercial development speed. She asked if those would not be included in this.
Ms. Light said not in this plan as it was listed, but the tax rate was separate from the budget, so if at the budget approval she disagreed with other positions, they could be swapped out.

Ms. Allen asked what the impact of this tax rate was on the schools' 3R and salaries scheduled for hard-to-staff positions and non-licensure positions. She asked where transportation was in this tax rate, and if personal property would be the only source of transportation funding.

Ms. Light said yes. She said that the Superintendent's budget request was a $21M increase, and in the County Administrator's proposed budget, it was $12M, which was a discrepancy of $8M. She said that reducing this by another $4.2M, there was a $12M discrepancy. She said that the first item for the Superintendent's budget was teacher salary increases at $16M, which would not be able to be supported at this rate.

Ms. Allen asked if the non-licensured staff would be supported.

Ms. Light said that nothing below that would be supported. She said that the Superintendent's budget looked at salary increases for teachers non-licensed and some stipended, and the School Board's budget looked at about $3.8M for the hard-to-fill positions, looked at putting paraprofessionals at 50% of the teacher's salary, and a number of other initiatives. She said that if that list was in priority order from the Superintendent and School Board, they would be able to fund a portion of the $16M, but it would be closer to having funding of about $4M rather than $16M to give the teachers a raise. She said that the School Board would decide how to fairly distribute it, because although the Board could suggest how to use funds, the funds were appropriated to the School Board and were used as the School Board needed to continue their operations. She said that for capital, there was no additional funding in this proposal for capital outside of what had been considered for VPSA or for the continuation of what the Board had provided since 2021 of $1.4M for 3R projects.

Ms. Allen asked if there was no extra money for capital transportation needs.

Ms. Light said that there was an increase in the County Administrator's budget of $3M to go to transportation, bringing the $8M of recurring revenue and $1M in one-time, which would continue at $0.91. She said that the Board could decide what to take out in the budget, and how they wanted to allocate the $0.91.

Ms. Allen stated that there was a $67M funding shortfall for transportation, but the proposed funding was $8M.

Mr. Coen asked what the impact on the CIP would be if the tax rate went down to $0.91.
Ms. Light said that the CIP did not anticipate any large swings with going from $0.91 to $0.94, and there was still additional capacity, so reducing that to $0.91 still allowed the CIP to be executed.

Mr. Coen asked if there was any written information on this tax rate proposal that could be brought to the Board. He asked if this was not a staff-prepared or staff-driven idea but requested by a Board member.

Ms. Light said that was correct. She said that staff's prepared budget was the County Administrator's proposed budget.

Mr. Coen said that he would like to hear from the staff who crafted this proposal and what their rationale was so that they did not have to ask Ms. Light all these questions.

Ms. Gary asked how this proposal would affect the 15% pay increase for the Sheriff's Office that required funding after ARPA funds were exhausted.

Ms. Light said that the ARPA funds used to support an early implementation of the 15% pay raise for sheriffs for sergeant and below in January 2023, and they would be using ARPA funds through FY2024, so there was no impact in FY24 because there were ARPA funds earmarked, but they anticipated FY2025 that it would be about $3.8M that would require a revenue source to cover, or $0.017 on the tax rate as a penny stood today.

Ms. Gary clarified that that was a 1.7% increase when the ARPA funds were used.

Ms. Light said yes.

Mr. English asked what the library funding would be. He asked what raises schoolteachers received last year.

Ms. Light stated that the library funding under this plan would be reduced. She said that the Library Board adopted budget had an amount of $152,000 that could be reduced. She said that Spotsylvania was a part of the Central Rappahannock Regional Library and provided their budget last week, which approved an additional reduction to the library to provide about 49% of what they had requested. She said that if Stafford was to do the same, it would be a reduction of $78,081. She stated that she would retrieve the salary increase amounts.

Ms. Vanuch said that she could provide them.

Ms. Light said that she could find them.

Ms. Allen asked how much Fairfax and Prince William Counties raised to pay for firefighters and teachers in their budgets.

Ms. Light said that she did not know. She said that Prince William was looking at all of their staff at a 9% raise, but they did not typically look at Fairfax. She said that Spotsylvania approved for their general government County staff an 8% raise, but specifically among their public safety she was unsure of how that played out.

Ms. Allen said that she knew that they were supposed to compare to localities when it came to some things, but when looking at salaries, Fairfax should be compared, because people also left Stafford for Fairfax. She said that the argument made for the 15% raise for deputies was that the northern Counties and state troopers were competing with them, and that argument was true for firefighters and teachers.

Ms. Bohmke said that after they approved that, Prince William approved a 17% increase for the Police Department. She said that they were already behind.

Ms. Gary said that she was glad that they had approved the 15% raise, because their County was safe, and she supported that even if there was a tax increase. She said that the same should be done for schools. She said that they were not trying to be Prince William or Fairfax Counties, but they had to pay comparably so that they could maintain and staff adequately in Stafford. She said that she supported both the pay increases for law enforcement and for funding their schools.

Mr. Coen asked if it was correct that not getting 8% but getting 5% was solely in the Fire and Rescue, but the sheriff's upper brackets would get the 8%.

Ms. Light said that it would be Fire and Rescue command staff, meaning senior-level staff, and also lieutenants and above in the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Coen said that there was a certain amount of money given per Supervisor for mailings and other services in the County Administrator's budget. He asked if that was included in this budget.

Ms. Light said yes.

Mr. Coen said that the funding should be removed.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had watched the Spotsylvania County Board of Supervisors when they set their tax rate, so she was looking in their budget book for partner agencies where the library was. She said that the library had a $502,000 increase, which was higher than theirs, then it was reduced multiple times, with a final increase to the library of $200,000. She said that there was $100,000 for one-time expenses and e-materials, and $20,000 for furniture, and she wondered if the library could pay for that out of the $1.8M in excess revenues. She said that the County could then give an equal amount to what Spotsylvania gave, as they were the two largest agencies providing money to the library.

Ms. Light said that if the Board chose to reduce funding for the library and make that suggestion, it could be shared with them.

Ms. Bohmke said that otherwise they would be giving increases to people's salaries who did not even work in their library system.

Dr. Yeung asked if there was a suggestion.

Ms. Light clarified that the matter before the Board was voting on a tax rate of $0.91. She said the scenario they just walked through was something that was one of probably hundreds of ways they could get to $0.91, which depended upon the priorities of the Board if they voted for a $0.91 real estate tax rate.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was the only Supervisor who came up with a budget, and she had met with multiple Board colleagues and shown them this plan. She said that in her four years on the Board, this was the most difficult budget season they had to go through. She said that there was $55M in requests from County government departments. She said that there was a tremendous amount of misinformation from the School Board, and she had seen emails from constituents that showed blatant lies from the school system, which was disturbing.

Ms. Vanuch said that the County government budget paid 54% to the school system, and they used the exact same amount of money that Prince William County gave in their shared service agreement or MOU. She said that last year alone, the County transferred 83% above their local required what was required by state law to the Stafford County Public School system. She said that the Cost-to-Compete was huge, and there was no one on the Board who did not want every single teacher to get a pay raise and retain and recruit the best educators for the children of Stafford.

Ms. Vanuch said that the five-year plan provided by the Superintendent was unsustainable, and they had to get the Cost-to-Compete with other localities. She said that she had a bipartisan meeting with Chair Yeung and the Governor's Office to get an amendment, and she checked with the lobbyist while they were waiting here and learned that the Governor could submit an amendment post-budget. He said that with this information, they could get action from the General Assembly, because that was the only way to fix this once and for all.

Ms. Vanuch said that it was untrue that she did not care about education, and she wanted to fix it so that they did not have this argument every single year, but they could not do it on the backs of the taxpayers. She said that they could not get a 32% or 38% increase on the taxpayers. She said that she researched the per-pupil expenditures, and the local ability to pay algorithm computed how much their locality should be paying. She said that the reason their per-pupil expenditures were so low based on that algorithm was because Stafford County had a much lower local ability to pay than Prince William County.

Ms. Vanuch said that the only way to fix that was through the Cost-to-Compete through the state. She said that she did not know where this was going to go, but she could say that if they raised the rate to $0.91, it was a $0.06 tax increase, and the fire levy would be different, which provided $6.7M in additional revenue. She said that her proposal would give $3.6M of that to the schools, totaling over $12M in addition to last year's budget, which was over an 8% increase or exactly what the state was proposing to fund the schools at, and the other $1M would go to the Sheriff's Office for the cars for SPO positions and $2.5M for Fire and Rescue apparatus.

Ms. Vanuch said that one of the other notes in the work sessions was that they would like to put a school protection officer in every single school in Stafford County, which cost $5.5M annually. She said that in some Counties, the schools would pay for that, but in Stafford County the money was appropriated to the Sheriff's Office and their budget by the Board of Supervisors. She said that delaying the tax rate was stated by the Treasurer's Office to be a horrendous idea because the tax bills and therefore revenue collection would be late, forcing them into a financial crisis. She stated that they could not wait two weeks to vote on a tax rate, and they had to make a decision.

Dr. Yeung asked Mr. Vosburg if he could speak to any of this information.

Mr. Vosburg said that two weeks would be detrimental for the tax bills. He said they had options if the Board wanted to have a special meeting or an adjourned meeting. He said that the earliest they could have a special meeting would be Monday, and there was an option of an adjourned meeting that Ms. McClendon could speak to more adequately.

Ms. McClendon stated that if the Board could not finish its business today, they could hold an adjourned meeting on a date and place set today, and it had to be before the next regular Board meeting. She said that if they wanted to meet this week, which was less than 72 hours, an adjourned meeting from today would be their best option.

Dr. Yeung asked if they would finish the rest of the agenda outside of this particular one.

Ms. McClendon said that for this business to remain before the Board with motions before the Board, they could be put on the table to be taken up at an adjourned meeting.

Mr. English said that they needed to vote tonight. He said that he supported the $0.91 tax increase. He said that he received equal amounts of calls for and against, but there were 11,000 people out there on food stamps and WIC. He said that he could not afford $1.145 tax increase. He said that education was important and there were good strategies about what they needed to do, but they would have to bite the bullet for a little while until they could get other revenues in this County. He said that his constituents said that half of his County said that they wanted it, but the other half said that they did not, and they could not afford this and must tighten their belts like they did across the street. He said that that was why he was supporting the $0.91.

Ms. Gary said that she would not support a $0.91 tax rate. She said that it would be irresponsible to set a tax rate increase as proposed without knowing what would happen with the COCA. She said that she would not vote in favor of this and would like to table it and come back to it.

Mr. Coen said that he liked to be consistent. He said that during his tenure on the Planning Commission, he hated it when things were thrown at him at the last minute that he did not know. He said that he did not know the impact of a lot of this. He said that he saw a paper version of it, but he did not get to keep it or ponder it or check on it, and he needed to know the ramifications of this. He said that he did not know what would happen to the library because the information had just been received. He said that it was uncomfortable.

Mr. Coen said that in his engagement with the community, they said that they wanted something done to help the school system. He said that when he talked to them, many people did not approve of a $1.145 rate, but did accept Mr. Vosburg's proposed rate, which he knew did not fund everything completely, but had been done judiciously. He said that he recently raised the fact that they had not allocated $10M and that it could be used to pay for Fire and Rescue apparatus at a one-time cost, which would lower the tax rate from 3% to 1.5%.

Mr. Coen said that Supervisor Allen had pointed out that there were questions about how transportation would be funded. He said that the public should be able to weigh in on it, and there was not even a slideshow to show people in the audience. He said that his constituents did not approve of a $1.145 tax rate, but people did acknowledge that they had to raise taxes.

Mr. Coen said that people had requested that it be known where their tax dollars were going, but he did not have a piece of paper that told him where things went, which made him uncomfortable. He said that he did not know that the people who would be impacted by this plan had been consulted, which also was uncomfortable. He said that he would not support a $0.91 tax rate without much more information on the impacts.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was prepared to vote. She said that there were a number of work sessions that the Board chose not to have, so it was unclear as to how members were unprepared to make a decision. She said that it was not easy to be in this position. She said that she had always been a huge supporter of schools and everything in the County and tried to be even-handed. She said that $120,000 was the median salary in Stafford County, which meant that 50% of the people were above, and 50% were below.

Ms. Bohmke said that she received a letter from someone today stating that they were a single mother and could not afford the increases. She said that she had received input from both sides of the coin, including senior citizens and people with limited incomes. She said that she did not want to count on data centers because they did not know what was going to happen with them, and she knew that many Board members would say that they did not have enough information.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was unsure if the COCA would be resolved by tomorrow, because she had not been a party to those conversations. She said that it was unclear if delaying this by a few days would benefit them, but she was prepared to make her decision tonight.

Ms. Gary asked to call the question.

Ms. Allen said that some statements were incorrect. She said that constituents had asked the Board at their last meeting to work in good faith to have the conversation and come to an agreement, but she never had seen this plan nor received a phone call, which could be confirmed if anyone wished to submit a FOIA request for her phone calls or emails. She said that there was no way for them to get to a medium if people were not willing to have a conversation.

Ms. Gary asked to call the question.

Mr. English said that he never received a call about this either.

Ms. Vanuch said that that was not true.

Mr. English said that it worked both ways.

Ms. Gary asked to call the question for the $0.91 tax rate.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(3)	Bohmke, English, Vanuch
Nay:	(3)	Allen, Coen, Gary
Abstain:	(1)	Yeung

Ms. McClendon stated that the motion failed. She said that the original motion was before the Board.

Mr. Coen said that that motion was for $0.94. He said that he understood the problems with this rate.

Ms. Gary made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Allen to defer the matter and bring it back before the Board.

Ms. Bohmke asked what the term was for the meeting the Board could hold this week.

Ms. McClendon said that it would be an adjourned meeting.

Ms. Bohmke said that they would still have to notice it, but not with 72 hours.

Ms. McClendon said that they would need to set the meeting day, time, and location today.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would like to make a friendly amendment to defer it until Thursday at some time in the evening or on Friday afternoon.

Ms. Gary accepted that friendly amendment.

Ms. McClendon said that instead of deferring, she recommended the Board take a motion to lay this on the table. She said that the date and time for the adjourned meeting could be set prior to the end of this meeting, but the item itself needed to be left as ongoing business.

Ms. Gary asked if she should withdraw her motion and make a motion to table.

Ms. Gary motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to table the matter.

Dr. Yeung asked if the date for the adjourned meeting needed to be determined at this time.

Ms. McClendon said there must be a vote to lay it on the table, and the actual adjourned meeting time could be set prior to the end of the meeting.
Ms. Bohmke said that she misinterpreted Ms. McClendon's explanation.

Ms. McClendon said that ultimately, picking the date was for the meeting itself and not for the item, so anything the Board did not finish today would get carried over to the adjourned meeting.

She said that this item and potentially any other item tabled would be brought forward to that adjourned meeting, which was the meeting they had to set a specific date for.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they could go back to Ms. Gary's original motion and there did not have to be a substitute to have a date and time.

Ms. McClendon said that was correct. She said that the current motion was to lay it on the table.

Dr. Yeung clarified that they would vote to table it and decide on a meeting date later in the meeting.

Mr. English asked for a point of order. He asked if Dr. Yeung had to give a reason for why she abstained from the last vote.

Ms. Vanuch said that the bylaws required it.

Dr. Yeung said that she could provide her reasoning. She said that the proposed plan arrived to her today and she would like more time to look at it.

Ms. Vanuch said that they could add and delete things in a work session at any time, moving the numbers around to see what it could be. She said that it was not as though there were unidentified positions within this proposal, and everything proposed were items the Board had reviewed multiple times. She said that all things added or removed were items discussed ad nauseum in work sessions.

Ms. Gary asked if the discussion was germane to the motion on the floor.

Ms. Vanuch said that slides were not provided on every single tax rate, which was the point of the Board of Supervisors doing their due diligence to bring forward a plan. She said that this was a tactic to delay, which was unfair to citizens. She said that she had texted with the Treasurer and Commissioner of Revenue's Office, and there were true consequences to delaying this. She said that it was unacceptable that Board members came to this meeting unprepared to take a vote.

Dr. Yeung said that she must evaluate the 8% to 6% reduction proposed for teachers in the plan.

Ms. Gary asked to call the question.

Mr. Coen said that it was difficult to be prepared for something when only looking at it 20 minutes before the meeting. He said that it was irrational to assume anyone could be prepared for that. He said that the plan was drafted Friday afternoon and one member learned of it on Saturday. He said that nobody had a piece of paper in front of them except for a select few in order to talk about the $0.91 plan. He said that the public was only aware of this if they heard and took notes.

Mr. Coen said that he wanted to be judicious and intelligent about this, and during the afternoon work session, there was reference to there being a plan, but it was not offered at that time, so they did not have the opportunity to review it at that point. He said that if there was going to be a plan that impacted the upper levels of Fire and Rescue, he had not been made aware that Fire and Rescue were informed of that. He said that he was happy that the plan kept the Fire and Rescue plan at 8%, but regular employees went down to 6%, and he was unsure if those employees were aware.

Mr. Coen said that there was an item of $70,000 in the plan that was worthless. He said that they should do due diligence to see what was in front of them. He said that they were now back to the County Administrator's proposed $0.94 rate, which was not ideal. He said that they did not know about the COCA or if the state would correct the VDOE error, but the public should know this information. He said that an adjourned meeting held so abruptly would not be helpful.

Ms. Bohmke said that there were four Board members who advertised and set the tax rate at $1.145. She said that there were three votes against that, and she had maintained that she did not support $0.94. She said that she was unsure about the fire tax levy, and it depended on where the tax rate came in. She said that those four Board members made the decision on where to propose the rate, so she thought that those four Supervisors would have gotten together, knowing that other members wished to approve a rate below $0.94.

Ms. Bohmke said that all of the Supervisors had access to the same information, so she did not know why they were sitting here right now. She said that they were letting people down because they were not coming to a decision. She said that some of them came up with a backup plan because they did not know where the Board was going to go, and this was a plan for the event that there was not a plan. She said that she had never been through this in nine years, and it was embarrassing. She said that there were six or seven attempts during Spotsylvania's Board of Supervisors meeting to pass a tax rate because they could not get four votes. She said that she was willing to listen and have a conversation like they were in a work session.

Ms. Vanuch asked Mr. Vosburg when he asked for guidance from the Board of Supervisors during their off-site meeting, what the highest tax rate increase that any Board member said that they would potentially vote for in order for him to build his budget on.

Mr. Vosburg said that at the off-site meeting, $0.10 was the highest he had heard.

Ms. Vanuch said that that would have been a $0.95 tax rate, and Mr. Vosburg returned with a $0.94 plus $0.03 fire levy, for a $0.12 tax rate.

Mr. Vosburg said that was correct.

Ms. Vanuch asked what Mr. Vosburg's reasoning for doing so was.

Mr. Vosburg said that per Board direction, he felt he could create a reasonable level for which the Board would coalesce, come together, and come down from his proposal to an approximate $0.10.

Ms. Vanuch said that Board members gave direction to a Count Administrator on a proposal, he came in high so that they could work through the budget and cut anything that needed to be there in order to get to a reasonable rate for taxpayers while continuing to reasonably fund the schools while still working with the General Assembly on the Cost-to-Compete. She said that she was willing to work through it, but they must set a tax rate tonight, and deferring and laying it on the table was not an option.

Dr. Yeung said that there were three plans here, differences in opinion and differences in what the needs were. She said that they were two or three cents removed from each other.

At 9:22 p.m., Dr. Yeung called for a recess.

At 10:08 p.m., the meeting reconvened.

Ms. Gary said that as far as she knew, they had all met with staff and come up with plans, and they were all trying to prepare the best that they could. She said that it was important for the public to know that they all were doing the best that they could in that respect, and she had tried to communicate, but there were some Supervisors that she had neglected to call. She said that she had spoken to Ms. Bohmke, and while she had requested to discuss the budget with Ms. Vanuch multiple times, she had stated that she did not have that plan until recently, and they had not requested to meet with each other since then, so perhaps that was the confusion there. She said that she wanted to clarify that so that the public did not think that they were not talking to each other and working through this. She said that she assumed the best and hoped they could move forward. Ms. Vanuch asked if she could make a motion.

Dr. Yeung said that there was a substitute motion on the floor.

Ms. Gary asked the Chair if the vote on the floor was to defer the matter until Thursday, otherwise increasing taxes without knowing what was happening with the COCA.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(3)	Allen, Coen, Gary
Nay:	(3)	Bohmke, English, Vanuch
Abstain:	(1)	Yeung

Mr. English asked Dr. Yeung why she abstained.

Dr. Yeung stated that she abstained because she was unsure if there was reason to defer. She said that the audience should give what they came there for, and she did not think deferring it would help. She said that whatever happened to COCA tomorrow, they would not get that money in their hands on the way back.

Ms. Vanuch made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, for R23-124 at a tax rate of $0.92, and R23-125 at a tax rate of $0.015 for the fire levy, for a total of $0.935.

Ms. Allen asked if the tax rates were to be voted on separately and not tied together. She said that she would prefer to vote on them separately.

Ms. McClendon said that any Board member could ask for votes to be separated out.

Ms. Vanuch said that her motion was for both items so that the citizens would know the full impact of the real estate and fire levy tax rates. She said that she and Dr. Yeung sat with County staff and went through every line item in the budget she proposed earlier with the $0.91. She said that the Supervisors felt strongly about representing their constituents and taxpayers, but they brought the best thing forward by doing that. She said that most of the increase was dedicated to the schools, they were able to fund County government raises at 8% instead of 6%, and command staff would also be at 8% and not 5%. She asked if Ms. Light could go through the line-by-line changes.

Ms. Gary asked if the original motion was to be voted on.

Mr. Coen said that there was a substitute motion.

Ms. Light said that changes in the budget included revenue adjustment from the projected and proposed tax relief for elderly and disabled, which had a higher reduction than they realized, and Historic Port of Falmouth fees coming into the general budget garnered an increase in revenue of $530,000. She said that the Board had asked to remove admin specialists and raises from the Board, which had been given to staff prior. She said that the sheriff had a Motorola contract increase, there was a decrease to the Central Rappahannock Regional Library, in which $152,000 came from staff finding ways to reduce their own budget. She said that at the $0.92 rate, it would reduce it by another $78,000, on par with Spotsylvania included.

Ms. Light said that it would remove Fire and Rescue Emergency Training Coordinator, removed the County's portion of Social Services pay, but still allowed for adding those FTEs. She said that those were funded 84.5% by state and federal revenue, so there would be costs that, if these were all filled and there was no turnover, they would have to find in the budget. She said that it removed Planning and Zoning Long-Range Planner II that was in the proposed budget, removed $675,000 of vehicles from the Sheriff's Department, assuming those moved to one-time funding.

Ms. Light said that it removed Fire and Rescue safety officers, of which there were three, at approximately $453,000. She said that it kept County raises at 8%, moved the scale for all Fire and Rescue at 8% plus their step, and moved the scale for lieutenants and above for the Sheriff's Department at 8%, which was the section of staff that did not get the 15% increase. She said that it eliminated the market pay in the proposed budget and was assumed approximately 1% of general government would be set aside for a market pay study that was being completed and removed that.

Ms. Light said that it added the sheriff investigator for Homeland Security, added five additional school protection officers so that all elementary schools would have school protection officers. She said that it would add a legal assistant with the Commonwealth Attorney to support the body camera initiative, added a budget management analyst, and removed community events and tree lighting. She said that it removed clothing allowance for the Board of $5,000, and as they talked about before, the community engagement in the schools of approximately $253,000 in the Superintendent's and the School Board's budget as part of their nondiscretionary spending.

Ms. Light said that they talked earlier about reducing the schools from $12M to $8M but found ways to bring that back up to $12M. She said that there was a new initiative in the proposed budget of using $1M of ongoing revenue to support large capital for the schools, moving that into their operating, and going from $8M to $9M. She said that the increase of the tax rate from $0.91 to $0.92, with all other things that are funded in there, provided an additional $2M, going from $9M to $11M, and reducing public safety over time, the increase was approximately $1M this year, then removing that from the proposed budget. She said that that got them to a tax rate of $0.92.

Ms. Allen asked how much of the budget was going toward transportation.

Ms. Light said that there was no change to the transportation, so that continued to be funded through personal property, increased this year by $3M to approximately $8M.

Ms. Allen clarified that the transportation budget was $8M for the year. She asked how much would go to 3R.

Ms. Light said that they assumed in the proposed budget that $1M would go to school capital. She said that they had identified a number of needs, and this was a way to help reduce their reliance on debt. She said that to get to the tax rate of $0.92, rather than getting this to go to school capital, it would go to the schools' operating budget, and the Board had maintained since FY2021 just under $1.5M for 3R funding. She said that they would also receive the VPSA 3R bond debt funding of approximately $6.5M.

Ms. Allen asked if they would be debt funding it instead of cash-funding it.

Ms. Light said yes.

Dr. Yeung called the vote for R23-124 and R23-125 together. She said that Supervisor Allen had asked for it to be separated, but the motion was currently on the floor.

Ms. McClendon clarified that when a Board member requested the motions to be separated, they should be separated.

Dr. Yeung said that the first vote would be for R23-124.

Ms. Vanuch said that the motion for R23-124 was $0.92, with the understanding that R23-125 would be passed at $0.015. She said that if it was not, then there would be a motion to reconsider so there was not a ploy to increase the fire tax levy.

Ms. Gary stated that she would not support this motion. She said that it was not brought about responsibly, nor was it a reflection of their community based off of real data and plentiful feedback from the community. She said that she went above and beyond to collect such data, and it was incredibly disappointing, and heartbreaking for their children and for people who had fought for something that made sense. She said that she was disappointed the Board did not work better together to provide for the community. She said that she had proposed funding partner agencies to help people when the tax increase occurred, but that received no feedback. She said that the public deserved better and she hoped they could provide that.

Mr. Coen said that he could not get four votes for the $0.94. He said that he was happy that many of the things he proposed to be cut were cut so more money was put toward education. He said that he had suggested something that saved $71,000 that was to be put toward education, and he had repeatedly come up with things to fund more educational projects. He said that he was glad this plan took care of the 8%, but there should be 8% across the board. He said that it was awkward, because they were not meeting all needs that they should, but they were not getting where they needed to go. He said that it was frustrating, and delaying it to get further information did not pass, so they were in a dilemma as to whether this was an appropriate rate because it was better than $0.91.

Ms. Allen said that she would not be supporting this. She said that their transportation budget was $8M. She said that it was said earlier that they were at a $67M shortfall for their bond projects. She stated that Prince William County would have $350M, Spotsylvania about $150M, and Stafford County was at $8M. She said that their roads had to be as equally as safe as their citizens, because the roads were traversed by them every day. She said that transportation funding of $8M would not do anything. She asked what $1.4M would get them in terms of fixing dilapidated school buildings. She said that pay was not being fully funded, and the teacher pay issue was not innocuous to public education, and private schools were competing with Prince William and Fairfax for their staffing. She said that Stafford should be competing to keep their own staff. She reiterated that she would not be supporting this motion.

Dr. Yeung said that she ran on a platform of ensuring that Stafford families had what they needed, which included transportation infrastructure, neighborhood schools, investing in the community for affordable communities and affordable taxes. She said that they would not get there overnight, and their real estate taxes were at $0.84, with mid-year raises given to the deputies in the Sheriff's Office to be sure that they would not be lured to higher-paying communities such as Fairfax, but they did that with a one-time fund, which she had been opposed to, because the bill would come due in 2025.

Dr. Yeung said that they had veterans among them in the community, but veterans who were 100% disabled did not pay taxes, and the County took a big hit as the amount went up every year because they wanted to live in an area that had amenities and services needed. She said that it amounted to $14M per year, and there was a fund for those who wanted to give back to the community. She said that COCA was a shortfall to the Cost-to-Compete or cost to do business that they received 25% for, while their northern neighbors received 100%. She said that they were meeting with the Governor's Office tomorrow to fight for that, but they may not get it this year.

Dr. Yeung said that they did not have the BPOL, which was passed, but the Board decided to get rid of it. She said that constituents wanted businesses to pay their fair share, and so did she. She said that they were paid in the north and in the south of them, so there was no reason Stafford could not. She said that the revenue could help relieve homeowners who were asked to pay higher real estate taxes. She said that all services would continue to be funded, and that the schools needed funds, they needed to keep their lights on, keep positions, and would work hard to ensure they had those extra funds.

Dr. Yeung stated that everyone in the community needed to pay their fair share to support the schools and services received from the County. She said that while it may not be enough right now, they could not be digging on the same backs of the same people. She said that she was willing to pay 6% or 7% for their teachers, because she had always been on the side of their teachers, but there were people who struggled through living with low incomes, and they must make sure they did what was best for everyone, not only for some. She said that she would support this tax increase to $0.92.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(5)	Bohmke, Coen, English, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(2)	Allen, Gary

Resolution R23-124 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE CALENDAR YEAR (CY) 2023 REAL ESTATE AND MOBILE HOME TAX RATE

WHEREAS, the Virginia Code requires the Board establish a levy for certain taxes each calendar year; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the proposed calendar year 2023 tax rates was held on April 4, 2023, at the 7:00 P.M. meeting, at the George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, located at 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Commissioner of the Revenue and the Treasurer require the timely establishment of tax levies to allow time for tax bills to be processed and received by citizens; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the following tax rates be and they hereby are established for the calendar year beginning January 1, 2023:

Classification	**Rate Per $100 of Assessed Value**
Real estate (Section 58.1-3200, Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	~~0.850~~ 0.920

Mobile homes (Section 58.1-3506(A)(10), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	~~0.850~~ 0.920

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to approve R23-125, the Fire and Rescue levy at $0.015.

Mr. Coen said that pulling out the fire items from the tax rate allowed them to address other items such as schools, and this increase would allow them to pay for construction of fire stations and apparatus. He said that he was in favor of this levy.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was glad they were moving forward with a $0.015 levy, which they would probably have to increase over the years, but she wanted to keep it limited to buildings and apparatus. She said that she preferred for future years to not have salaries and benefits in the fire tax and keep that in the general fund. She said that it was structured, and in the resolution would say, that it was for apparatus right now. She stated that she was in support of this, especially because of the stations that needed to be rebuilt.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the resolution was written to exclude operating expenses as discussed in the work session.

Ms. Light said that it was not currently written that way and the motion was not made that way.

Ms. Vanuch asked if she could amend the motion to exclude the operating expenses.

Ms. McClendon said that the motion could be changed, but it must be seconded.

Mr. Coen said that he agreed with that.

Ms. Gary said that she would not support this item. She said that she was amicable to the $0.015 when the tax rate looked different with certain priorities, so in conjunction with that, she did not think it was adequate for their needs, and everyone on the Board knew that it would be going up, likely at $0.03 depending on the decisions of the Board. She said that $0.015 was inadequate for what was needed, it was at $0.03 and there was a compromise for $0.015 if the real estate tax rate was different. She reiterated that she would not be supporting this motion.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(4)	Bohmke, Coen, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(3)	Allen, English, Gary

Resolution R23-125 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE CALENDAR YEAR (CY) 2023 COUNTYWIDE FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES TAX DISTRICT LEVY

WHEREAS, the Virginia Code requires the Board establish a levy for certain taxes each calendar year; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the proposed calendar year 2023 tax rates was held on April 4, 2023, at the 7:00 P.M. meeting, at the George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, located at 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Commissioner of the Revenue and the Treasurer require the timely establishment of tax levies to allow time for tax bills to be processed and received by citizens; and

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

WHEREAS, the Board desires for the revenue generated from the Countywide Fire and Emergency Medical Services Tax District levy to be allocated solely for debt service and capital expenses;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the following tax rate be and it hereby is established for the calendar year beginning January 1, 2023:

Classification	**Rate Per $100 of Assessed Value**
Countywide Fire and Emergency Medical Services Tax District (Section 27-23.1, Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.) See also County Code Sec. 23-225 *et seq.*	~~.00~~ 0.015

ITEM 26. UTILITIES; CONSIDER ADOPTING AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN THE USER FEE SCHEDULE FOR FISCAL YEARS 2024-2026 FOR PROVIDING WATER AND SEWER SERVICES.

Ms. Light said that this item was an increase in water and sewer user fees and water and sewer plan and pro-rata fees. She said the Board held a public hearing on these items on April 4, 2023. She said that the first item was O23-03, the water and sewer user fee, and that this would provide a 6.5% increase from FY24-FY26. She said that the average increase for a townhouse that used approximately 4,000 gallons monthly would see a $4.62 monthly increase, a single-family house using approximately 6,000 gallons monthly would see a $6.20 monthly increase.

Ms. Light stated that the increased revenues were driven by significant inflation in chemicals, electric, and 3R costs. She said that the Board was also asked to consider R23-86, to amend the water and sewer program, and Ordinance O23-07, to increase pro-rata fees. She said that the water and sewer general improvement plan was used to determine what those pro-rata fees would be, and the last time this plan was updated was 2018. She said that the plan had been updated now with a third-party vendor to look at the change cost estimates, and they asked the Board to consider the increase in pro-rata fees so that developer-driven fees were more in line with costs.

Ms. Gary asked if this increase was caused by inflation and the need to fund these services.

Ms. Light said yes. She said that some prices for chemicals had more than doubled, and those chemicals were necessary for safe drinking water.

Ms. Gary motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve proposed Ordinance O23-03.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(5)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, Gary, Yeung
Nay:	(2)	English, Vanuch

<u>Ordinance O23-03 reads as follows:</u>

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN THE USER FEE SCHEDULE FOR FISCAL YEARS 2024, 2025, AND 2026 FOR PROVIDING WATER AND SEWER SERVICES

WHEREAS, the Board is authorized to set reasonable fees and charges for providing public water and sewer service pursuant to Virginia Code §§ 15.2-2111, 15.2-2119, 15.2-2122, and 15.2-2143; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County Code, Chapter 25, authorizes the establishment of public water and sewer fees; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to set the fees for these services commensurate with the services provided by the County; and

WHEREAS, the Board has provided notice and conducted a public hearing in accordance Virginia Code §§ 15.2-107 and 15.2-1427; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the fees for providing public water and sewer service be and they hereby are amended and reordained as follows for fiscal years 2024-2026:

User fees effective for water usage on or after June 1, 2023 and reflected in bills on or after July 1, 2023.							
User Category	**CONSUMPTION CHARGES, per 1,000 gallons**						**County Code Section**
	WATER			**SEWER**			
RESIDENTIAL (including Apartments)	**Current**	**Proposed**	**Change**	**Current**	**Proposed**	**Change**	25-96(b)
0 - 2,000 gallons	~~$2.84~~	$3.02	$0.18	~~$6.72~~	$7.16	$0.44	25-98 (b, c)
3,000 - 4,000 gallons	~~$3.95~~	$4.21	$0.26	per 1,000 gallons for all usage up to non-seasonal average + 20%	per 1,000 gallons for all usage up to non-seasonal average + 20%	per 1,000 gallons for all usage up to non-seasonal average + 20%	
5,000 - 8,000 gallons	~~$5.41~~	$5.76	$0.35				
9,000 - 12,000 gallons	~~$10.87~~	$11.58	$0.71				
13,000 - 25,000 gallons	~~$13.78~~	$14.68	$0.90				
Above 25,000 gallons	~~$19.17~~	$20.42	$1.25				
NON-RESIDENTIAL (Commercial, Industrial, Multi-Family, Public, Semi-Public and Mobile Homes) All Consumption	~~$5.15~~	$5.48	$0.33	~~$6.72~~	$7.16	$0.44	25-96(b) and 25-98 (b, c)
Water-Dependent, Home- Based Business	~~$12.86~~	$13.70	$0.84	~~$6.72~~	$7.16	$0.44	25-96(b) and 25-98 (b, c)

Irrigation, Bulk, Construction and Hydrant Meters	~~$18.62~~	$19.83	$1.21	n/a	n/a	n/a	25-96(e)
Monthly Customer Service Charge (per account)	~~$2.86~~	$3.05	$0.19	~~$2.92~~	$3.11	$0.19	25-96(c) and 25-98(d)
Monthly Demand Charge (per Meter Equivalent, per account)	~~$10.77~~	$11.47	$0.70	~~$14.11~~	$15.03	$0.92	25-96(d) and 25-98(e)

User fees effective for water usage on or after June 1, 2024 and reflected in bills on or after July 1, 2024.							
User Category	**CONSUMPTION CHARGES, per 1,000 gallons**						**County Code Section**
	WATER			**SEWER**			
RESIDENTIAL (including Apartments)	**Current**	**Proposed**	**Change**	**Current**	**Proposed**	**Change**	25-96(b)
0 - 2,000 gallons	~~$3.02~~	$3.22	$0.20	~~$7.16~~	$7.62	$0.46	25-98 (b, c)
3,000 - 4,000 gallons	~~$4.21~~	$4.48	$0.27	per 1,000 gallons for all usage up to non-seasonal average + 20%	per 1,000 gallons for all usage up to non-seasonal average + 20%	per 1,000 gallons for all usage up to non-seasonal average + 20%	
5,000 - 8,000 gallons	~~$5.76~~	$6.14	$0.38				
9,000 - 12,000 gallons	~~$11.58~~	$12.33	$0.75				
13,000 - 25,000 gallons	~~$14.68~~	$15.63	$0.95				
Above 25,000 gallons	~~$20.42~~	$21.74	$1.32				
NON-RESIDENTIAL (Commercial, Industrial, Multi-Family, Public, Semi-Public and Mobile Homes) All Consumption	~~$5.48~~	$5.85	$0.36	~~$7.16~~	$7.62	$0.46	25-96(b) and 25-98 (b, c)

Water-Dependent, Home- Based Business	~~$13.70~~	$14.60	$0.90	~~$7.16~~	$7.62	$0.46	25-96(b) and 25-98 (b, c)
Irrigation, Bulk, Construction and Hydrant Meters	~~$19.83~~	$21.13	$1.29	n/a	n/a	n/a	25-96(e)
Monthly Customer Service Charge (per account)	~~$3.05~~	$3.24	$0.19	~~$3.11~~	$3.31	$0.20	25-96(c) and 25-98(d)
Monthly Demand Charge (per Meter Equivalent, per account)	~~$11.47~~	$12.22	$0.75	~~$15.03~~	$16.01	$0.98	25-96(d) and 25-98(e)

User fees effective for water usage on or after June 1, 2025 and reflected on bills on or after July 1, 2025.

User Category	**CONSUMPTION CHARGES, per 1,000 gallons**						**County Code Section**
	WATER			**SEWER**			
RESIDENTIAL (including Apartments)	**Current**	**Proposed**	**Change**	**Current**	**Proposed**	**Change**	25-96(b)
0 - 2,000 gallons	~~$3.22~~	$3.43	$0.21	~~$7.62~~	$8.12	$0.50	25-98 (b, c)
3,000 - 4,000 gallons	~~$4.48~~	$4.77	$0.29	per 1,000 gallons for all usage up to non-seasonal average + 20%	per 1,000 gallons for all usage up to non-seasonal average + 20%	per 1,000 gallons for all usage up to non-seasonal average + 20%	
5,000 - 8,000 gallons	~~$6.14~~	$6.54	$0.40				
9,000 - 12,000 gallons	~~$12.33~~	$13.13	$0.80				
13,000 - 25,000 gallons	~~$15.63~~	$16.65	$1.02				
Above 25,000 gallons	~~$21.74~~	$23.16	$1.42				
NON-RESIDENTIAL (Commercial, Industrial, Multi-Family, Public, Semi-Public and Mobile Homes)	~~$5.85~~	$6.23	$0.38	~~$7.62~~	$8.12	$0.50	25-96(b) and 25-98 (b, c)

All Consumption							
Water-Dependent, Home- Based Business	~~$14.60~~	$15.55	$0.95	~~$7.62~~	$8.12	$0.50	25-96(b) and 25-98 (b, c)
Irrigation, Bulk, Construction and Hydrant Meters	~~$21.13~~	$22.50	$1.37	n/a	n/a	n/a	25-96(e)
Monthly Customer Service Charge (per account)	~~$3.24~~	$3.45	$0.21	~~$3.31~~	$3.53	$0.22	25-96(c) and 25-98(d)
Monthly Demand Charge (per Meter Equivalent, per account)	~~$12.22~~	$13.01	$0.79	~~$16.01~~	$17.05	$1.04	25-96(d) and 25-98(e)

ITEM 27. UTILITIES; CONSIDER ADOPTING THE AMENDED WATER AND SEWER GENERAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, AND AMENDING AND REORDAINING WATER AND SEWER PRO-RATA FEES.

Ms. Vanuch said there should be a motion to approve the items together.

Dr. Yeung asked if that was possible.

Ms. McClendon said that it was recommended for the Board to vote on the items separately.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve proposed Resolution R23-86.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (5) Allen, Bohmke, Coen, Gary, Yeung
Nay: (2) English, Vanuch

Resolution R23-86 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE GENERAL WATER AND SEWER IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AS SHOWN IN THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "STAFFORD COUNTY GENERAL WATER AND SEWER IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM"

WHEREAS, the Board desires to provide reliable water and wastewater service to the citizens of Stafford County; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires that future service needs be carefully planned; and

WHEREAS, County Code Secs. 25-72.1 and 25-72.2 require developers and subdivision developers to pay a *pro rata* share of off-site water and sewer costs; and

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 15.2-2243(A) requires the establishment of a general water and sewer improvement program in order to require the collection of pro-rata fees; and

WHEREAS, the General Water and Sewer Improvement Program, last approved pursuant to Resolution R18-116, has been updated to reflect current estimates of the costs to construct water and sewer infrastructure in the common areas and now requires Board approval;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the amended General Water and Sewer Improvement Program as shown in the document entitled "Stafford County General Water and Sewer Improvement Program," dated April 4, 2023, be and it hereby is adopted.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to adopt proposed Ordinance O23-07.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(5)	Allen, Bohmke, Coen, Gary, Yeung
Nay:	(2)	English, Vanuch

Ordinance O23-07 reads as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN WATER AND SEWER SERVICE PRO-RATA FEES

WHEREAS, the Board is authorized to set reasonable fees and charges for public water and sewer pursuant to Virginia Code §§ 15.2-2111, 15.2-2122, and 15.2- 2243; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to set fees for these services commensurate with the services provided by the County; and

WHEREAS, County Code Secs. 25-72.1 and 25-72.2 require developers and subdivision developers to pay a pro-rata share of water and sewer infrastructure costs; and

WHEREAS, the General Water and Sewer Improvement Program have been updated to reflect current estimates of the costs to construct water and sewer infrastructure in the common areas necessitating an update to the County's pro-rata fees; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the pro-rata fees for public water and sewer service infrastructure be and they hereby are amended and reordained as follows, with all other portions remaining unchanged:

Pro Rata Charges (Per Gallon)

	Water Fees		Sewer Fees		County
Pressure Zone	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Code Sec. Section
Aquia	~~2.27~~	3.68			25-72.1 &
Berea	~~3.56~~	4.31			25-72.2
Central	~~6.38~~	12.49			
Falmouth	~~4.13~~	5.53			
Garrisonville	~~3.22~~	4.26			
Drainage Area					
Accokeek			~~10.57~~	10.17	
Aquia			~~4.59~~	10.22	
Austin Run			~~2.17~~	2.43	
Claiborne Run			~~3.63~~	7.60	
Falls Run			~~5.23~~	10.59	
Little Falls Run			~~14.32~~	0.00	
Potomac Creek			~~28.22~~	64.77	
Rocky Pen Run			~~13.57~~	28.64	

Mr. Vosburg asked if Items 28 and 29 could be tabled while the resolutions were fixed. He asked if Item 30 could be discussed, then go back to 21 and 22.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to table Items 28 and 29.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 30. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER APPROVING THE FY2024-FY2023 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP).

Dr. Yeung said that this was a document to be approved for next year, but it could be changed.

Ms. Light said that was correct. She said that the capital improvement plan was over $1.3M for school, transportation, and County projects. She said that in the FY24 plan, the Board was considering this year the beginning of building Embrey Mill Fire Station. She said that several parks projects were proposed using proffer funding only, there were road projects supported with bonds and other funds, service district projects, and education, the largest component of the CIP, had 3R cash for schools, 3R bonds.

Ms. Light said that High School #6 continued and Elementary School #18 continued into FY24. She said that seen in FY25 with schools was the beginning of Elementary School #19. She said that in a prior work session they talked about the VPSA borrow, they had not included Elementary School #19 in FY24, but if the Board, through discussions with the School Board, felt comfortable moving forward with that in FY24, they could readvertise, have a public hearing, and increase VPSA authorization to move Elementary School #19 into FY24.

Ms. Bohmke said that there was some discussion regarding the site for Elementary School #19, with both sites owned by the County. She asked if there was sufficient information to know that they wanted to move that up to FY24 and whether the school division begin architectural and engineering plans, or whether they use the same prototype for #18 to #19, so that they could make an educated decision tonight.

Ms. Light said that no decisions about Elementary School #19 needed to be made tonight, but she wanted to ensure the Board and the public were aware that they could revisit this and amend the CIP in FY24 to move up that elementary school if they felt confident in a way to move forward with it.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to approve proposed Resolution R23-77.

Mr. Coen made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Gary, to move Elementary School #19 up.

Mr. Coen said that it was normal to move forward with a project without having land identified specifically, and there could be savings by doing these schools at the same time, so it made sense to be prepared to move forward if that happened. He asked Ms. Light if nothing bad would happen if it did not come to fruition.

Ms. Light said that was correct.

Ms. Gary said that there were significant savings to be realized in doing this, the original projection being around $2M, but now perhaps around $6M. She said that this made sense to do during a difficult situation.

Ms. Bohmke asked if Mr. Vosburg had savings cost estimates the Board would know about from the school division. She said that they had just approved a tax rate and did not have funds in there for FY24. She asked if it was moved up what the funds would be for architectural and engineering, or if it was a greater number, how would that impact their tax rate and how they would shuffle things around in the CIP.

Ms. Light said that they would not have to shuffle anything around in the CIP. She said that they would probably assume these were VPSA funds. She said that when they brought that public hearing back to the Board, they could discuss what other resources may be available, but they would have to do an additional VPSA public hearing to increase the authority to do the borrowing.

Ms. Bohmke asked what debt service would be required to plug into FY24.

Ms. Light said that they would set up their borrowing in such a way that they would not see it until FY25.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that they were moving it up but would not have debt or debt service.

Ms. Light clarified that they may issue debt, but the debt service would not be due until FY25.

Ms. Bohmke said she was unclear what information was available related to the construction cost savings.

Mr. Chris Fulmer stated that there were some savings if #18 and #19 were bunched together, and they had just approved the architect for #18 at the most recent School Board meeting. He said that it was a prototype, so it could be used for both, but they had a reduced fee with the architect for when they used that same prototype for #19, and that was negotiated into the contract. He said that architectural fees were usually based on the cost of construction, which historically was 10%, but they had negotiated 6%.

Mr. Fulmer said that they were looking at architectural fees they could start to incur in FY24. He said that he recalled it was about $3M for Elementary School #18, so it would be a bit less for #19. He said if they pulled #19 up, they also prevented another year of inflation, so the sooner it happened, they would save money from avoiding the inflation. He said that there was potential for construction savings when doing them simultaneously, and it was difficult to put a firm number on, but typically in the industry was 5%.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Nay: (0)

Resolution R23-77 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE FISCAL YEARS (FY) 2024-2033 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) WITH THE INTENT TO REIMBURSE CERTAIN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the proposed FY2024-FY2033 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) was held on April 4, 2023, 7:00 P.M., in the Board Chambers at the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center, located at 1300 Courthouse Road Stafford, Virginia; and

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

WHEREAS, the five-year CIP with an additional five-year planning period is a significant part of the County's comprehensive planning; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that it is necessary to identify needed capital improvements;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the FY2024-FY2033 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) be and it hereby is adopted as follows, and as more particularly described in those documents entitled "FY2024-2033 PROPOSED CIP" and "Utilities Project Funding Summary" for FY2024-2033, with the intent to reimburse certain capital improvement expenditures for the same:

General Government	
Information Technology Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation (3R) Projects	
Public Safety	
Replacement Apparatus	Ambulance Replacement (3R Project)
Rockhill Station (FS8) Rebuild (New Site)	Fire and Rescue Equipment Replacement
Brooke Station 5 Rebuild (New Site)	SCBA Equipment Replacement
Fire & Rescue Station Repairs and Maintenance 3R Projects	Public Safety Joint Training Center, Logistics & Fire Apparatus Fleet
Embrey Mill Station 15 (New Build)	White Oak Station 7 Rebuild (New Site)
Firearms Range Building	Public Safety Radio Replacement
Public Safety Building Security Implementations (3R Project)	
Judicial	

New Circuit Court and Renovation of Existing Facility	
Land	
Land Acquisition	
Parks and Recreation	
Aquia Landing Parking Expansion	Carl Lewis Community Center
Duff McDuff Green Memorial Park	Library #4
Mountain View Property	Musselman Property
Two Stone Overlook	Patawomeck Park Phase #2
Parks, Recreation, and Cultural 3R Projects	Belmont Ferry Farm Trail
Community Facilities 3R Projects	
Transportation	
Garrisonville Road Widening (Eustace Rd to Shelton Shop Rd)	Onville Road Widening
Route 1 & Layhill Road Intersection Improvements	Leeland Road Widening
Shelton Shop Road Improvements	Roadway Safety/Widening Improvements
Brooke Road Reconstruction	Stefaniga Road and Mountain View Road Intersection Improvements
Rt. 628 Left Turn Lanes at Rt. 1 (American Legion/Eskimo Hill)	US-17 Business Pedestrian Improvements (Olde Forge to Lendall Lane)
Enon Road and Route 1 Improvements	US-17 Business STARS Improvements
Staffordboro Boulevard Sidewalk	
Education	
Schools 3R Projects	High School #6
Hartwood Elementary Rebuild	Elementary School #18
Elementary School #19	Drew Middle School Replacement
Rising Star Replacement (Including Associated Programs and Added Capacity)	High School Bus Access Roads and School Traffic Flow Improvements
Public Day School	Elementary School #20
Middle School #9	High School #7
Utilities (Water)	
R1 1 N WL (Am. Legion to Hospital)	370-201 Centreport Parkway Water Booster PS
342-15 Transmission Upgrade	Smith Lake WTP-Facility Upgrade-002
SLWTP-001 Smith Lake Water Treatment Plant Filter Replacement	342-01 24-inch Main from Olde Forge Dr.
342-02 Cambridge to Cool Springs	Abel Lake Dam Spillway Improvement
LMWTP-007 Replace Membranes	American Legion Road Water Main Upgrade

WTR Main INST: RT1 & SUNYSD	Smith Lake BPS Elec. & Fac. Upgrade
24-inch 342-05.5 Water Transmission Main	Berea Church Rd. Water Main Replacement
480-02 16-inch CVA Parkway to International	Raw Water Line – Abel Lake to Lake Mooney
433-06 Moncure Pump Station Upgrade	480-01 16-inch Celebrate Tank to Jewett
Telegraph Rd/Woodstock Intersection Water	Water Plant Regulator Upgrades
Various 3R Projects	
Utilities (Wastewater)	
LFR WWTF Plant Upgrade	AWWFT Elec. HDWKS Ancillary
A-205 Expand Upper Accokeek Pump Station	Grav. SWR Replacements Nelms Cir.
A-15 Aquia & Bridge Force Main Phase 2	LFR-226 Expand Potomac Creek Pump Station
LFR-59 Replace 8-inch to 10-inch Nelms to Auction Dr.	Huff & Claw PS Replacement
Aquia WTP MCC1 Em. Gen. Pre.	A-18 36-inch Austin Run (Whitson's)
A115 Aquia @ Bridge Force Main	Falls Run Sewer Intrcpt. Ph2
A-241 Decommission Autumn Ridge Pump Station	Various 3R Projects
Utilities (General)	
Utilities – Public Works Division Complex	Customer Service Renovation
Water and System and Wastewater System SCADA	Water and Sewer System Planning

NOTICE OF INTENT TO REIMBURSE
CERTAIN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES

Section 1: Statement of Intent. The County presently intends, at one time or from time- to-time, to finance projects in the FY2024-FY2033 Capital Improvement Program (Projects) with tax-exempt or taxable bonds, or other obligations (Bonds), and to reimburse capital expenditures paid by Stafford County (including expenditures previously paid by the County to the extent permitted by law) in connection with the Projects before the issuance of the Bonds.

Section 2: Source of Interim Financing and Payment of Bonds. Stafford County expects to pay the capital expenditures related to the Projects, and incurred before the issuance of the Bonds, with an inter-fund loan or loans from the General Fund or funds from temporary appropriations or loans from the General Capital Projects Fund. Stafford County expects to pay debt service on the Bonds from the General Fund consisting of general tax revenues for the Projects to be financed in the FY2024-FY2033 Capital Improvement Program. The maximum amount of the Bonds expected to be issued for the Projects is Seven Hundred Ninety Million Seven Hundred Twenty-Eight Thousand Dollars ($790,728,000).

Section 3: Effective Date; Public Inspection. This Resolution is adopted for the purpose of complying with Treasury Regulation Section 1.150-2 (26 CFR 1.150-2) or any successor regulation, and shall be in full force and effect upon its adoption. The Clerk of the Board shall file a copy of this Resolution in the records of Stafford County, available for inspection by the general public during Stafford County's normal business hours.

ITEM 21. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY ASSOCIATED WITH A RESTAURANT USE WITHIN THE B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL AND HC, HIGHWAY CORRIDOR OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICTS ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 44-120U (PROJECT KNOWN AS SHOP SAT ENGLAND RUN PANDA EXPRESS).

Ms. Kathy Baker stated that this item was a conditional use permit for a drive-through associated with a restaurant in the B-2, Urban Commercial, and HC, Highway Corridor overlays in the George Washington District. She said that the location was on the north side of Warrenton Road, east of Plantation Drive, the zoning was B-2, the zoning areas in pink, and some M-1 and M-2 uses within the vicinity. She said that existing conditions showed the former PNC Bank building on this property, which would be removed in order to make room for a new Panda Express with drive-through.

Ms. Baker stated that there was an existing entrance off of Warrenton Road and off of the internal access that served the remainder of the shopping center. She said that there would be no additional entrances off of Plantation Drive, there was existing sidewalk on Warrenton, and sidewalk would be added along Plantation Drive. She said that the Generalized Development Plan showed the entrance off Warrenton and modified entrance on the internal shared access. She said that the 2,600 square foot building would have circulation with the drive-through going counterclockwise around the drive-through lane. She said that they would have two lanes entering for ordering points and one lane for pickup, with a bypass lane on the outside of that.

Ms. Baker said that the applicant submitted a delivery truck access route, in which the delivery trucks would come in off of Warrenton Road, then would have to back up into the loading area and exit out of the north entrance. She said that it could potentially block travelways so they were limiting delivery hours to when the restaurant was not open for business. She indicated on the slide the architectural renderings of the building, which complied with the standards of the neighborhood design standards, including the mix of materials and roofline. She said that the comprehensive plan designation for this area was Berea Targeted Development Area and included a specific designation of Highway Commercial.

Ms. Baker said that with regard to the conditions, development of the site would occur in conformance with the GDP, there would be no new driveway entrances on Warrenton Road or Plantation Road, the sidewalk would be constructed along Plantation Drive, there would be a large row of evergreen shrubs to screen headlight glare from the drive-through area along Warrenton Road and Plantation Drive, and the building would be constructed in accordance with those renderings.

Ms. Baker said that staff found it to be generally consistent with land use recommendations, and the use was consistent with the established uses along Warrenton, and the proposed building was in conformance with the neighborhood design standards. She said that the use of the site would appropriately minimize impacts to the corridor highway. She said that the negative point was that the truck delivery would block the access lanes, but that would be mitigated by the condition. She said that staff recommended approval, and the Planning Commission voted 7-0 to recommend approval. She noted that this had a time limit for the Board's action of May 20, 2023.

Dr. Yeung opened the public hearing. She asked if there were any speakers. Seeing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to approve proposed Resolution R23-46.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

<u>Resolution R23-46 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) TO ALLOW A DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY IN THE B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL AND THE HC, HIGHWAY CORRIDOR OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICTS ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 44-120U, LOCATED IN THE GEORGE WASHINGTON ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, Panda Restaurant Group, Inc. submitted application CUP22154490 (Application), requesting a conditional use permit to allow a drive-through facility in the B-2, Urban Commercial and HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning Districts on Tax Map Parcel No. 44-120U, located within the George Washington Election District; and

WHEREAS, the Application was submitted pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-35, Table 3.1 and Sec. 28-59(e) which permit this use within the B-2 and HC Zoning Districts, after a CUP is issued by the Board; and

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

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that a conditional use permit pursuant to application CUP22154490 (CUP) be and it hereby is approved with the following conditions:

1. This Conditional Use Permit (CUP) permits one drive-through facility, in support of a restaurant use, in the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay and B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning Districts on Tax Map Parcel No. 44-120U (Property).

2. Development of the Property shall occur generally as shown on the Generalized Development Plan prepared by Norr Foresite Group, entitled, "Generalized Development Plan (GDP): Shops at England Run Panda Express," as last revised and sealed on January 19, 2023 (GDP).

3. Direct access to the Property shall be via the existing entrance on Warrenton Road and the existing variable width ingress/egress easement, as depicted on the GDP. No new driveway entrances onto Warrenton Road or Plantation Drive shall be permitted.

4. A sidewalk shall be constructed along Plantation Drive and a sidewalk connection shall be provided between the proposed building and the existing sidewalk along Warrenton Road, as generally depicted on the GDP.

5. A row of large evergreen shrubs adequate to screen headlight glare from the drive-through shall be provided along Warrenton Road and Plantation Drive, as shown on the GDP.

6. The building shall be constructed in general conformance with the styles and materials depicted on the architectural renderings prepared by NORR Architects Engineers Planners entitled "Illustrative Building Elevation," dated November 14, 2022.

7. A drive-through by-pass lane shall be provided as generally depicted on the GDP.

8. The dumpster shall be screened from view with masonry and/or brick materials, with type and color similar to that of the primary building.

9. This Conditional Use Permit (CUP) may be revoked for a violation of any of these conditions or any applicable federal, state, or County code, law, ordinance, or regulation.

ITEM 22. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR (1) A PROPOSED ZONING RECLASSIFICIATION, WITH PROFFERS, FROM THE B-2, OFFICE ZONING DISTRICT TO THE B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT, AND (2) A CONDITINOAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A HOTEL/MOTEL USE WITHIN THE B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL AND HC, HIGHWAY CORRIDOR OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICTS ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 28-20 (PROJECT KNOWN AS RA-AMIT, LLC).

Ms. Amy Taylor stated that this request was a rezoning of 4.98 acres from B-3, Office, to B-2, Urban Commercial, in addition to a conditional use permit for a hotel or motel use within the B-2 Zoning District and the Highway Corridor Overlay District. She said that the property in question was Tax Map Parcel No. 38-20 within the Falmouth District, and the applicant and property owner was RA-Amit, LLC. She said that the subject parcel was located along the east side of Richmond Highway, approximately 3,700 feet north of Center Port Parkway, and was currently zoned B-3, and the applicant was proposing a B-2 zoning. She said that the surrounding uses were M-1, B-1, B-2, and A-1.

Ms. Taylor said that prior to 1986, this parcel was the former location of the Town and Country Motel, and the property was later rezoned in 1986 to B-3 Office with no associated proffers. She said that a special use permit was also authorized in 1986 for use as a rest home, known as the Potomac Point Nursing Home, and was later amended in 1990 to expand the number of beds permitted. She said that the nursing home operations ultimately ceased in 2006, and the building had remained vacant since that time.

Ms. Taylor said that the applicant had indicated his intent to refurbish the existing building while maintaining the existing footprint, specifically to reestablish use as a hotel or motel. She said that in lieu of a Generalized Development Plan, the applicant had provided a boundary survey of the property, which depicted the layout of the site, as well as the location of the existing building and all other existing site features.

Ms. Taylor said that the building was currently vacant and existed with a single-story structure of approximately 21,815 square feet in size, in a classic horseshoe design with an existing parking area located in the center of that configuration. She said that access to the site would include two existing site entrances along Richmond Highway, and since the building was constructed prior to the establishment of development standards, it lacked sidewalk and adequate screening along the site’s frontage on Richmond Highway.

Ms. Taylor said that existing conditions showed that the site did have frontage along Richmond Highway, largely open with some smaller wooded areas throughout the northern and central portions of the property, and a larger vegetated area along the southern property line. She said that site topography was predominantly level, however the southern portion of the site was encumbered by a Resource Protection Area, and nearly the entire site was within the 100-year flood plain.

Ms. Taylor said that the RPA impacts were located within the southern half of the site, affecting one-third of the existing structure. She said that there was a FEMA map that depicted the existing flood zone impacts to the site and demonstrated that nearly the entire site was located within that 100-year floodplain, and a portion of the existing structure may also be within a regulatory floodway. She said that due to its location in this flood zone, the building was subject to provisions of the Flood Hazard Overlay District, which would ultimately require the impacted portion of the building to be flood-proof to a height of three feet or more above the base flood elevation.

Ms. Taylor said that due to the applicant's intent to refurbish the existing structure, architectural renderings had not been provided, however photographs of the existing building were provided as viewed from Richmond Highway, which depicted the building's design and general appearance. She said that the applicant had not proffered the building design nor had staff proposed conditions related to the building design or materials, but because of its location in the Highway Corridor Overlay District, any future expansion or reconstruction of the building would be required to perform to the design criteria of the neighborhood design standards, and compliance with all associated development standards would typically occur at the time of site plan review.

Ms. Taylor said that the comprehensive plan identified the property in the Central Stafford Targeted Development Area, and the more detailed land use concept plan designated the property as Business and Industry. She said that these areas were intended to serve as employment centers in the County, since the location would accommodate a wide range of commercial activities, ultimately serving small businesses to larger corporations She said that staff believed the proposed use as a hotel or other commercial use was both consistent with the comprehensive plan recommendations and appropriate within the business and industry area

Ms. Taylor said that proposed proffers associated with the rezoning would limit trip generation to no more than 1,000 trips per day, limit access to the site to no more than two entrances along Richmond Highway, limit use of the southern entrance to utility access and deliveries only and would require dedication of additional right-of-way along Richmond Highway to the maximum extent practical.

Ms. Taylor said that in regard to the conditional use permit for the hotel/motel use, there were proposed conditions that would allow for development of one hotel or motel, including a hospitality conference room, limit overnight lodging to 35 rooms, prohibit long-term room rentals exceeding 30 days, and would limit the southern entrance use to utility access and deliveries only. She said that it would also require loading spaces to be located behind the primary building, require installation of a fence along the eastern property line to screen the rear building façade.

Ms. Taylor said that overall, staff found that there were several positive aspects to these applications in that the request was generally consistent with the land use recommendations in the comprehensive plan, the proposed use was consistent with the established pattern of development along Richmond Highway, proffers limited maximum trip generation to no more than 1,000 trips per day, and the proposed conditions would also ensure any negative impacts were mitigated.

Ms. Taylor said that negative aspects of this request were that a significant portion of the property was impacted by a 100-year floodplain, which may ultimately limit future expansion or redevelopment on this site. She said that staff recommended approval of both the reclassification and conditional use permit applications, and the Planning Commission voted 6-1 for approval of the reclassification, and 7-0 for the approval of the conditional use permit. She said that there was a time limit associated with this application, which was Tuesday, April 15, 2023, the one-year deadline for the Board to take action.

Ms. Vanuch asked why the Board was receiving this item so late.

Ms. Taylor said that it initially went to the Planning Commission in February, but because of the number of items coming to the Board immediately after that, it was deferred until this date to come back to the Board.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the applicant was willing to wait a little longer. She said that she had questions about why they were not offering a GDP.

Ms. Taylor said that there was a code provision within the zoning ordinance that allowed them to waive a GDP at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Zoning based on certain components, and because he was proposing less than 2,500 square feet of disturbance, that was a criterion that allowed waiving the GDP, in addition to the proposal of refurbishment of the existing structure and not proposing to build anything new at this time.

Ms. Gary asked what specific uses there were that this proposal was compatible along Richmond Highway.

Ms. Taylor said that the specific uses referenced as compatible and consistent with development were other commercial uses in the vicinity such as the outdoor structure, sales immediately north of the site, consistency with the industrial park, and there was another planned industrial use across the street on the west side of Route 1.

Ms. Gary asked if it was directly across from that.

Ms. Taylor said that was correct.

Mr. English said that improvement would be appreciated.

Dr. Yeung asked if there was a traffic study done.

Ms. Taylor said no. She said that the proposed use of the applicant for a hotel/motel use would generate less than 1,000 trips per day, and County Code dictated that only uses that exceeded 1,000 trips per day required a traffic impact analysis, which was why there was a proffer indicating that the trips were limited to 1,000 trips per day, eliminating the need for a traffic impact study.

Dr. Yeung asked when the applicant planned on building the hotel.

Ms. Taylor said that the applicant planned to refurbish the hotel and was currently pulling building permits to do improvements to the building, including putting a new roof on the structure last year, and there were additional permits in with building right now for internal improvements.

Dr. Yeung asked if the applicant planned on keeping this site or to sell it.

Ms. Taylor said that the applicant's intent was to reestablish the hotel at this location and run it himself, but in the event that it did not work out for him, he was pursuing the general B-2 zoning, which would allow greater flexibility in the event that he chose to sell the property later.

Dr. Yeung asked if the applicant was planning to sell the property.

Ms. Taylor said that he had not expressed intent at the moment to sell the property.

Mr. Coen said that he did not understand why this site was using neighborhood design standards when it was surrounded by industrial and commercial use. He asked if it would look the same but be better, not upgraded to neighborhood design standards.

Ms. Taylor said that he would be required to comply with neighborhood design standards because the building was located within the Highway Corridor Overlay District.

Mr. Coen asked what those standards were.

Ms. Taylor said that they would limit the types of building materials that he could use on the outside of the structure. She said that the design and configuration of the building would remain the same because it was intact, but the colors and types of materials on the outside would require compliance with the standards.

Mr. Gupta, the Applicant said that he was requesting the Board to allow him the hotel/motel use. He said that he promised there would be no nuisance on the property, and he could give the names of the other three hotels that he ran, and they could call the police and County and town. He said that it would be a small, good-looking hotel. He said that no one lived in a shabby place, and they would try to make it as good as possible with a single story. He said that he did not have the funds, but if they gave him funds, he could demolish the building and make a three-story building.

Dr. Yeung asked if there were any questions for Mr. Gupta.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the Board could have a two-week extension and vote on this at their May 2, 2023 meeting.

Mr. Gupta said that he had no choice in the matter.

Mr. Coen said that there was a time limit.

Dr. Yeung asked if Mr. Gupta was amenable to doing it two weeks from now.

Mr. Gupta said that he would prefer to have approval right now.

Dr. Yeung opened the public hearing. She asked if there was anyone who wished to speak on this item. Seeing none, she closed the public hearing and brought the matter back before the Board.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to defer Item 22 to the May 2, 2023 3:00 p.m. meeting.
The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. McClendon asked if the Board could take a recess to allow staff to prepare the resolutions.

Dr. Yeung called for a five-minute recess until 11:27 p.m.

Dr. Yeung called the meeting back to order at 12:11 p.m.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to extend the meeting past midnight.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

<u>ITEM 25. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER SETTING THE CALENDAR YEAR (CY) 2023 TAX RATES.</u>

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to reconsider the tax rate R23-124.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(4)	Bohmke, Coen, Gary, Yeung
Nay:	(3)	Allen, English, Vanuch

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve a tax rate of $0.94.

Ms. Light stated that the Board was considering a tax rate increase of $0.02 to ensure support for all school raises of 5%, providing $4.5M to the schools, which they could use to give contracts a 5% increase across the board.

Ms. Vanuch said there was a challenge with the $3.7M being withheld by the Virginia Department of Education error, and without that they could not execute the contracts at the 5% increase for teachers. She said that there was potentially to be more funding available from the state, so they technically could provide one-time funds because the state would come through and they would not have to increase the tax rate. She said that she would not support this because of that reason.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the state comes through with the $3.75M, what happened to the excess money.

Ms. Vanuch said that they would keep it to leverage the teacher pay scale implementation instead.

Ms. Light said that the Board would have to appropriate those funds when they came, so it was not appropriated at this point, and if it was not included in the appropriated resolution or that resolution was not voted on tonight, it would be a decision to be made later.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that the $3.75M was essentially raising the tax rate, and if they got those monies, they were giving them back, but at the same time they had raised taxes. She asked if that was an accurate statement.

Ms. Light said yes. She said that the Board held the authority to appropriate the funds if they received the $3.75M, but if they did not, the Board had taken action through increasing the tax rate to ensure they had the 5%. She said that it was the schools' position that they wanted to understand their revenue sources before issuing contracts to school employees.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was irresponsible of the state. She asked Mr. Fulmer if there was no commitment right now from the state that they would give them those funds.

Mr. Fulmer said no. He said that as it stood now, they were projected to get $17.5M, but it was about $4.2M higher than when the Governor originally released his budget and was what the Superintendent had originally based his budget on. He said that about two days after the Superintendent presented his budget, there was news about the VDOE calculation error, and sometime after that realized that there was about a $7.5M hit to the schools. He said that on top of that, the General Assembly recessed and adopted a skinny budget, so they did not finalize the budget, and that skinny budget had another $500,000 hit to the School Board.

Mr. Fulmer said that with those adjustments, in order to fully fund the Superintendent's budget, it pushed the County's request to approximately $24M, which was not the original intent. He said that as Ms. Vanuch was explaining, they were said to come back in June to adopt a budget that would make right by the $3.75M and potentially more funds, but right now it would be irresponsible to issue contracts with the assumption of $4M or more in additional state monies, because as it stood now, they thought this was going to be fixed back in February during their normal session, but it was postponed to June.

Mr. Fulmer said that they did not have $4M and there was no way that they could cover that, so with all of those taken into account, with approximately $12M discussed tonight, they were short of the 5% raises, not including what was in the Superintendent's budget. He said that by not doing a 5% raise, they lost about $8.5M on top of that because there was a match from the state for them to do a 5% average across the board for staff. He said that they needed approximately $5M to reach that and were discussing with Ms. Light how to make that work.

Mr. Fulmer said that when the state returned with a budget in June, there was a chance that instead of 5%, they could make it 7% and give additional funds. He said that even at that point, they would not have to change the Superintendent's budget presentation, and they would meet that 7% requirement and implement the teacher pay scale correction of phase two. He said that even doing the 5% now was completely necessary because they needed to issue contracts, but only doing the 5% to the teacher pay scale instead of the pay scale correction set them back.

Ms. Bohmke said that if they increased the tax rate to do this, they would sit on $3.75M from the taxpayers that they did not have dedicated toward anything, and the Board would have to make a decision on that. She said that they could use one-time funds, and if money was received from the state, they switched the money out.

Ms. Vanuch asked Ms. Light how much in one-time funds they would have from voting on the $0.92 tax rate minus the money for apparatus and Sheriff's Office cars.

Ms. Light said that it would be approximately $3.6M.

Ms. Vanuch said that there was enough to do that. She asked what else could be funded with that.

Ms. Light said that there was $1.4M for 3R money, which they would ask the Board to replace with one-time funding, because the schools 3R were necessary, so that may not be enough to get to the $5M for the schools.

Ms. Vanuch said that Mr. Fulmer stated that he could find $500,000 in addition to the $4.5M in order to get it to $5M.

Ms. Light said that if they took out the $1.4M, there would not be a funding source to replace it with. She said the issue was that all the one-time money that would be available from the June billing would go to the schools, other than cars and apparatus, and the $1.4M, without a different funding source for that.

Ms. Bohmke asked if Ms. Light recommended using one-time money or not.

Mr. Vosburg said no, that was not their recommendation at this time.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(3)	Bohmke, Coen, Yeung
Nay:	(3)	Allen, English, Vanuch
Abstain:	(1)	Gary

Ms. McClendon said that there was currently not a tax rate set for this calendar year.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. English, for $0.92 as the tax rate.

Mr. Coen made a substitute motion for $0.940001.

Ms. Bohmke asked to make a friendly amendment for $0.94.

Mr. Coen said yes.

Ms. Bohmke seconded Mr. Coen's motion.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(3)	Bohmke, Coen, Yeung
Nay:	(4)	Allen, English, Gary, Vanuch

Ms. Bohmke made a substitute motion for $0.92, using one-time funds to get the schools where they needed to be with the additional funds of $4.53M that Ms. Light mentioned.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the tax rate would be $0.92 with the understanding that that would be one-time funds added to the budget.

Mr. Coen asked where the one-time funds were coming from.

Mr. Vosburg said that at $0.92, it was almost $8M in one-time money generated, and taking out $2.5M for fire apparatus and $1M for the cars for the sheriff, it left $4.5M in one-time money.

Mr. Coen asked how much was needed to fix the error.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was $4.53M.

Mr. Coen asked if there was no further funding for 3R if this funding was used in this case.

Ms. Light said that there was no change to the current budget proposed by the County Administrator for 3R projects for schools.

Mr. Bohmke said that the fire tax would stay where it was.

Dr. Yeung said that the reduction was from $0.94 to $0.925.
Mr. Vosburg said that the consideration was from $0.94 to $0.92, and utilization of one-time money to fix the School Board's problems. He said that the current vote was for a $0.92 tax rate.

Dr. Yeung said that there was still the issue of the $5M.

Mr. Vosburg said that there were two avenues, one avenue to cover it with the tax rate, which would take $0.94, or use one-time money at a $0.92 rate.

Ms. Bohmke said that they tried to include the $4.5M at $0.94, but that did not pass, so this was the other option.

Dr. Yeung asked if the one-time funding helped the schools.

Ms. Light said that this would be using one-time revenue for ongoing expenses, impacting the FY25 budget.

Ms. Vanuch said that was true if the state did not pay the money, and the state would give more than $3.7M. She asked to call the question.

Ms. Gary said that she would not be voting for this because it was irresponsible budgeting.

Dr. Yeung called for the vote.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(3)	Bohmke, English, Vanuch
Nay:	(4)	Allen, Coen, Gary, Yeung

Mr. Coen motioned to approve a tax rate of $0.94.

Dr. Yeung said that there was no second, so the motion failed.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve a tax rate of $0.92 and $4.53M out of reserves.

Ms. Vanuch made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Bohmke to approve a tax rate of $0.93, utilizing the rest in one-time funds.

Ms. McClendon said that there could not be another substitute motion on the floor, so a motion must be withdrawn.
Ms. Vanuch withdrew her motion for $0.92.

Mr. Coen asked what the impacts of this tax increase would be.

Ms. Light said that this one cent on the tax rate would be approximately $2.26M, and schools needed $4.5M to finish out their raises, so the difference of that would come out of one-time funding.

Ms. Allen asked if they would still have to use one-time funding for ongoing expenses.

Ms. Light said yes.

Ms. Gary asked if Ms. Light's opinion had changed on using one-time funding for ongoing expenses.

Ms. Light said no.

Mr. Coen asked how this would impact next year's tax rate if it was an ongoing issue. He asked what the pay for the Sheriff's Office was.

Ms. Light said it was $3.8M.

Mr. Coen asked what the debt for the high school was.

Ms. Light said that for the high school and Elementary School #19, the debt was $7.7M. She said that they would be losing the revenue source of the ARPA funds to cover the 15% sheriff pay increases, and they were assuming in FY25 that they had a $7.5M increase to the schools to continue with their operating, which was vastly different from the Superintendent's five-year plan, assuming that they were doing 40% of their revenue. She said that they were also assuming an additional fire crew for about $1.8M and a CAD for the sheriff. She said that overall, there was a $23M increase from those items alone, and it did not include any consideration of raises for general government staff or implementing the continuation of public safety's step plan.

Mr. Coen said that there would be a 13.35 increase next year, so if they did this with one-time funds, they were adding another penny next year.

Ms. Light said yes, it would definitely catch up.

Ms. Vanuch said that such a calculation did not account for additional revenue the County could receive or if the state paid the money that they said they would. She said that they did not have to account for it to raise the taxes.

Dr. Yeung called the vote for the real estate tax rate of $0.93.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(4)	Bohmke, English, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay:	(3)	Allen, Coen, Gary

Resolution R23-124 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE CALENDAR YEAR (CY) 2023 REAL ESTATE AND MOBILE HOME TAX RATE

WHEREAS, the Virginia Code requires the Board establish a levy for certain taxes each calendar year; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the proposed calendar year 2023 tax rates was held on April 4, 2023, at the 7:00 P.M. meeting, at the George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, located at 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Commissioner of the Revenue and the Treasurer require the timely establishment of tax levies to allow time for tax bills to be processed and received by citizens; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the following tax rates be and they hereby are established for the calendar year beginning January 1, 2023:

Classification	**Rate Per $100 of Assessed Value**
Real estate (Section 58.1-3200, Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	~~0.850~~ 0.930
Mobile homes (Section 58.1-3506(A)(10), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.)	~~0.850~~ 0.930

ITEM 28. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER APPROVING THE FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2024 COUNTY BUDGET AND APPROPRIATING THE FY2024 BUDGET.

Ms. Light said they had provided an updated general funds budget resolution, Resolution R23-75, which took into account all of the changes which had been discussed: removal of the Supervisor salary raises and additional staff; addition of a budget and management position; increases and decreases for IT; reductions to Fire and Rescue; increases to SCSO; increases to the Commonwealth's Attorney; a reduction to Planning and Zoning; a reduction to the Central Rappahannock Regional Library; a reduction to Parks and Recreation; a reduction to FES; an increase to the school operating transfer; reductions in funding for community engagement events; a reduction to capital transfers and school debt service; and an increase to school 3R projects.

Dr. Yeung said they could table the budget appropriation until the next Board meeting. She said they could wait for information on school funding from the state and other key pieces of information.

Ms. Vanuch made the motion, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve proposed Resolution R23-75.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (5) Bohmke, Coen, English, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay: (2) Allen, Gary

Resolution R23-75 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2024 COUNTY BUDGET

WHEREAS, the Board received public comment and held a public hearing on the proposed FY2024 County budget on April 4, 2023, at the 7:00 P.M. meeting, in the Board Chambers at the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road Stafford, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Board held budget work sessions at which the Board analyzed and deliberated on the County budget; and

WHEREAS, the Board considered the recommendations of staff, requests submitted by the School Board and partner agencies, information presented at the budget work sessions, and the public testimony, if any, received at the public hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that the FY2024 County budget be and it hereby is adopted as follows for the County Funds:

General Funds:

	Proposed	**Change**	**Adopted**
	414,926,761	**3,337,024**	**418,296,785**
Board of Supervisors	1,009,507	(181,311)	828,196
Budget and Management	1,025,071	107,390	1,132,461

Commissioner of the Revenue	3,696,555	0	3,696,555
County Administration	1,632,365	0	1,632,365
County Attorney	1,617,643	0	1,617,643
Electoral Board and Registrar	802,038	0	802,038
Finance	1,694,657	0	1,694,657
Procurement	865,455	0	865,455
Geographic Information System	807,777	0	807,777
Human Resources	1,415,840	0	1,415,840
Information Technology	5,135,762	13,967	5,149,729
Community Engagement	996,977	0	996,977
Treasurer	2,725,207	0	2,725,207
15th District Court Unit	364,384	0	364,384
Code Compliance	6,349,764	0	6,349,764
Fire & Rescue Services	37,496,316	(1,140,941)	36,355,375
Rappahannock Juvenile Center	1,632,804	0	1,632,804
Rappahannock Regional Jail Authority	8,767,030	0	8,767,030
Sheriff	44,683,397	603,251	45,286,649
Circuit Court	720,972	0	720,972
Clerk of the Circuit Court	1,931,488	0	1,931,488
Commonwealth's Attorney	4,687,213	88,851	4,776,064
Court Deputies	4,473,693	0	4,473,693
General District Court	117,258	0	117,258
Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court	132,488	0	132,488
Magistrate	8,717	0	8,717
Cooperative Extension	216,649	0	216,649
Economic Development	782,939	(20,110)	762,829
Partner Agencies - Community Development	324,189	20,110	344,299
Planning and Zoning	3,275,455	(136,699)	3,138,756
Human Services	6,710,011	0	6,710,011
Partner Agencies - Health and Social Services	2,018,101	0	2,018,101
Social Services	11,094,062	0	11,094,062
Central Rappahannock Regional Library	5,768,141	(230,640)	5,537,501
Parks and Recreation	10,379,720	(85,000)	10,294,720
Community Facilities	5,534,443	(1,500)	5,532,943
Engineering	895,760	0	895,760

Partner Agencies - Germanna Community College	348,858	0	348,858
Schools Operating Budget Transfer	153,747,669	4,246,780	157,994,449
Schools Public Day School Transfer	1,154,922	0	1,154,922
Schools Transfer to Designated Repairs, Replacement and Rehab	1,445,865	344,612	1,790,477
Schools Transfer for Capital Projects	5,540,016	(3,333,158)	2,206,858
Schools Debt Service	34,667,653	(344,612)	34,323,041
County Debt Service	7,919,339	0	7,919,339
Non-Departmental - Human Resources	715,149	0	715,149
Non-Departmental - Insurance	1,247,939	0	1,247,939
Non-Departmental - Capital and One-Time Projects	6,006,839	1,248,000	7,254,839
Non-Departmental - Other	2,274,674	(384,466)	1,890,208
Non-Departmental - Purchase of Development Rights	250,000	0	250,000
Non-Departmental - Fire and Emergency Services Fund	0	2,737,698	2,737,698
Non-Departmental - Transfer to Capital Projects Fund	9,779,645	(182,198)	9,597,447
Non-Departmental - Transfer to Transportation Fund	8,038,342	0	8,038,342

<u>Other Funds:</u>

	Proposed	**Changes**	**Adopted**
Asset Forfeiture Fund	320,000		320,000
Armed Services Memorial	2,000		2,000
Capital Improvements Fund	154,228,091	(52,624,912)	101,603,179
E-Summons Fund	31,370		31,370
Fire and Emergency Services Fund	14,953,645	6,559,500	21,513,145
Fleet Services Fund	4,952,011		4,952,011
Garrisonville Road Service District Fund	1,474,568		1,474,568
Hidden Lake Special Revenue Fund	122,358		122,358
Historic Port of Falmouth Parking Fees	60,000		60,000
Lake Arrowhead Service District Fund	100,623		100,623
Lake Carroll Service District Fund	30,970		30,970
Lynhaven Lane Service District	5,500		5,500
Tourism Fund	3,256,597		3,256,597
Transportation Fund	19,874,323		19,874,323

Transportation Impact Fee - County-Wide Fund	800,000		800,000
Utilities Funds	89,222,578		89,222,578

;and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the FY2024 Schools budget is approved in the following amounts:

	Proposed	**Changes**	**Adopted**
Construction Fund	132,015,542	(78,824,329)	53,191,213
Grants Fund	16,383,681		16,383,681
Health Services Fund	37,062,970		37,062,970
Nutrition Services Fund	21,066,738		21,066,738
Schools Operating Fund	404,716,492	4,246,780	408,963,272
Workers' Compensation Fund	1,553,454		1,553,454

; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board desires to continue to support special education students in the County, as identified by Stafford County Public Schools, and authorizes the County Administrator to execute a memorandum of understanding with the School Board for the Public Day School program in an amount not to exceed One Million One Hundred Fifty-Four Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty-Two Dollars ($1,154,922). The Public Day School program provides educational services in the least restrictive, most cost-effective environment, within the community, through shared responsibility between the County and Schools for Public Day School students; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to disburse funds to Stafford County Volunteer Fire and Rescue companies only after ensuring compliance with the Fire and Rescue Department, County, and State policies, regulations, rules, and procedures; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County's authorized full-time strength is 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 Full-Time	FY2023 Revised Part-Time	FY2024 Full-Time	FY2024 Part-Time
General Fund • Non-Public Safety	~~429~~	~~159~~	444	159
• Public Safety	~~526~~	~~16~~	549	25
Utilities Fund	~~164~~	0	167	0
Capital Projects Fund	2	0	2	0
Transportation Fund	~~3~~	0	4	0
Total	**~~1,124~~**	**~~175~~**	**1,166**	**184**

; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an 4.0% pay scale adjustment is authorized, effective July 1, 2023, for all full-time and regular part-time General Government County employees; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a 4.0% salary increase is authorized, effective July 1, 2023, for all full-time and regular part-time General Government County employees hired prior to April 1, 2023, whose job performance is effective or better; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an 8.0% scale adjustment is authorized for uniformed Fire and Rescue positions and Sheriff's Lieutenant and above positions, effective July 1, 2023 and a 15% scale adjustment is continued and recognized for the Sheriff's First Sergeant and below positions which was already authorized and became effective January 1, 2023; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a salary step increase is authorized in accordance with the Public Safety Step Plan, effective on the anniversary date, for all full-time and regular part-time Public Safety County employees whose job performance is effective or better; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board approves the FY2024 Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC) subsidy of One Hundred Thirty-Nine Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($139,500) and the Virginia Railway Express (VRE) subsidy of Two Million Three Hundred Six Thousand Six Hundred Twenty-Five Dollars ($2,306,625), and authorizes the payment of the subsidies during FY2024 from the County's Motor Fuels Tax Revenue Fund.

Ms. Vanuch asked when the matter should be deferred.

Ms. McClendon said it was at the Board's discretion.

Ms. Bohmke asked what Ms. Light's recommendation was.

Ms. Light said they could defer the matter to May 2, and if there was no additional information from the state, it could be deferred further.

Ms. Vanuch made the motion, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to defer Resolution R23-76 to the May 2 meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 29. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER IMPLEMENTING FY2024 RAISES FOR SOCIAL SERVICE POSITIONS EARLY AND BUDGETING AND APPROPRIATING ONE TIME FUNDING TO SUPPORT THE SAME.

Ms. Light said the resolution would implement social service increases in early May using one-time funding. She said the budget included an increase based on a comprehensive market study. She said there were significant morale issues and compensation issues.

Ms. Allen asked if the tax rate would be impacted moving forward from using the one-time funding.

Ms. Light said the budget already supported the continuation of the program. She said the funds were related to early implementation.

Mr. Coen made the motion, seconded by Mr. English, to approve proposed Resolution R23-120.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R23-120 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE IMPLEMENT OF FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2024 RAISES FOR SOCIAL SERVICES POSITIONS EARLY, EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 2023, AND TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE PRIOR YEAREND FUND BALANCE

WHEREAS, the Human Resources and Social Services Departments completed a market study for Social Services positions which showed lower than market pay; and

WHEREAS, the Board approved the pay increase as part of the FY2024 budget in the estimated amount of $330,500 with a projected revenue offset of $104,108; and

WHEREAS, due to the nature of these positions, the Board desires to use prior yearend fund balance to implement the FY2024 raises on May 1, 2023 for all eligible Social Services employees; and

WHEREAS, prior yearend fund balance funds are available and can be used for this purpose;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 18th day of April, 2023, that pay raises equal to the amount approved by the Board for general government employees as part of the Fiscal Year 2024 budget be and they hereby are approved with an implementation date of May 1, 2023 for all eligible Social Services employees; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that prior yearend fund balance is budgeted and appropriated as follows to implement the raises authorized herein:

Fund	**Department**	**Amount**
General Fund	Social Services	$50,850

ADJOURNMENT

At 12:47 a.m., Chairman Yeung adjourned the April 18, 2023 Stafford County Board of Supervisor's meeting.

Randy Vosburg

Randal E. Vosburg
County Administrator

Yeung

Dr. R. Pamela Yeung
Chairman

Julia E. Holmes

From: noreply@revize.com
Sent: Saturday, April 15, 2023 11:19 AM
To: Cheryl D. Giles
Cc: Julia E. Holmes
Subject: Speaker Card

First-Name = Lester
Last-Name = Gabriel
Address1 = 86 Smithfield Way
City = Fredericksburg
State = VA
Zip = 22406
Written-Comment = I strongly oppose any increase to the tax rate anywhere near the maximum that has been proposed ($1.145). Even half of that increase, I.E. anything over $1.00, would put many elderly homeowners on fixed incomes at risk of losing their homes. Holding revenue increases to a level that covers inflation and population growth would not cut the level of services provided by the County.
Plan-to-speak =
Client IP = 173.71.211.62

Julia E. Holmes

From: noreply@revize.com
Sent: Saturday, April 15, 2023 8:04 PM
To: Cheryl D. Giles
Cc: Julia E. Holmes
Subject: Speaker Card

First-Name = Ruth Cady
Last-Name = Bell
Address1 = 651 Lancaster St
City = Fredericksburg
State = VA
Zip = 22405
Subject-Comments = Presentations by the Public 7pm
Written-Comment = Signing up to speak at 7pm regarding the budget
Plan-to-speak =
Client IP = 173.71.219.166

Julia E. Holmes

From: noreply@revize.com
Sent: Sunday, April 16, 2023 8:10 AM
To: Cheryl D. Giles
Cc: Julia E. Holmes
Subject: Speaker Card

First-Name = David
Last-Name = Ulrich
Address1 = 2 Brookeshire Drive
City = Fredericksburg
State = Virginia
Zip = 22405
Subject-Comments = Presentations by the Public 7pm
Written-Comment = Will be speaking for allotted 3 minutes.
Plan-to-speak =
Client IP = 96.241.104.10

Julia E. Holmes

From:	noreply@revize.com
Sent:	Monday, April 17, 2023 11:11 AM
To:	Cheryl D. Giles
Cc:	Julia E. Holmes
Subject:	Speaker Card

First-Name = Eric
Last-Name = Pacheco
Address1 = 76 Carriage Hill DR.
City = Fredericksburg
State = VA
Zip = 22405
Subject-Comments = April 18, 2023 Resolution R23-78 - Virginia Public School Authority General Obligation Debt
Written-Comment = I plan to speak.
Plan-to-speak =
Client IP = 70.109.57.74

Julia E. Holmes

From: noreply@revize.com
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 11:52 AM
To: Cheryl D. Giles
Cc: Julia E. Holmes
Subject: Speaker Card

First-Name = Stephen
Last-Name = Cohen
Address1 = 63 Settlers Way
City = Stafford
State = VA
Zip = 22554
Subject-Comments = Presentations by the Public 7pm
Written-Comment = Plan to speak
Plan-to-speak =
Client IP = 214.25.106.207